

Discussion Papers No. 398, December 2004
Statistics Norway, Research Department

Iulie Aslaksen, Bent Natvig and Inger Nordal

**Environmental risk and the
precautionary principle**
**“Late lessons from early warnings”
applied to genetically modified
plants**

Abstract:

The environmental risk associated with genetically modified organisms (GMO) implies that new approaches to risk assessment, risk management and risk communication are needed. In this paper we discuss the role of the precautionary principle in policy responses to GMO risk. We first discuss application of the criteria in the European Environment Agency report “Late lessons from early warnings: The precautionary principle 1896-2000” to environmental GMO risk, with focus on crop plants. Moreover, we discuss Bayesian analysis in the context of improving the informational basis for decision making under uncertainty. Finally, environmental uncertainties are intertwined with economic uncertainties. Providing incentives for improved risk assessment, risk management and risk communication is crucial for enhancing social and environmental responsibility and thereby facilitate implementation of precautionary approaches. We discuss ethical screening of companies as an example of how such incentives can be provided.

Keywords: Environmental risk, precautionary principle, Bayesian analysis, genetically modified organisms.

JEL classification: D81, Q20, Q50

Acknowledgement: The authors would like to thank Jørund Gåsemeyr, Haakon Vennemo and the participants of the GMO risk conferences in Oslo, Brussels and Ravello in 2003 for comments and helpful discussions, the referees for very constructive critical reports, and Anne Skoglund for excellent editing and word processing.

Address: Iulie Aslaksen, Statistics Norway, Research Department. E-mail: iulie.aslaksen@ssb.no
Bent Natvig, Department of Mathematics, University of Oslo. E-mail: bent@math.uio.no
Inger Nordal, Department of Biology, University of Oslo. E-mail: inger.nordal@bio.uio.no

Discussion Papers

comprise research papers intended for international journals or books. A preprint of a Discussion Paper may be longer and more elaborate than a standard journal article, as it may include intermediate calculations and background material etc.

Abstracts with downloadable Discussion Papers
in PDF are available on the Internet:

<http://www.ssb.no>

<http://ideas.repec.org/s/ssb/dispap.html>

For printed Discussion Papers contact:

Statistics Norway
Sales- and subscription service
NO-2225 Kongsvinger

Telephone: +47 62 88 55 00

Telefax: +47 62 88 55 95

E-mail: Salg-abonnement@ssb.no

1. Introduction

Many scientists express concerns about potential irreversible impacts of releasing genetically modified organisms (GMO) into the natural environment, while others emphasize their potential benefits in increasing agricultural output and enhancing certain aspects of food quality, as well as potential environmental benefits such as reduced pesticide and herbicide use, soil conservation and phytoremediation of polluted soil and surface water (Wolfenbarger and Phifer 2000). Despite the large research efforts in GMO risk assessments, see e.g. EU (2001), unresolved issues remain in the assessments of long-term environmental risk. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the role of the precautionary principle in policy responses to GMO risk.

Since the precautionary principle was introduced in environmental risk management at the 1992 Rio conference on environment and development, the issue of when and how to use the precautionary principle has given rise to much debate. The European Commission has established some guidelines in its Communication on the precautionary principle, suggesting that “The precautionary approach should be considered within a structured approach to the analysis of risk which comprises three elements: risk assessment, risk management, risk communication. The precautionary principle is particularly relevant to the management of risk” (European Commission 2000, p. 2). However, as we argue in this paper, the intertwining of environmental and economic risks in relation to GMO crops suggests that a precautionary approach should involve all three elements.

Moreover, risk perception varies between stakeholder groups, and risk may be seen as having an element of social construction (Slovic 2001). Risk communication between stakeholder groups may influence perceived risks and improve risk assessments, as well as providing incentives for improved risk management. As a background for our discussion of the precautionary principle, we first discuss some recent controversies in GMO risk analysis, considering that the environmental and health related uncertainties are intertwined with economic and social uncertainties (Batie and Ervin 2001). We then discuss regulatory efforts of the EU and OECD in light of the precautionary principle and discuss some of the literature on the precautionary principle. A recent overview of the application of the precautionary principle in relation to GMOs is given by Myhr (2002) and Myhr and Traavik (2002). We argue that decision-making under uncertainty needs to incorporate a precautionary perspective based on environmental responsibility.

We discuss three different approaches to implementation of the precautionary principle, each of them comprising both risk assessment, risk management and risk communication. Rather than contributing to a precise definition of a precautionary principle, we consider it more fruitful to provide interpretations of what we see as a precautionary perspective in various contexts. Our first approach is to discuss to what extent the potential risks associated with GMO, in particular crop plants, represent a relevant example in the context of the European Environment Agency report “Late lessons from early warnings: The precautionary principle 1896-2000” (EEA 2001). The report describes the environmental and health costs of not responding to credible scientific “early warnings” and summarizes some of the “late lessons” that may be drawn from these experiences, with the aim to “prevent, or at least minimise, future impacts of other agents that may turn out to be harmful, and to do so without stifling innovation or compromising science” (EEA 2001, p. 11). The EEA report does not include any examples of false alarms, where actions taken on the basis of a precautionary approach later may have turned out to be unnecessary. Despite invitations to industry to submit such cases, “no suitable examples emerged” (EEA 2001, p. 12).

Secondly, in order to provide a more formal interpretation of the precautionary principle, we discuss Bayesian analysis in the context of improving the informational basis for decision making under large uncertainty about potentially irreversible effects on the ecosystem. The precautionary approach taken by decision makers is reflected in their evaluation of risk.

Finally, we discuss implementation of precautionary strategies via economic incentives. We discuss the possibility of providing economic incentives for biotechnology companies to improve their risk assessment, risk management and risk communication. We suggest that ethical screening of companies may provide incentives for companies to enhance their social and environmental responsibility, and thereby facilitate implementation of precautionary strategies.

2. Uncertainty issues: Environmental and economic risk

It is frequently argued that genetic modification techniques provide a faster and more effective method for a process that has been carried out for ages, namely, the development of desirable characteristics in crops and animals through selective breeding. However, this argument overlooks the qualitative difference between the two types of processes. Selective breeding permits the concentration of certain characteristics already inherent within a particular species, or enhanced by hybridization between closely related species. The unpredictability created by introduction of genetic material from entirely unrelated species is a qualitatively different issue that raises a number of environmental and health

related safety concerns. The environmental risks related to GMO crops include herbicide resistance and the development of superweeds, nontarget adverse effects on beneficial organisms such as pollinators, and loss of biological and genetic diversity.

Herbicide-tolerant weeds, called superweeds, may evolve through gene flow from transgenic plants to wild plants. Recent studies show that herbicide-resistance has been transferred from GMO crops to weeds (Ellstrand, Prentice and Hancock 1999). For example, glyphosate tolerance is now known in rigid ryegrass, a pernicious weed. If glyphosate resistance spreads, there is concern that more toxic herbicides may be required. The empirical question is to what extent it is likely that the GMO crop or its hybrids with wild relatives will persist outside cultivation. Wolfenbarger and Phifer (2000) review a number of studies on rapeseed that indicate that self-sustaining populations of transgenes outside cultivation seem unlikely, whereas establishment through hybridization with wild relatives seems more likely.

