

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Making sense of complexity in risk governance in post-disaster Fukushima fisheries: A scalar approach

Journal Item

How to cite:

Mabon, Leslie and Kawabe, Midori (2017). Making sense of complexity in risk governance in post-disaster Fukushima fisheries: A scalar approach. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 75 pp. 173–183.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.06.001>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

1 TITLE PAGE

2

3 Making sense of complexity in risk governance in post-disaster Fukushima fisheries: a scalar
4 approach

5

6 Leslie Mabon^{1*} and Midori Kawabe²

7

8 1. School of Applied Social Studies, Robert Gordon University, Garthdee Road, Aberdeen
9 AB10 7QG Scotland, United Kingdom T: +44 (0)1224 263210 E: l.j.mabon@rgu.ac.uk

10 (*corresponding author)

11 2. Department of Marine Policy and Culture, Tokyo University of Marine Science and
12 Technology, 4-5-7 Konan, Minato-Ku, Tokyo 108-8477 Japan E: kawabe@kaiyodai.ac.jp

13

14 Abstract

15

16 This paper evaluates how geographical theories of scale can give a more robust
17 understanding of the governance of complex environmental risks. We assess the case of
18 fisheries in Iwaki City, Fukushima Prefecture in Japan following the 2011 nuclear disaster.
19 Fisheries in Iwaki and Fukushima more widely are operating on a trial basis as understanding
20 of the marine radiation situation becomes clearer, however questions remain over whether
21 consumers will buy produce and to what extent full-scale fisheries will resume. Based on
22 empirical fieldwork undertaken in Fukushima plus supporting documentary analysis, we
23 construct a scalar account of post-disaster Iwaki fisheries. We use this to argue that framing
24 post-disaster fisheries governance at the municipal scale rather than the prefectural scale has
25 opened up opportunities for enacting the more two-way forms of risk governance that
26 contemporary environmental issues may require. We also argue locally-situated 'experts' (e.g.
27 fisheries extension officers and citizen science groups) play a key role in negotiating citizens'
28 and fishers' relationships with larger-scale scientific discourses due to their ability to work
29 across scales, despite having less techno-scientific expertise than their national-level
30 counterparts. In turn, we suggest that in governance of complex environmental issues,
31 policymakers ought to (a) consider how community-level expectations may differ from risk
32 governance processes developed at larger scales; (b) identify key institutions or figures who
33 can work across scales and support them accordingly; and (c) show cognisance to the social
34 effects that may arise from spatial demarcation of environmental problems.

35

36 Keywords

37

38 environmental governance; Fukushima nuclear disaster; landscapes of risk; risk governance;
39 social construction of scale.

40

41 Research highlights

42

- 43 • Evaluation of risk governance in post-disaster Fukushima fisheries;
- 44 • Focus on spaces of risk and processes across spatial scales;

- 45 • Local-level focus on understanding uncertainty instead of assuring safety outright;
46 • Framing at municipal scale rather than regional enhances traceability in risk;
47 • Actors who can work across scales key to governing complex environmental issues.
48

49

50

Vitae

51

52 Leslie Mabon is a Lecturer in Sociology at Robert Gordon University in Aberdeen, Scotland.
53 He holds a PhD in Human Geography, and is especially interested in the governance of
54 complex and ethically contentious environmental issues. Leslie's research has a particular
55 emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration and on working at the science-policy interface.
56 He has been carrying out empirical research in Iwaki and Fukushima Prefecture since 2014.
57 Regular research updates are available via his blog - energyvalues.wordpress.com - and
58 Twitter account: @ljmabon.

59

60 Midori Kawabe is a Professor in Marine Policy at Tokyo University of Marine Science and
61 Technology. Her research focuses on coastal and ocean management, with a particular
62 interest in social learning of stakeholders in collaborative management. Since the 2011
63 nuclear accident, Midori has been closely working with the fisheries sectors of Fukushima by
64 having participatory workshops and *café scientifique* with natural scientists, fishers and
65 citizens to discuss ways for rehabilitation of the Fukushima coastal area.

66

Funding

67

68
69 This work was supported by a Japan Foundation Fellowship held by the lead author; and the
70 ideas were further developed during the lead author's involvement in the 2015 Summer
71 Institute for Disaster and Risk Research at Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China,
72 supported by the Program for Introducing Talents of Disciplines to Universities funded by the
73 Ministry of Education and State Administration of Foreign Experts Affairs, China,
74 No.B08008. Neither funder had any influence over the research design, execution, analysis or
75 dissemination.