Moreover, genetic modifications may enhance the ability of an organism to become an invasive species. Invasive species have been categorized as one of the three most pressing environmental problems, in addition to global climate change and habitat loss (Wolfenbarger and Phifer 2000). The vulnerability of ecosystems to invasive species is exacerbated by human activity, such as clear cutting of forests and other changes in land-use. In practice, few introduced organisms become invasive, yet an issue for risk management is how to identify those modifications that may lead to or augment invasive characteristics (Warwick and Small 1999).

Another source of uncertainty is the direct nontarget effects on beneficial and native organisms. Plants engineered to produce proteins with pesticidal properties, such as *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) toxin, have direct and indirect effects on populations of nontarget species, such as pollinators. The laboratory study suggesting that adverse effects may occur when monarch butterfly larvae ingest Bt corn pollen (Losey, Raynor and Carter 1999) was criticized for its lack of relevance to field conditions, and a recent 2-year field study suggests that the impact of Bt corn pollen on monarch butterfly populations is negligible (Sears et al. 2001). Ladybird larvae, who contribute to controlling harmful insects, have been adversely affected by genetically modified corn. Bt corn can release toxin through its roots into the soil and affect the soil microfauna important for the decomposition of organic material in the soil (Saxena et al. 1999).

The perceived risk of GMO is amplified by the interactions of environmental and health risks with social and economic risks. Public concern about GMO food has not been based solely on concern about environmental and health related risks, see Burton, Rigby, Young and James (2001) and Noussair, Robin and Ruffieux (2002). Economic risks have been widely cited too, as discussed by Harhoff, Régibeau and Rockett (2001). Such economic risks include the fear that the world's food supply increasingly will be controlled by a few large firms, the concern about these firms engaging in anti-competitive practices such as the integration of seed and agri-chemical manufacturers, as well as the issue of ownership rights over genetic resources being transferred to the private sector. The introduction of terminator genes gives rise to particular consideration. This type of genetically modified crops does not yield fertile seeds. Farmers can no longer depend on own production of seeds, but have to buy seeds and, moreover, may be threatened by litigation even if their native crops unintentionally are polluted by windspread GMO (Warwick and Meziani 2002).

Adoption of GMO crops may reduce the genetic diversity in important food crops. Although the wild maize became extinct 2000 years ago, its genes have survived in a large number of local varieties in Mexico. This unique resource is now threatened by genetically modified corn crowding-out the local varieties, effectively contributing to their extinction and leading to an irreversible loss of genes. In November 2001 *Nature* published an article by Eric Quist and Ignacio Chapela, showing that transgenes are found in five out of seven native varieties of maize in Mexico (Quist and Chapela 2001). After a number of critical reviews of the Quist and Chapela results, *Nature* claimed in an editorial note of 11 April 2002 that "the evidence is not sufficient to justify the publication of the original paper". Withdrawing a published article is a surprising response to a situation of controversy, which normally will find its resolution through subsequent publication of new results and open debate.

3. Elements of the precautionary principle

In 1986, OECD published its first safety considerations for GMOs (OECD 1986). The subsequent OECD work on safety in biotechnology has been based on the concepts of substantial equivalence and the familiarity principle (OECD 1993a, 1993b). Substantial equivalence and the familiarity principle emphasize the similarity between conventionally bred crop plants and their GMO counterparts. The controversies over GMO risk assessment, risk management and risk communication suggest that relying on substantial equivalence and the familiarity principle may not capture all the relevant risk elements and that precautionary strategies may be appropriate, see Myhr (2002).

The EU guidelines require that measures based on the precautionary principle should be proportional to the chosen level of protection, non-discriminatory in their application, consistent with similar measures already taken, based on an examination of the potential benefits and costs of action or lack of action, subject to review, in the light of new scientific data, and capable of assigning responsibility for producing the scientific evidence necessary for a more comprehensive risk assessment (European Commission 2000, p. 3). The precautionary principle has recently been taken into account in EU legislation on GMO (European Council 2001). For example, the directive emphasizes that monitoring of potential cumulative long-term effects should be carried out, and that the introduction of GMOs into the environment should be carried out according to the “step by step” principle.

The controversy over how to interpret the precautionary principle and apply it as a tool for decision-making has inspired a large literature. A key element in recent applications of the precautionary principle is the recognition that not all future outcomes are well defined at the time of risk assessment. What is referred to as uncertainty can hide the distinction between uncertainty, risk and ignorance, where the concept of ignorance applies in situations where the definition of a complete set of outcomes is problematic, see Funtowicz and Ravetz (1990), Wynne (1992) and Stirling (1999). The usefulness of the concept of ignorance lies in its reminder that unexpected events are easily overlooked in risk assessment. Hazards not identified will not be analysed, unless the risk assessment process explicitly searches for “early warnings” of unexpected effects.

Natvig and Gåsemeyr (1996) and Natvig (1987) show that a standard risk aversion argument leads to preferring a decision based on larger probabilities for less severe consequences compared to one with smaller probabilities for more severe consequences. This risk aversion argument is strengthened if the uncertainties in probabilities and consequences are larger in the latter decision, and even more if the ethical problems are more apparent. In this case, risk aversion can be interpreted as an application of the precautionary principle.

Gollier, Jullien and Treich (2000) argue that the intuition behind the precautionary principle leads, in light of substantial uncertainty, to other preventive strategies than what is usually called for by the notion of risk aversion in standard decision-making under uncertainty. Gollier and Treich (2003) provide a further economic interpretation of the precautionary principle in terms of option values. Sandsmark and Vennemo (2003) relate the precautionary principle to the pricing of risk in financial models and suggest that investments contribute to a precautionary approach if their risk profile is uncorrelated or negatively correlated with average risk in society.

Klinke and Renn (1999, 2002) analyze precautionary strategies where ignorance about future potential outcomes is explicitly taken into account. They provide a classification of the domain of ignorance that should be addressed in risk assessments by considering the potential extent of damage vs. the potential probabilities of occurrence for different types of environmental risk. In their view, the challenge of designing a precautionary approach involves improving and refining the knowledge of potential hazards and their probabilities, initiating timely action when there are reasonable grounds for concern, and improving communication between stakeholder groups.

Communication on risk perception is an important part of implementing a precautionary approach (Shrader-Frechette 1991). In the terminology of Klinke and Renn (1999, 2002), a precautionary strategy must induce decision makers to avoid opening Pandora's box of long-term environmental and health hazards. An important element in this strategy is expanding the scope of risk assessments and systematically taking "early warnings" into account.

4. Late lessons from early warnings

In this section we discuss the relevance of the twelve late lessons of the EEA report in the context of GMO risk. We focus on environmental risk and also discuss possible interactions between environmental, health related, social and economic consequences of GMO adoption.

1. Acknowledge and respond to ignorance, as well as uncertainty and risk, in technology appraisal and public policy-making

Many of the case studies in "Late lessons" illustrate that the scope of the risk assessments was not broad enough, and unexpected outcomes were not considered. The question in our context is how unexpected outcomes can be taken into account in risk assessments of GMO crops. Ecosystems are complex, and not every risk associated with the release of new organisms can be identified, much less taken into account. Some risks derive from rare events, and it may take many years for problems to emerge. At larger spatial scales, there is a greater possibility for contact with sensitive species or habitats or for landscape-level changes. Although the likelihood that GMO crops, like other cultivated species, will establish in wild conditions seems small, it is important to give particular attention to those traits of the modified plants that enhance their competitiveness in natural surroundings.

The novelty of the GMOs and lack of experience with their adoption emphasize the potential risk and point to the importance of systematically looking for "early warnings". One aspect of the novelty of the genetic modification technology is the possibility to introduce genetic material from entirely

unrelated species, for example genes from Arctic flounder in order to improve cold tolerance in potatoes. Crossing the species border, in contrast to traditional selective breeding, that is limited by the available genetic variability within the organisms and its close relatives, implies an unpredictability that raises a number of environmental and health related safety concerns. Some of the main concerns related to human health risks include toxic or allergic reactions of genetic modification, direct uptake of genetic material, and increased antibiotics resistance (Donaldson and May 1999). Although direct uptake of genetic material into human cells seems extremely unlikely, Traavik (1999) argues that the lack of reliable data on the direct uptake of genetic material into human cells precludes any assessments of risk levels, and that the precautionary principle should be applied.

2. Provide adequate long-term environmental and health monitoring and research into early warnings

Many of the case studies in “Late lessons” indicate the value of systematic, long-term monitoring and well-planned research, essential to the identification of potential hazards. Monitoring of GMO crops is discussed by Marvier, Meir and Kareiva (1999). Marvier (2001) suggests that 30 or more years of sampling might be required in order to assess probability distributions of environmental effects. Monitoring of potential cumulative long-term effects is included in the new EU legislation (European Council 2001). In light of the long time horizon before reliable data can be obtained, it is important to establish criteria for detecting “early warnings”.

3. Identify and work to reduce “blind spots” and gaps in scientific knowledge

A “blind spot” in scientific knowledge may occur as a result of failing to acknowledge and respond to ignorance, in the sense of not addressing potential hazards that are considered outside the normal domain for risk assessment. The study by Quist and Chapela (2001) on genetic contamination of corn landraces in Mexico, discussed above, provides an example of “blind spots”. Another example is the controversial study by Ewen and Pusztai (1999), indicating that rats fed on genetically modified potatoes suffered from stunted growth, intestinal damage, and immune system problems. The Pusztai experiments lead to substantial controversies in the scientific community, and Pusztai was suspended from the Rowett Research Institute and subjected to investigation, see Hadfield (2000) for a further discussion. It is a challenge for the scientific community, industry and government to cooperate in order to initiate new research to test controversial results, provide information, improve communication between academic and industry research, and ensure independent research funding. A strategy of risk communication and cooperation could enhance the capacity of overcoming “blind spots” and detecting “early warnings”.

4. Identify and reduce interdisciplinary obstacles to learning

Improving risk assessment, risk management and risk communication in relation to GMOs requires a broad interdisciplinary approach involving microbiologists, botanists, entomologists, ecologists, the medical profession, statistical experts as well as social scientists. Conflicting expert opinions and differences in risk perception may preclude formal risk assessment. Given the complexity of the uncertainties, it is important to refine the statistical methods for improving the informational basis for decision-making under uncertainty and conflicting opinions. Recently, more attention has been given to the Bayesian approach of updating probabilities based on new information. As we will discuss in the following, Bayesian analysis offers a framework for consistent evaluation of conflicting expert opinions and contributes to a formal interpretation of the precautionary principle.

5. Ensure that real world conditions are adequately accounted for in regulatory appraisal

The complexity of ecological systems presents considerable challenges for experiments to assess the risks and benefits of GMO. The lack of relevant and reliable empirical data on long-term and large-scale adoption of GMO crops makes it difficult to apply traditional risk management methods based on probability distributions. Laboratory-based research on field adoptions of GMO crops is not representative of conditions on real farms. In experimental studies, the dynamics of gene flows from GMO crops to weeds will best be described by the use of commercial-sized plots (Klinger and Ellstrand 1999). Establishing systematic monitoring as well as criteria for detecting “early warnings” is required.

6. Systematically scrutinize the claimed justifications and benefits alongside the potential risks

If a technology is introduced to replace a previous technology causing environmental problems, new problems associated with the new technology may readily be overlooked. In the context of GMO risk, this dilemma is illustrated by the trade-off between adoption of GM crops and use of herbicides and pesticides (Wesseler 2001). In a cost-benefit analysis of the adoption of GMO crops in Europe, Wesseler (2001) has analysed the benefits of GMO adoption in terms of reduced pesticide use, with its positive impact on human health, ground water quality and bio-diversity.

In risk assessments for GMOs, the choice of null-hypothesis has important policy implications. With a null-hypothesis that GMO food is safe, the burden of proof lies on the government, public interest groups or consumers. A null-hypothesis that GMO food is unsafe places the burden of proof on the biotechnology industry. It is important to avoid a situation of “no evidence of harm” being misinterpreted as “evidence of no harm”. The assumption that GMO crops are “safe until proven otherwise” is discussed by Marvier (2001) in a review of a number of applications for approval of

GMO crops by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. For a toxicity study of Bt cotton she found that it relied on a small sample, only $n = 4$, and did not give a statistically significant conclusion, whereas an increase to only eight replicates would give a statistically significant result that this Bt cotton did harm the tested species. In another study, of Bt potatoes, she found that the investigators repeated experiments only when a statistically significant non-target effect of Bt toxin was detected. If the assumption “safe until proven otherwise” is to be maintained, the rigor of testing must be improved considerably.

7. Evaluate a range of alternative options for meeting needs alongside the option under appraisal, and promote more robust, diverse and adaptable technologies so as to minimize the costs of surprises and maximize the benefits of innovation

Adoption of genetically modified crops in agriculture worldwide is often seen as a means for securing food supplies in poor countries and alleviating hunger. But there is no guarantee that increased food production will reach the starving people. A more precautionary approach to increasing world food supply would be to not only promote adoption of GMO crops, but also to promote environmental improvement in traditional agriculture, innovations in organic farming, and preservation of genetic diversity in agriculture.

Moreover, a precautionary approach should also include a more rapid adoption of for example intra-genetic techniques like chimeroplasty (Beetham et al. 1999). Intra-genetic methods are likely to give more stable and predictable organisms than transgenics, as the recipient genome is not destabilized by insertions of foreign DNA, and no new promoter is added.

8. Ensure use of “lay” and local knowledge as well as relevant specialist expertise in the risk appraisal

Lay knowledge is complementary to expert knowledge, with its firm grounding in real world conditions and independence from any particular professional perspective. The use of lay and local knowledge is important for improvements in traditional and organic agriculture. Traditional agriculture in poor countries often suffers from lack of property rights and financial resources, and limited access to markets. Improving these conditions could enhance productivity in traditional agriculture and provide alternatives to industrial agriculture. Sustainable development of agriculture involves preservation of local knowledge and culture along with environmental improvements.

9. Take full account of the assumptions and values of different social groups

In the context of GMO risk, different stakeholder groups have widely diverging opinions on risk perception. Attention should be given to differences in risk perception between experts and the public (Slovic 2001). Some consumers are mostly concerned with potential health effects of GMO food, while others are attentive to the relationship between the quality of food and how it is produced and thus focus on the relationship between health and environmental effects. Public concern about GMO risk is also related to the market concentration. The failure of market prices to reflect full environmental and health costs can give GMO crops an unjustifiable advantage in the market place. It is difficult for consumers to obtain non-GMO corn as separate storage for GMO corn is usually not provided due to higher costs.