76 1. Introduction

77

78 The March 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Tsunami, which killed more than 15,000
79 people and left over 2,000 missing, profoundly affected fisheries in north-east Japan.
80 Significant infrastructural damage was caused to ports, fisheries buildings and fishers'
81 homes, and boats were swept away. The effects of the earthquake and tsunami were
82 compounded in Fukushima Prefecture by the triple meltdowns at the Fukushima Dai'ichi
83 Nuclear Power Plant (FDNPP). 70-80% of released radionuclides ended up over the north-
84 west Pacific Ocean (Yoshida and Kanda, 2012), finding their way into sea water, sediments
85 and marine species (Wada et al, 2013).


86

87 With over 40% of sampled fish caught in Fukushima waters exceeding regulatory limits for
88 radioactive caesium (Buessler, 2012), all commercial coastal fisheries in Fukushima waters
89 were stopped after the disaster. Whilst deep-sea operations have since resumed, coastal
90 fisheries remain closed apart from small-scale trial fisheries. These trials, running at about
91 10% of pre-disaster capacity, are targeted at species in which radioactive caesium has not
92 recently been detected and aim to move towards the restart of larger-scale fisheries by
93 monitoring the sale of Fukushima produce in markets. As of spring 2017 over 90 species had
94 been released for trial fishing operations in this way (Fukushima Prefecture Federation of
95 Fisheries Cooperative Associations, 2017). Yet despite monitoring regimes broadly agreed to
96 be scientifically rigorous and reliable, consumer confidence in Fukushima produce is divided
97 (Mabon and Kawabe, 2015).

98

99 This paper takes as its point of departure a slippage in terminology observed in interviews
100 with post-disaster fisheries stakeholders, between 'Fukushima' fish (landed at ports in

101 Fukushima Prefecture as a single entity) and ‘Iwaki’ fish (landed in at ports in the
102 municipality of Iwaki, the further south of Fukushima’s two fishing districts (see Figure 1)) –
103 two different spatial scales for addressing what appears to be the same issue. This question of
104 scale has not gone unnoticed in environmental governance thinking. Shi et al (2012) propose
105 a consilience model to differentiate the kinds of governance required at different scales for
106 climate change, and Boyes and Elliot (2014) hold that the complexity of marine governance
107 is enhanced by the interests of different actors and institutions operating at different
108 organisational scales. Building on this, through the case of post-disaster fisheries in Iwaki we
109 suggest the scale at which the governance of an environmental risk such as marine
110 radioactive contamination is framed may open up different management options and thus
111 different societal effects. We argue that explicitly and specifically mapping out the
112 involvement of actors involved in risk governance for a particular issue offers a systematic
113 means of laying out and understanding complexity in environmental risk governance, and in
114 turn helps identify pathways for the kinds of dialogue across scales that risk governance
115 necessitates.



116

117

118 Figure 1: Fukushima Prefecture and Iwaki City. Adapted from map tiles by Stamen Design,
 119 under CC BY 3.0. Data by OpenStreetMap, under ODbL, originally published in Mabon and
 120 Kawabe (2015)

121

122 2. Spaces and scales of risk?

123

124 We set out the value of a scale-centered approach to understanding complexity in
 125 environmental risk governance, synthesising existing literature to argue that environmental
 126 risk governance happens across space, and that the spatial scale at which this governance is
 127 framed may engender particular social or political effects. Explicit attention to spatial scale,
 128 we suggest, may clarify the roles and aims of different actors within the risk governance
 129 process.

130

131 First, however, a reminder of what is meant by ‘risk governance’. Pellizzoni (2003)
132 characterises contemporary environmental issues through limitations in scientific knowledge,
133 declining trust in ‘experts’ previously trusted to assess risks, and the potential for intractable
134 conflicts to emerge. Such risks and decisions about their management nonetheless affect how
135 people may live their lives and/or the environments and places meaningful to them, especially
136 for energy or ‘risky’ large-scale environmental infrastructure (Bradbury, 1989; Wynne,
137 1992), hence can be seen as involving a significant value dimension. Partly because of this
138 values-driven component, the requirement for risk governance has emerged, defined by Renn
139 (2008) as a means of making decisions whilst balancing the range of societal perspectives on
140 a given risk or set of risks. This does not mean ‘anything’ goes with regard to what may be
141 considered a risk versus what may not (Klinke and Renn, 2002). Rather, it implies a value
142 dimension to the underpinning knowledge (scientific or otherwise) used to inform decision-
143 making (Duckett et al, 2015). The aim is to strive towards ‘better’ risk management
144 decisions, sensitive to techno-scientific realities, but also the uncertainties inherent within
145 these and the different value positions informing their interpretation. Rather than being one-
146 way and top-down, effective risk governance is widely characterised as a dialogic process for
147 evaluating different knowledge claims (Bradbury, 1989; Renn, 2008). By extension, ‘risk
148 communication’ thus ought to be considered not as a one-way transfer of information from
149 experts to citizens, but rather as the means through which discussions around these
150 knowledge claims take place (e.g. Arvai, 2014; Kasperson, 2014).