Genetic modifications of crops have primarily been motivated from the production side, in order to increase agricultural output, rather than from a consumer demand and health perspective. Batie and Ervin (2001) refer to this as “technology-push” rather than “demand-pull”. Manufacturing of GM seeds takes place in an industrial structure characterized by strong integration of seed and herbicide production. Adoption of herbicide-tolerant GM crops and new market opportunities for herbicide may create incentives to promote GM crops too early, relative to socially optimal levels of risk assessment. If early adoption of a new technology is highly profitable, and there is scientific controversy about long-term environmental and health effects, it is likely that public concern is relatively high. In this situation, industry has a role to play in the implementation of the precautionary principle, by improving risk communication with various stakeholders, providing improved risk assessments, and acknowledging risk management as their contribution to social and environmental responsibility. From the viewpoint of the biotechnological industry, national and international regulations and stakeholder reactions, such as consumer response to information about the effect of GMO food, is a source of uncertainty.

10. Maintain the regulatory independence of interested parties while retaining an inclusive approach to information and opinion gathering

The recent focus on corporate social responsibility has improved the conditions for dialogue between companies and stakeholders considerably. This creates a potential for improved risk communication.

Appropriate risk assessment for GMOs is crucially dependent on information produced and owned by the companies whose products are being assessed. A problem for independent risk assessment is to obtain access to this information (Myhr and Traavik 2002). Improved risk communication could contribute to develop strategies for sharing information.

11. Identify and reduce institutional obstacles to learning and action

Policy responses to GMO risk reflect different national approaches, as illustrated by the controversies between the United States and the European Union on GMO risk. In the European Union, a de-facto moratorium on GMO food was implemented in 1998 and has recently been lifted. In the United States, field releases of GMO may be implemented after notifying the US Department of Agriculture, without any formal public risk assessment (Goldburg 1999, p. 70). The US Food and Drug Administration requests that companies voluntarily consult with the agency before marketing GMO food. However, transgenic crops that produce insect toxins must undergo two separate reviews of environmental safety, by the EPA and the USDA, before commercial marketing (Marvier 2001). Improving national and international regulatory frameworks is an important step in implementing a precautionary perspective. The Cartagena protocol on biosafety is currently in the process of ratification. The protocol seeks to establish an international framework for safe management of all potential uses of GMOs that could affect biodiversity, such as transboundary movements of GMOs. A precautionary approach to biotechnology may challenge trade liberalization in agriculture, see Eggers and Mackenzie (2000).

Attitudes to GMO risk differ widely in Europe and the United States. A cultural difference in risk perception is illustrated by the following quotation from the textbook by Raven and Johnson (2002, p. 417).

“It does no good whatsoever to tell a fearful European that there is no evidence to warrant fear, no trace of data supporting danger from GM crops. A European consumer will simply respond that the harm is not yet evident, that we don’t know enough to see danger lurking around the corner. “Slow down”, the European consumers say. “Give research a chance to look around all the corners. Let’s be sure.” No one can argue against caution, but it is difficult to imagine what else researchers can look into—safety has been explored thoroughly. The fear remains, though, for the simple reason that no amount of information can remove it. Like a child scared of a monster under the bed, looking under the bed again doesn’t help—the monster still might be there next time.

In claiming that “The fear remains, though, for the simple reason that no amount of information can remove it”, the authors illustrate the need for improved risk communication. An important element of a precautionary strategy is to improve communication on risk perception between stakeholder groups and develop a realistic basis for improved confidence.

12. Avoid “paralysis by analysis” by acting to reduce potential harm when there are reasonable grounds for concern

In contrast to the preceding eleven lessons that call for more information, for example by searching out blind spots within disciplines, reaching out to other disciplines, and taking into account lay and local knowledge and wider social perspectives, the twelfth lesson warns against using the call for more information as an excuse to postpone timely action to reduce potential hazards. The novelty of the genetic modification techniques and their applications, the long time horizon before health and environmental consequences can be assessed, the potentially irreversible effects on biodiversity, the widely divergent risk perceptions of different stakeholder groups, the ethical concerns, and the enormous economic interest at stake for the companies; these and numerous other factors contribute to the complexity of the risk analysis, yet they indicate reasonable grounds for concern and provide the rationale for a precautionary approach. The challenge is to design precautionary strategies that can prevent, or at least minimize, future harmful impacts while at the same time promoting innovation.

5. A Bayesian approach

A key element in the precautionary principle is how the informational basis for risk assessment, risk management and risk communication can be improved. Recently, more attention has been given to the Bayesian approach of updating probabilities as a promising avenue for incorporating new information and divergent risk perceptions in a systematic way. In this section, we discuss a simple example, adapted from Natvig (1999), that illustrates how new information can be applied to update probability distributions. We focus on the uncertainty about potentially irreversible effects on the ecosystem of implementing GMO crops.

We formalize the decision problem by the following stylised example. Assume that the decision maker is a government, considering whether to impose a moratorium on GMO crops in the country, or whether to implement GMO crops subject to given regulations and standards. The option of imposing a moratorium on GMO crops is denoted R (radical option), and the option of implementing GMO crops is denoted C (conservative option). Assume that the environmental safety of GMO crops is characterized by two states, either that GMO crops are environmentally safe relative to anticipated standards, denoted by G (good outcome), or that GMO crops are not environmentally safe relative to anticipated standards, denoted by B (bad outcome).

Experts assess the following subjective probability distribution for the safety of GMO crops, $P(G) = 0.4$ and $P(B) = 0.6$. In order to improve the basis for the decision problem, independent

experts are consulted on the safety issue. Two groups of experts evaluating the same data may reach opposite conclusions, depending for example on how they view the burden of proof. Assume that the experts may give either of two conclusions, $E(+)$ = positive evaluation, that is, GMO crops are safe relative to anticipated standards, or $E(-)$ = negative evaluation, that is, GMO crops are not safe relative to anticipated standards.

Consider now the situation where the experts conclude that GMO crops are environmentally safe relative to anticipated standards. They emphasize, however, that their evaluation is subject to large uncertainty. Denote by $P(E(+)|G)$ the conditional probability of a positive evaluation given that GMO crops in fact are safe, and by $P(E(+)|B)$ the conditional probability of a positive evaluation given that GMO crops in fact are not safe. The experts conclude that $P(E(+)|G) = 0.9$ and $P(E(+)|B) = 0.2$. Hence, there is a 20 per cent probability that the experts will give a positive evaluation even if GMO crops are not safe.

Given the evaluation of the experts, the decision maker would like to update the à priori probability distributions $P(G)$ and $P(B)$ based on the conditional probabilities $P(E(+)|G)$ and $P(E(+)|B)$ and use the new conditional probabilities $P(G|E(+))$ and $P(B|E(+))$ in the decision problem. Recall that the definition of conditional probability is

$$P(G|E(+)) = \frac{P(G \cap E(+))}{P(E(+))}.$$

In order to find $P(G \cap E(+))$, note that the definition of conditional probability implies that

$$P(E(+)|G) = \frac{P(G \cap E(+))}{P(G)}$$

and hence we obtain $P(G \cap E(+)) = P(E(+)|G)P(G) = 0.36$. In order to find $P(E(+))$, consider the two disjoint events $G \cap E(+)$ and $B \cap E(+)$ and note that

$$P(E(+)) = P(G \cap E(+)) + P(B \cap E(+)) = P(E(+)|G)P(G) + P(E(+)|B)P(B) = 0.48.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$P(G|E(+)) = \frac{P(E(+)|G)P(G)}{P(E(+)|G)P(G) + P(E(+)|B)P(B)} = 0.75$$

and $P(B|E(+)) = 1 - 0.75 = 0.25$. As compared to the situation before the positive expert evaluation, the probability that GMO crops are safe has increased from $P(G) = 0.4$ to $P(G|E(+)) = 0.75$, whereas the probability that GMO crops are not safe has declined from $P(B) = 0.6$ to $P(B|E(+)) = 0.25$. Based on the positive evaluation of the independent experts, it seems considerably more likely that GMO crops will be safe relative to anticipated standards.

If the independent experts had arrived at the second conclusion, that is, GMO crops are not safe relative to the anticipated standards, the decision problem would have had to be based on the updated conditional probabilities $P(G|E(-))$ and $P(B|E(-))$. In this case we have

$$P(E(-)|G) = 1 - P(E(+)|G) = 1 - 0.9 = 0.1 \text{ and } P(E(-)|B) = 1 - P(E(+)|B) = 1 - 0.2 = 0.8.$$

Proceeding as above we find

$$P(G|E(-)) = \frac{P(E(-)|G)P(G)}{P(E(-)|G)P(G) + P(E(-)|B)P(B)} = 0.08$$

and $P(B|E(-)) = 1 - 0.08 = 0.92$. As compared to the initial probability assessment, the negative evaluation implies that the probability that GMO crops are safe has declined from $P(G) = 0.4$ to $P(G|E(-)) = 0.08$, and the probability that GMO crops are not safe has increased from $P(B) = 0.6$ to $P(B|E(-)) = 0.92$. Based on the negative evaluation of the independent experts, it seems considerably less likely that GMO crops will be safe relative to anticipated standards.

The precautionary approach taken by the decision maker is reflected in their evaluation of risk. In order to choose between R and C the decision maker has to evaluate the risk, that is, subjectively assess the gain or loss of each decision relative to the inherent uncertainty. The decision maker is faced with two types of loss, the environmental cost in the event that GMOs are not safe and a moratorium is not imposed, and the loss of potential gains from GMO implementation in the event that GMOs are safe and a moratorium is imposed. Table 1 illustrates the trade-off between the two types of loss, relative to the correct decisions of imposing a moratorium when GMOs are not safe and not imposing a moratorium when GMOs are safe.

Table 1. A numerical example of risk evaluation: Gain from decisions “Moratorium” vs. “Implementation”

| | | State | |
|----------|------------------------|----------|--------------|
| | | GMO safe | GMO not safe |
| Decision | Moratorium (R) | -100 | 0 |
| | Implementation (C) | 0 | -1000 |

Table 1 illustrates a scenario where it is assumed that the most serious mistake is not to impose a moratorium in the event that GMO crops are not environmentally safe. In this case the loss is 1000, representing the environmental damage that may result from implementation of GMO crops. If, on the other hand, GMO crops are safe, and a moratorium nonetheless is imposed, the loss is 100, representing the loss of potential gains from safe GMO crops. The correct decisions, where a moratorium is imposed in a situation where GMO crops are not safe, and not imposed when GMO crops are safe, correspond to zero loss.

The evaluation of potential gain and loss as exemplified in Table 1 can be expressed as a value function $V(R)$ and $V(C)$. Combining the value function with the conditional probabilities based on the positive expert evaluations, $P(G|E(+))=0.75$ and $P(B|E(+))=0.25$, we obtain the following expected value of the gain in each situation, $EV(R) = -100 \cdot 0.75 + 0 \cdot 0.25 = -75$ and $EV(C) = 0 \cdot 0.75 - 1000 \cdot 0.25 = -250$. The expected loss of imposing the moratorium is smaller than the expected loss of implementation, hence, the appropriate decision is to impose the moratorium although the conditional probability that GMO crops are not safe, given the positive expert evaluation, is as low as 0.25.

This conclusion is highly sensitive to the choice of value function, that is, the assessment of potential gain and loss. Assume for example that the loss from not imposing a moratorium in the event that GMO crops are not safe is reduced to -300, reflecting a much higher willingness to accept risk. In this case we find that $EV(R) = EV(C) = -75$ and the decision maker is indifferent between imposing a moratorium or not. The difference between the evaluation of uncertainty in these two examples can be interpreted as an application of the precautionary principle. The evaluation of risk as implied by the weights of the gains and losses in the objective function given in Table 1 implies a much lower willingness of society to accept the risk of GMO crops not being safe, expressing a precautionary approach from the decision maker.

Consider now the effect of taking the negative expert evaluation, with $P(G|E(-))=0.08$ and $P(B|E(-))=0.92$, into account. Applying the risk evaluation in the second example we obtain $EV(R)=-100\cdot 0.08+0\cdot 0.92=-8$ and $EV(C)=0\cdot 0.08-300\cdot 0.92=-276$. In this case the argument for imposing a moratorium is considerably strengthened.

This stylised example illustrates how Bayesian analysis offers a consistent framework for revising probabilities in view of new information. A key parameter in empirically based risk management is the relationship between the social evaluation of potential risks and potential benefits associated with GMO adoption. A crucial point is whether the price of non-GMO food increases relative to GMO food. Evidence from North America indicates a premium paid for non-GMO food as consumers become more aware of the potential risks. (Warwick and Meziani 2002). As discussed above, the risks associated with field releases of GMO crops have similarities with the risks of invasive species and loss of biodiversity. Hence, estimates of the cost of invasive species (Pimentel et al. 2000) and the value of biodiversity (Kunin and Lawton 1996) may give a starting point for risk evaluation. Nonetheless, as the analogies are somewhat limited, direct experimentation and monitoring are the primary tools for risk assessment.

6. Incentives for social and environmental responsibility

A precautionary strategy includes both risk assessment, risk management and risk communication. Improved risk communication between industry, the scientific community, government and consumers may provide incentives for better risk assessment and risk management, thus improving conditions for detecting “early warnings”. The approach of a company towards risk reflects its commitment to social and environmental responsibility. The challenge is to identify the performance of individual companies with respect to social and environmental responsibility, in order to provide incentives for further improvements and to facilitate implementation of precautionary strategies.

Recently, much focus has been given to how investment funds with different types of environmental or ethical screening of companies may provide incentives for companies to improve their social and environmental responsibility in order to be included in these investment funds (see, for example, Angel and Rivoli 1997, Khanna and Anton 2002, Aslaksen and Synnestvedt 2003). The increased demand for “screened” investments by individuals and organizations reflects that these stakeholders expect a positive effect of their investment choice on environmental and social development.

A key element in ethical screening of companies is to establish criteria for inclusion of companies based on social and environmental performance relative to other companies within the same industry. For the biotechnology industry, their approach to risk is clearly relevant for whether they qualify among the “best in class” companies or not. Based on our discussion of GMO uncertainties, the criteria should include information on how companies perform on risk assessment, risk management and risk communication. Companies could be evaluated on questions like the following:

- To what extent does the company provide relevant information on environmental and health risks of GMOs to regulators, the academic community and consumers?
- To what extent does the company provide a choice between GM and GM-free food and seeds?
- To what extent does the company cooperate with and support independent research?
- To what extent does the company contribute to development of alternative technologies?