151

152 For energy and/or environmental issues this risk governance relates to infrastructure or
153 phenomena rooted in certain locations, hence the governance of risk will manifest itself in
154 particular spaces or landscapes (Nadai and van der Horst, 2010). These landscapes in turn

155 engender particular social effects. Blowers (1999) discusses ‘landscapes of dependence’
156 created around sites for nuclear waste disposal as a reflection of injustices, whereas Parkhill
157 et al (2014) evaluate ‘landscapes of stigma’ associated with undesirable infrastructure and
158 note that residents may create their own alternative, more positive, narratives of place by way
159 of resistance or response. This becomes all the more pointed for radioactive contamination,
160 where the substance itself may be invisible (Pezzullo and Depoe, 2010) and yet can have
161 profound effects on humans. These impacts transcend immediate health risks to include how
162 others form opinions of places and the people within them (Edelstein, 2002), and how ability
163 to partake in economically, socially or culturally significant practices within geographically-
164 bounded locations may be constrained by the choices of decision-makers (Oughton, 2013).

165

166 Environmental risk governance necessitates specific forms of spatial organisation, which both
167 set the terms of debate on the risk in question and constrain or enable the actions of those
168 occupying the landscape of risk. Nevertheless, in keeping with Smith’s (2006: np) reminder
169 that “(i)n every phase and aspect of a disaster [...] the contours of disaster and the difference
170 between who lives and who dies is to a greater or lesser extent a social calculus”, running
171 through much literature on spaces of risk but not treated explicitly is reflection on the *scale* at
172 which landscapes of risk are constructed, and what the implications for risk governance are
173 from the scale at which the debate is framed. It is of course well understood that particular
174 scales are constituted and transformed through social and spatial processes (Marston, 2000)
175 and also that there is a need to think across scales and reflect more deeply on how scale
176 specifically orders a social process (Brenner, 2001).

177

178 Fuller understanding of how contemporary environmental risks are governed, by whom and
179 to what effect thus ought to entail specific and systematic consideration of the spatial scales

180 over which risk governance takes place. Recurring themes in extant literature on risk and/or
181 environmental infrastructure such as ‘lay’ versus expert knowledges (Wynne, 1996;
182 McKechnie, 2003), localised narratives shaping perception (Bickerstaff, 2012; Parkhill et al,
183 2014) and potential for distributional injustices across space in siting decisions (Blowers,
184 1999) lend themselves well to the idea of different understandings of or responses to risk
185 emerging depending on the spatial scale through which the issue is evaluated. Emerging post-
186 disaster social research on Fukushima too carries strands of the role of scale, reflecting the
187 influence on social production and consumption of the “small-scale social, physical, cultural
188 and emotional infrastructure of the household” (Marston, 2000: 233). This can be seen in
189 difficulties of Fukushima households living with the indeterminacies of radioactive
190 contamination on a daily basis (Morris-Suzuki, 2014); differences in perception of radiation
191 risk within households and their influence on consumption/relocation decisions (Sato, 2014);
192 and the enactment and performance of radiation standards (Kimura, 2016). Developing such
193 scalar dimensions in existing work and in keeping with the challenges outlined above, this
194 paper systematically evaluates how questions of scale play out for one specific aspect of the
195 Fukushima disaster – fisheries governance in Iwaki in the south of the prefecture.

196

197 The critical geographical thinking on scale on which we draw has emerged largely in the
198 context of globalisation and processes of production under capitalism (e.g. Marston, 2000;
199 Brenner, 2001; Smith, 2004). Production and consumption processes do of course influence
200 the issue under study here, and we refer to them as and when appropriate. But to be clear, our
201 central focus is environmental risks in a largely rural area after a major pollution event and
202 the wider implications for understanding risk governance under conditions of high
203 uncertainty, rather than addressing more political issues such as nuclear power as a system
204 head-on. Nonetheless, the concerns of the ‘scalar’ school of thought with regard to the

205 construction of different scales to different purposes, and the need to think in a systematic
206 and structured way about whether scale does make a difference, give a useful point of
207 departure for enquiry into the scale at which environmental risk governance is enacted.