Evaluating companies on the basis of this type of questions can provide information on how the company scores on social and environmental responsibility, relative to other companies in the industry. This information enables investors to choose between companies with different social and environmental performance. Many studies indicate that companies are increasingly sensitive to publicity about lack of social and environmental responsibility. The existence of investment funds screening for ethical concerns may strengthen the incentives for companies to improve their social and environmental practices, including their approach to environmental risk.

7. Conclusions

Despite the large research efforts in GMO risk assessments, unresolved issues remain in the assessments of long-term environmental risk. In view of the considerable uncertainty and potentially irreversible effects on the environment, regulatory policies need to incorporate various elements of the precautionary principle. The widely divergent interests and risk perceptions of stakeholder groups represent a challenge for implementing a precautionary perspective.

“Late lessons from early warnings” gave examples of situations where early warnings of hazards had been discounted by the interests of various stakeholders. The large economic incentives for early adoption of GMO crops may conflict with incentives for sufficient risk assessment, risk management and risk communication. More focus on the ethical, social and environmental responsibility of industry may provide incentives for improved risk communication between industry and stakeholders. Applying criteria for ethical screening of companies in the biotechnology industry could provide

incentives for better risk communication, thus promoting better risk assessment and risk management and improving conditions for detecting “early warnings”.

In this paper we have discussed three approaches to a precautionary perspective, establishing criteria for detecting “early warnings”, applying Bayesian analysis for improving the information basis for decision making under large uncertainty, and providing incentives for improved risk management. These precautionary strategies may enhance the environmental responsibility of stakeholders and contribute to a more comprehensive discussion of the available policy responses to GMO risk.

References

- Angel, J.J. and P. Rivoli (1997): Does Ethical Investing impose a Cost upon the Firm? A Theoretical Perspective, *The Journal of Investing* **6**, 57-61.
- Aslaksen, I. and T. Synnestvedt (2003): On ethical investment and the incentives for corporate environmental protection and social responsibility. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* **10**, 1-12.
- Batie, S. and D.E. Ervin (2001): Transgenic Crops and the Environment: Missing Markets and Public Roles, *Environment and Development Economics* **6**, 435-457.
- Beetham, P.R. et al. (1999): A tool for functional plant genomics cause *in vivo* gene-specific mutations, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **96**, 8774-8778.
- Burton, M. et al. (2001): Consumer Attitudes to Genetically Modified Organisms in Food in the UK, *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **28**, 479-498.
- Donaldson, L. and R. May (1999): Health implications of genetically modified foods, London: Department of Health, www.doh.gov.uk/gmfood.htm.
- EEA (2001): *Late lessons from early warnings: the precautionary principle 1896-2000*. European Environmental Agency (EEA), Environmental issue report no. 22.
- Eggers, B. and R. Mackenzie (2000): The Cartagena protocol on biosafety, *Journal of International Economic Law* **3**, 525-543.
- Ellstrand, N.C., H.C. Prentice and J.F. Hancock (1999): Gene flow and introgression from domesticated plants into their wild relatives, *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **30**, 539-563.
- EU (2001): Review of results: EC-sponsored research on safety on genetically modified organisms, European Commission, http://europa.eu.int/comm./research/quality_of_life/gmo/01-plants
- European Commission (2000): *Communication from the Commission on the precautionary principle*, COM (2000), 1.
- European Council (2001): Directive 2001/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 March 2001 on the deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms and repealing Council Directive 90/220/EEC, *Official Journal of the European Communities*, L106, 17.4.2001, 1-38, <http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj>
- Ewen, S.W.B. and A. Pusztai (1999): Effects of diets containing genetically modified potatoes expressing *Galanthus nivalis* lectin on rat small intestine, *Lancet* **354**, 1353-1355.
- Funtowicz, S. and J.R. Ravetz (1990): *Uncertainty and Quality in Knowledge for Policy*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Goldburg, R. (1999): "Are the Risks of Developing and Releasing Genetically Modified Organisms Being Adequately Evaluated and Assessed?" in I. Serageldin and W. Collins (eds.): *Biotechnology and biosafety*. Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Series. Washington D.C.: World Bank, 69-71.

- Gollier, C., B. Jullien and N. Treich (2000): Scientific progress and irreversibility: An economic interpretation of the Precautionary Principle, *Journal of Public Economics* **75**, 229-253.
- Gollier, C. and N. Treich (2003): Decision-Making Under Scientific Uncertainty: The Economics of the Precautionary Principle. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **27**, 77-103.
- Hadfield, L. (2000): The debate over genetically modified organisms: Scientific uncertainty and public controversy, *Foresight* **2**, 257-268.
- Harhoff, D., P. Régibeau and K. Rockett (2001): Some simple economics of GM food, *Economic Policy* **33**, 265-299.
- Khanna, M. and W.R.Q. Anton (2002): Corporate Environmental Management: Regulatory and Market-Based Incentives, *Land Economics*, **78**, 539-558.
- Klinger, T. and N.C. Ellstrand (1999): "Transgene movement via gene flow: recommendations for improved biosafety assessment" in K. Ammann, Y. Jacot, V. Simonsen and G. Kjellson (eds.): *Methods for Risk Assessment of Transgenic Plants*. III Ecological risks and prospects of transgenic plants. Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 129-140.
- Klinke, A. and O. Renn (1999): Prometheus Unbound. Challenges of Risk Evaluation, Risk Classification and Risk Management. Working Paper 153, Akademie für Technikfolgenabschätzung in Baden-Württemberg.
- Klinke, A. and O. Renn (2002): A New Approach to Risk Evaluation and Management: Risk-Based, Precaution-Based, and Discourse-Based Strategies. *Risk Analysis* **22**, 1071-1094.
- Kunin, W.E. and J.H. Lawton (1996): "Does biodiversity matter? Evaluating the case for conserving species", in K.J. Gaston (ed.): *Biodiversity. A biology of numbers and difference*. Oxford: Blackwell, 283-307.
- Losey, J.E., L.S. Raynor and M.E. Carter (1999): Transgenic pollen harms monarch larvae, *Nature* **399**, 214.
- Marvier, M. (2001): Ecology of Transgenic Crops, *American Scientist* **89**, 160-167.
- Marvier, M.A., E. Meir and P.M. Kareiva (1999): "How do the design of monitoring and control strategies affect the chance of detecting and containing transgenic weeds?" in K. Ammann, Y. Jacot, V. Simonsen and G. Kjellson (eds.): *Methods for Risk Assessment of Transgenic Plants*. III Ecological risks and prospects of transgenic plants. Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 109-122.
- Myhr, A.I. (2002): *Precaution, Context and Sustainability. A study of how ethical values may be involved in risk governance of GMOs (genetically modified organisms)*. Dr.scient. thesis, Institute of Medical Biology, University of Tromsø.
- Myhr, A.I. and T. Traavik (2002): The precautionary principle: Scientific uncertainty and omitted research in the context of GMO use and release. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* **15**, 73-86.
- Natvig, B. (1987): *Sannsynlighetsvurderinger i atomalderen* (Probability Assessments in the Nuclear Age). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Natvig, B. and J. Gåsemyr (1996): On probabilistic risk analysis of technological systems, *Radiation Protection Dosimetry* **68**, 185-190.

Natvig, B. (1999): Risiko og føre-var strategi. Hvilke konsekvenser har dette for bedriftens miljøpolitikk? (Risk and precautionary strategy. Consequences for corporate environmental policy?) Memo, University of Oslo, Department of Mathematics.

Noussair, C., S. Robin and B. Ruffieux (2002): Do Consumers Not Care about Biotech Foods or Do They Just Not Read the Labels? *Economic Letters* **75**, 47-53.

OECD (1986): *Recombinant DNA Safety Considerations*.

OECD (1993a): *Safety evaluation of foods produced by modern biotechnology: Concepts and principles*.

OECD (1993b): *Safety Considerations for Biotechnology: Scale-up of Crop Plants*.

Pimentel, D., L. Lach, R. Zuniga and D. Morrison (2000): Environmental and Economic Costs of Nonindigenous Species in the United States, *BioScience* **50**, 53-65.

Quist, D. and I. H. Chapela (2001): Transgenic DNA introgressed into traditional maize landraces in Oaxaca, Mexico, *Nature* **414**, 541-543.

Raven, P.H. and G.B. Johnson (2002): *Biology*. Sixth edition. McGraw Hill.

Sandsmark, M. and H. Vennemo (2003): CAPM meets the precautionary principle. ECON Working Paper 16/03.

Saxena, D., S. Flores and G. Stotzky (1999): Insecticidal toxin in root exudates from Bt corn, *Nature* **402**, 480.

Sears, M.K. et al. (2001): Impact of Bt corn pollen on monarch butterfly populations: A risk assessment, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **98**, 11937-11942.

Shrader-Frechette, K.S. (1991): *Risk and Rationality. Philosophical Foundations for Populist Reforms*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Slovic, P. (2001): *The perception of risk*. London: Earthscan.

Stirling, A. (1999): On science and precaution in the management of technological risk. Volume I. A Synthesis Report of case studies. European Science and Technology Observatory. Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission, <http://www.jrc.es>

Traavik, T. (1999): Too Early May Be Too Late. Ecological risks associated with the use of naked DNA as a biological tool for research, production and therapy. Research Report 1999-1, Trondheim: DN - Directorate of Nature Management.

Warwick, H. and G. Meziani (2002): *Seeds of doubt. North American farmers' experiences of GM crops*. Bristol: Soil Association.

Warwick, S. and E. Small (1999): "Invasive plant species: evolutionary risk from transgenic crops" in L.W.D. van Raamsdonk and J.C.M. den Nijs (eds.): *Plant Evolution in Man-made Habitats*, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, Hugo de Vries Laboratory, 235-256.

Wesseler, J. (2001): Resistance economics of transgenic crops under uncertainty. A real option approach. Paper presented at REF Conference on Economics of Resistance, April 2001, Washington D.C.

Wolfenbarger, L.L. and P.R. Phifer (2000): The Ecological Risks and Benefits of Genetically Engineered Plants, *Science* **290**, 2088-2093.

Wynne, B. (1992): Uncertainty and environmental learning: Reconceiving science and policy in the preventive paradigm. *Global Environmental Change* **2**, 111-127.

Recent publications in the series Discussion Papers

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|---|
| 308 | T. Kornstad (2001): Are Predicted Lifetime Consumption Profiles Robust with respect to Model Specifications? | 333 | J. T. Lind (2002): Small continuous surveys and the Kalman filter |
| 309 | H. Hungnes (2001): Estimating and Restricting Growth Rates and Cointegration Means. With Applications to Consumption and Money Demand | 334 | B. Halvorsen and T. Willumsen (2002): Willingness to Pay for Dental Fear Treatment. Is Supplying Fear Treatment Social Beneficial? |
| 310 | M. Rege and K. Telle (2001): An Experimental Investigation of Social Norms | 335 | T. O. Thoresen (2002): Reduced Tax Progressivity in Norway in the Nineties. The Effect from Tax Changes |
| 311 | L.C. Zhang (2001): A method of weighting adjustment for survey data subject to nonignorable nonresponse | 336 | M. Søberg (2002): Price formation in monopolistic markets with endogenous diffusion of trading information: An experimental approach |
| 312 | K. R. Wangen and E. Biørn (2001): Prevalence and substitution effects in tobacco consumption. A discrete choice analysis of panel data | 337 | A. Bruvold og B.M. Larsen (2002): Greenhouse gas emissions in Norway. Do carbon taxes work? |
| 313 | G.H. Bjertnær (2001): Optimal Combinations of Income Tax and Subsidies for Education | 338 | B. Halvorsen and R. Nesbakken (2002): A conflict of interests in electricity taxation? A micro econometric analysis of household behaviour |
| 314 | K. E. Rosendahl (2002): Cost-effective environmental policy: Implications of induced technological change | 339 | R. Aaberge and A. Langørgen (2003): Measuring the Benefits from Public Services: The Effects of Local Government Spending on the Distribution of Income in Norway |
| 315 | T. Kornstad and T.O. Thoresen (2002): A Discrete Choice Model for Labor Supply and Child Care | 340 | H. C. Bjørnland and H. Hungnes (2003): The importance of interest rates for forecasting the exchange rate |
| 316 | A. Bruvold and K. Nyborg (2002): On the value of households' recycling efforts | 341 | A. Bruvold, T.Fæhn and Birger Strøm (2003): Quantifying Central Hypotheses on Environmental Kuznets Curves for a Rich Economy: A Computable General Equilibrium Study |
| 317 | E. Biørn and T. Skjerpen (2002): Aggregation and Aggregation Biases in Production Functions: A Panel Data Analysis of Translog Models | 342 | E. Biørn, T. Skjerpen and K.R. Wangen (2003): Parametric Aggregation of Random Coefficient Cobb-Douglas Production Functions: Evidence from Manufacturing Industries |
| 318 | Ø. Døhl (2002): Energy Flexibility and Technological Progress with Multioutput Production. Application on Norwegian Pulp and Paper Industries | 343 | B. Bye, B. Strøm and T. Åvitsland (2003): Welfare effects of VAT reforms: A general equilibrium analysis |
| 319 | R. Aaberge (2002): Characterization and Measurement of Duration Dependence in Hazard Rate Models | 344 | J.K. Dagsvik and S. Strøm (2003): Analyzing Labor Supply Behavior with Latent Job Opportunity Sets and Institutional Choice Constraints |
| 320 | T. J. Klette and A. Raknerud (2002): How and why do Firms differ? | 345 | A. Raknerud, T. Skjerpen and A. Rygh Swensen (2003): A linear demand system within a Seemingly Unrelated Time Series Equation framework |
| 321 | J. Aasness and E. Røed Larsen (2002): Distributional and Environmental Effects of Taxes on Transportation | 346 | B.M. Larsen and R.Nesbakken (2003): How to quantify household electricity end-use consumption |
| 322 | E. Røed Larsen (2002): The Political Economy of Global Warming: From Data to Decisions | 347 | B. Halvorsen, B. M. Larsen and R. Nesbakken (2003): Possibility for hedging from price increases in residential energy demand |
| 323 | E. Røed Larsen (2002): Searching for Basic Consumption Patterns: Is the Engel Elasticity of Housing Unity? | 348 | S. Johansen and A. R. Swensen (2003): More on Testing Exact Rational Expectations in Cointegrated Vector Autoregressive Models: Restricted Drift Terms |
| 324 | E. Røed Larsen (2002): Estimating Latent Total Consumption in a Household. | 349 | B. Holtmark (2003): The Kyoto Protocol without USA and Australia - with the Russian Federation as a strategic permit seller |
| 325 | E. Røed Larsen (2002): Consumption Inequality in Norway in the 80s and 90s. | 350 | J. Larsson (2003): Testing the Multiproduct Hypothesis on Norwegian Aluminium Industry Plants |
| 326 | H.C. Bjørnland and H. Hungnes (2002): Fundamental determinants of the long run real exchange rate: The case of Norway. | 351 | T. Bye (2003): On the Price and Volume Effects from Green Certificates in the Energy Market |
| 327 | M. Søberg (2002): A laboratory stress-test of bid, double and offer auctions. | 352 | E. Holmøy (2003): Aggregate Industry Behaviour in a Monopolistic Competition Model with Heterogeneous Firms |
| 328 | M. Søberg (2002): Voting rules and endogenous trading institutions: An experimental study. | 353 | A. O. Ervik, E.Holmøy and T. Hægeland (2003): A Theory-Based Measure of the Output of the Education Sector |
| 329 | M. Søberg (2002): The Duhem-Quine thesis and experimental economics: A reinterpretation. | 354 | E. Halvorsen (2003): A Cohort Analysis of Household Saving in Norway |
| 330 | A. Raknerud (2002): Identification, Estimation and Testing in Panel Data Models with Attrition: The Role of the Missing at Random Assumption | | |
| 331 | M.W. Arneberg, J.K. Dagsvik and Z. Jia (2002): Labor Market Modeling Recognizing Latent Job Attributes and Opportunity Constraints. An Empirical Analysis of Labor Market Behavior of Eritrean Women | | |
| 332 | M. Greaker (2002): Eco-labels, Production Related Externalities and Trade | | |