208

209 3. Methodology

210

211 Data was collected through qualitative empirical research in Iwaki City and Fukushima City
212 between 2014 and 2017. This was supported by desk research into relevant public-facing
213 documentation on risk governance for marine radiation in Iwaki and Fukushima.

214

215 3.1. Qualitative empirical research

216

217 In-depth interviews were conducted with forty people, encompassing fishers, fisheries
218 cooperative staff and managers, Fukushima Prefecture Fisheries Section researchers and
219 extension officers, local scientists, municipal government employees, municipal government
220 politicians and academics working on Fukushima issues at the national and international
221 level. Participants were sampled purposefully to encompass different sectors with a
222 relationship to trial fishing operations (based on existing knowledge within the research team
223 and initial review of policy documentation), and also to encompass people (e.g. local
224 politicians sceptical of nuclear power, university researchers unrelated to fishing operations)
225 who would be able to offer a more detached or critical perspective on safety post-disaster.
226 Recruitment was undertaken via email or telephone contact, however given ethical concerns
227 about undertaking research on a potentially sensitive topic, recruitment of fisheries and
228 household-level interviewees was undertaken in cooperation with Fukushima Prefecture

229 Fisheries Section. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the interviewees by scale, sector and
230 rationale, with further information in the Supplementary Material.

231

232 Whilst this may seem a relatively small sample, given the complexity of the topic and the
233 specificity of the information required a focused sample of participants able to talk in-depth
234 not only about Iwaki fisheries but also about social and cultural dynamics in the area was
235 considered to offer more analytical purchase than a larger sample with less explanatory depth.
236 As Marshall (1996: 523) explains, “some informants are 'richer' than others and that these
237 people are more likely to provide insight and understanding for the researcher.” Similar
238 sample sizes have been used for qualitative research into marine governance issues elsewhere
239 (e.g. McDaniels et al, 2006; Hicks et al, 2014). The higher number of interviewees at smaller
240 scales is for three reasons. First, the majority of risk governance actions and processes for
241 fisheries in Iwaki and Fukushima such as catching fish, monitoring, screening take place at
242 the prefectural level or lower (see Section 4.1.), hence understanding how risk governance is
243 enacted in practice necessitates greater attention to these scales. Second, the majority of fish
244 landed in Iwaki post-disaster are sold *within* Fukushima Prefecture. For example, in the week
245 commencing 16 June 2014, by weight 55% of Iwaki fish were sold at market in Iwaki itself;
246 20.2% at other markets within Fukushima Prefecture (Aizu-Wakamatsu, Koriyama,
247 Fukushima); 15.1% in Tohoku (Mito, Sendai); and 9.7% in Tokyo (Iwaki City Fisheries
248 Cooperative, personal communication). For the objectives of both restarting fishers'
249 livelihoods and also ensuring consumer safety it is therefore people and processes *within* the
250 prefecture, and especially within Iwaki City, which are most significant. Third and final, at
251 smaller spatial scales textual documentation (e.g. policy briefs) to evidence risk governance
252 practices is more limited compared to the national level, hence interview-based data takes on

253 extra importance in understanding risk governance practices in a way that is not otherwise
254 readily accessible.

255

256 The interviews were loosely structured to allow naturally-occurring discussion to emerge.
257 Participants were in all cases asked how they felt the recovery of fisheries was proceeding
258 post-disaster; what they thought the key concerns around radiation in the area were; and how
259 they felt about living in Iwaki City and/or Fukushima Prefecture more generally. A
260 discussion group was also held with nine fishers covering a range of ports and catching a
261 range of fish from along the Iwaki coast. This again was loosely structured in order to allow
262 themes the fishers themselves deemed important to emerge but guided around questions of
263 how fishers saw the prognosis of Iwaki fisheries, and what they felt the main risk
264 communication and management needs were. Ethnographic observation was undertaken at
265 the landing of a catch of fish for monitoring at Onahama Fisheries Research Station, the
266 landing of catches for trial fishing operations (including radiation screening) at Onahama Fish
267 Market, and a weekly information meeting between Fukushima Prefecture fisheries
268 scientists/extension officers and fishers at the Iwaki Fisheries Building. The Supplementary
269 Material gives a fuller breakdown of the data sources and interview/focus group topic guides
270 on which this paper is based.

271

272 The interviews and discussion group were audio-recorded, with notes being written up for the
273 field observations. All interviews were undertaken in Japanese, and to avoid any slippage in
274 language analysis proceeded as far as possible on Japanese versions of the data. Analysis was
275 undertaken through a process of identifying key themes and ideas in both the interviews and
276 field notes, then grouping the main emergent ideas before re-reading to ensure the overall
277 synthesis was consistent with the themes identified in the original reading. This is derived

278 from the ‘grounded theory’ approach (Strauss and Corbin, 1997; Henwood and Pidgeon,
279 2012), where the aim is to identify themes and concepts within the data itself rather than
280 attempting to categorise the data into pre-existing interpretative frameworks. Such iterative
281 techniques for environmental issues have been deployed by Kempton et al (2005) and
282 Parkhill et al (2014) among others, and are argued to be appropriate for complex
283 environmental issues such as the issue under study here where respondents’ opinions may be
284 contingent on local context and may not at first sight appear ‘rational’. For fuller information
285 on the research design and execution, we direct the reader to the Supplementary Material.

286

287 3.2. Documentary analysis

288

289 The qualitative empirical data was supplemented with analysis of documentation pertaining
290 to risk governance in Iwaki and Fukushima fisheries produced by actors operating at different
291 spatial scales (see Table 2). The purpose of this was (a) to further refine the themes identified
292 in the empirical research; (b) gain deeper understanding on risk governance practices and
293 standards at different spatial scales; and (c) to understand the language, messaging and
294 framing used to discuss risk governance for Iwaki and Fukushima fisheries at different scales.

295

296 The documents were sampled to reflect institutions with interest or involvement in risk
297 governance for Iwaki trial fisheries, including those at smaller scales who were outside
298 decision-making processes but could influence local consumer opinion. This was based on
299 knowledge of the governance landscape emerging during fieldwork and prior review of
300 policy documentation. Prior (2003) holds that documents are produced in social settings and
301 that the context in which a document is produced is as significant as the content. Document
302 analysis thus entailed two components – reading the documents themselves for the language

303 and imagery (and spatial scales) used to describe risks and uncertainties around marine
304 radiation, and also considering how the language and imagery used related to how the
305 reporting institution was discussed (e.g. perceived competence or trustworthiness) during the
306 qualitative empirical research outlined above. In the following Findings section, reference to
307 relevant sections of the above documents or related documentation is made where appropriate
308 to support the observations from the empirical data.

309

310 3.3. Rigour

311

312 As a final note for this section, we have sought to follow as far as possible the checklist for
313 rigour in qualitative research developed by Mays and Pope (1995). Table 3 explains the
314 means through which we have aimed to achieve this. Note also that all translations from
315 Japanese sources into English were undertaken by the authors – both of whom are proficient
316 in Japanese – and checked for accuracy with an additional native speaker independent from
317 the research team.

318

319 4. Findings

320


321 We follow the approach for an account of scalar structuration suggested by Brenner (2001).
322 This entails laying out how/why/when the social process is subdivided into a vertical
323 hierarchy of separate yet intertwined scales; specifying relevant spatial units within this
324 hierarchy; delineating the specific and historically evolving roles within hierarchy; and
325 evaluating the specific and historically evolving relations to other units within this hierarchy
326 (Brenner, 2001). It is also important to clarify how we distinguish ‘Fukushima’ fish and
327 ‘Iwaki’ fish, bearing in mind that how actors themselves make this distinction is a key

328 concern of the paper. For factual descriptions, we use *Fukushima* fish for processes relevant
 329 to whole prefecture (such as the stoppage of fisheries), and *Iwaki* fish for processes specific
 330 to Iwaki (for instance, screening by the municipal fisheries cooperative).

331

332 4.1. How/why/when the social process is subdivided into vertical hierarchy of separate yet
 333 intertwined scales; and specifying relevant spatial units within the hierarchy

334



335

336 Figure 2: overview of institutions, processes, and standards involved in governance of trial
 337 fisheries in Iwaki.

338

339 Figure 2 summarises how the social process – in this case risk governance of fisheries in
 340 Iwaki after the Fukushima nuclear accident – is subdivided into a vertical hierarchy of

341 separate yet intertwined scales. The ‘why’ and the ‘when’ of this subdivision is as follows.
342 This is necessarily descriptive, but sets the context for the following analysis.