- 355 I. Aslaksen and T. Synnøstvedt (2003): Corporate environmental protection under uncertainty
- 356 S. Glomsrød and W. Taoyuan (2003): Coal cleaning: A viable strategy for reduced carbon emissions and improved environment in China?
- 357 A. Bruvoll T. Bye, J. Larsson og K. Telle (2003): Technological changes in the pulp and paper industry and the role of uniform versus selective environmental policy.
- 358 J.K. Dagsvik, S. Strøm and Z. Jia (2003): A Stochastic Model for the Utility of Income.
- 359 M. Rege and K. Telle (2003): Indirect Social Sanctions from Monetarily Unaffected Strangers in a Public Good Game.
- 360 R. Aaberge (2003): Mean-Spread-Preserving Transformation.
- 361 E. Halvorsen (2003): Financial Deregulation and Household Saving. The Norwegian Experience Revisited
- 362 E. Røed Larsen (2003): Are Rich Countries Immune to the Resource Curse? Evidence from Norway's Management of Its Oil Riches
- 363 E. Røed Larsen and Dag Einar Sommervoll (2003): Rising Inequality of Housing? Evidence from Segmented Housing Price Indices
- 364 R. Bjørnstad and T. Skjerpen (2003): Technology, Trade and Inequality
- 365 A. Raknerud, D. Rønningen and T. Skjerpen (2003): A method for improved capital measurement by combining accounts and firm investment data
- 366 B.J. Holtmark and K.H. Alfsen (2004): PPP-correction of the IPCC emission scenarios - does it matter?
- 367 R. Aaberge, U. Colombino, E. Holmøy, B. Strøm and T. Wennemo (2004): Population ageing and fiscal sustainability: An integrated micro-macro analysis of required tax changes
- 368 E. Røed Larsen (2004): Does the CPI Mirror Costs.of.Living? Engel's Law Suggests Not in Norway
- 369 T. Skjerpen (2004): The dynamic factor model revisited: the identification problem remains
- 370 J.K. Dagsvik and A.L. Mathiassen (2004): Agricultural Production with Uncertain Water Supply
- 371 M. Greaker (2004): Industrial Competitiveness and Diffusion of New Pollution Abatement Technology – a new look at the Porter-hypothesis
- 372 G. Børnes Ringlund, K.E. Rosendahl and T. Skjerpen (2004): Does oilrig activity react to oil price changes? An empirical investigation
- 373 G. Liu (2004) Estimating Energy Demand Elasticities for OECD Countries. A Dynamic Panel Data Approach
- 374 K. Telle and J. Larsson (2004): Do environmental regulations hamper productivity growth? How accounting for improvements of firms' environmental performance can change the conclusion
- 375 K.R. Wangen (2004): Some Fundamental Problems in Becker, Grossman and Murphy's Implementation of Rational Addiction Theory
- 376 B.J. Holtmark and K.H. Alfsen (2004): Implementation of the Kyoto Protocol without Russian participation
- 377 E. Røed Larsen (2004): Escaping the Resource Curse and the Dutch Disease? When and Why Norway Caught up with and Forged ahead of Its Neighbors
- 378 L. Andreassen (2004): Mortality, fertility and old age care in a two-sex growth model
- 379 E. Lund Sagen and F. R. Aune (2004): The Future European Natural Gas Market - are lower gas prices attainable?
- 380 A. Langørgen and D. Rønningen (2004): Local government preferences, individual needs, and the allocation of social assistance
- 381 K. Telle (2004): Effects of inspections on plants' regulatory and environmental performance - evidence from Norwegian manufacturing industries
- 382 T. A. Galloway (2004): To What Extent Is a Transition into Employment Associated with an Exit from Poverty
- 383 J. F. Bjørnstad and E. Ytterstad (2004): Two-Stage Sampling from a Prediction Point of View
- 384 A. Bruvoll and T. Fæhn (2004): Transboundary environmental policy effects: Markets and emission leakages
- 385 P.V. Hansen and L. Lindholt (2004): The market power of OPEC 1973-2001
- 386 N. Keilman and D. Q. Pham (2004): Empirical errors and predicted errors in fertility, mortality and migration forecasts in the European Economic Area
- 387 G. H. Bjertnæs and T. Fæhn (2004): Energy Taxation in a Small, Open Economy: Efficiency Gains under Political Restraints
- 388 J.K. Dagsvik and S. Strøm (2004): Sectoral Labor Supply, Choice Restrictions and Functional Form
- 389 B. Halvorsen (2004): Effects of norms, warm-glow and time use on household recycling
- 390 I. Aslaksen and T. Synnøstvedt (2004): Are the Dixit-Pindyck and the Arrow-Fisher-Henry-Hanemann Option Values Equivalent?
- 391 G. H. Bjørnnes, D. Rime and H. O.Aa. Solheim (2004): Liquidity provision in the overnight foreign exchange market
- 392 T. Åvitsland and J. Aasness (2004): Combining CGE and microsimulation models: Effects on equality of VAT reforms
- 393 M. Greaker and Eirik. Sagen (2004): Explaining experience curves for LNG liquefaction costs: Competition matter more than learning
- 394 K. Telle, I. Aslaksen and T. Synnøstvedt (2004): "It pays to be green" - a premature conclusion?
- 395 T. Harding, H. O. Aa. Solheim and A. Benedictow (2004). House ownership and taxes
- 396 E. Holmøy and B. Strøm (2004): The Social Cost of Government Spending in an Economy with Large Tax Distortions: A CGE Decomposition for Norway
- 397 T. Hægeland, O. Raaum and K.G. Salvanes (2004): Pupil achievement, school resources and family background
- 398 I. Aslaksen, B. Natvig and I. Nordal (2004): Environmental risk and the precautionary principle: "Late lessons from early warnings" applied to genetically modified plants