343

344 The *national* scale ultimately determines whether fish can be sold and restricts commercial
345 coastal fisheries in Fukushima, via the regulatory baseline for radioactive caesium in marine
346 produce (100 Bq/kg). Following the March 2011 disaster, the Japanese government imposed
347 a control directive on all fisheries off Fukushima Prefecture (Buessler, 2012) and also for
348 some species from nearby Ibaraki, Miyagi and Iwate Prefectures (Fisheries Agency of Japan,
349 2014). A national-level actor in FDNPP operator Tokyo Electric Power Company (TEPCO)
350 is also responsible for compensating affected fishers and ensuring that the damaged plant
351 remains under control.

352

353 The *prefectural* scale is responsible for moving fisheries towards restarts. Fukushima
354 Prefecture’s Fisheries Section has since 2011 conducted regular (almost weekly) monitoring
355 of fish stocks, sea water and bottom sediment, which provides baseline data for determining
356 which species are released for trial fishing operations. For species in zones where radioactive
357 caesium has not recently been detected during this monitoring, the potential to be released for
358 trial operations is determined at prefectural scale via the Representatives of Fisheries
359 Cooperative conference (Wada et al, 2013; Mabon and Kawabe, 2015).

360

361 The *municipal* scale is where trial fisheries – not only the catching of fish but also their
362 subsequent radiation screening – are executed. Trial operations are overseen by municipal
363 cooperatives in Soma-Futaba (north Fukushima) and Iwaki (south Fukushima), who are
364 connected at the prefectural level through the Fukushima Prefecture Federation of Fisheries
365 Cooperatives. Produce landed in trial fishing operations is screened within laboratories in

366 each municipality before going on to market – mainly within the municipality or Fukushima
367 Prefecture, but also across north-east Japan. This process has been developing in Iwaki since
368 2012.

369

370 The *local* scale has a significant role in decision-making around the restart of fisheries. The
371 actual practice of fishing is carried out by small groups of fishers who fish out of – and are
372 members of cooperative branches within - the various ports within the municipality, who
373 decide at the local level about participation or otherwise in trial fishing. It is also at the
374 municipal and local scales that radiation monitoring by citizens and alternative brandings for
375 produce have emerged, as discussed in Sections 4.2. and 4.3.

376

377 The *household* and *individual* scale is significant in that it is it is at the scale of the *household*
378 that decisions about whether or not to consume fish caught in Fukushima waters are
379 ultimately taken. Interpersonal face-to-face interaction between fishers, fisheries cooperative
380 staff and brokers is also important in consensus-building around the development and
381 expansion of trial fisheries.

382

383 Also relevant, if not involved directly in the governance of Fukushima fisheries, is the
384 *international* context. This may be seen to influence risk governance in Fukushima fisheries
385 via the provision of international recommendations on internal exposure to radioactivity (e.g.
386 UNSCEAR, 2016), reputation and perception of Japanese fish (for example import bans for
387 specific countries), and observation and research into marine radioactivity from overseas
388 institutions who may shape international perception on the safety or otherwise of the
389 Fukushima marine radiation situation (e.g. FukushimaInFORM, 2015).

390

391 4.2. Specific and historically evolving roles within hierarchy

392

393 Table 4 summarises specific and historically evolving roles within the scalar hierarchy. It lays
394 out risk governance roles, processes and actions across scales based on insights from field
395 work and documentary analysis. Especially noteworthy is that in interviews, the municipal
396 and local scales emerge as sites for radiation monitoring perceived as more rigorous and
397 trustworthy (interviews with fishers, Onahama/Central Iwaki; interviews with aquarium
398 scientists/citizen monitoring group members, Onahama). We draw several explanations for
399 this from the table. First, rather than the national standard of 100Bq/kg, the Fukushima
400 Prefectural Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations (FPFFCA) upper limit for
401 saleable produce is 50Bq/kg, with additional screening required for batches where samples
402 exceed 25Bq/kg (Fukushima Prefecture Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations,
403 2015). Second, this screening is undertaken at fish markets within Iwaki by municipal
404 cooperative staff trained by Fukushima Prefecture fisheries researchers, and is accompanied
405 by calls from fishers themselves to enhance traceability of produce within trial fisheries
406 (discussion group with fishers, Onahama). Third, separate from municipal cooperative
407 screening, non-governmental marine research group Iwaki Sea Survey Team UmiLabo
408 provides another means for consumers to assess the level of radioactivity in marine produce.
409 UmiLabo allows citizens to join them to catch fish at sea for monitoring (results later being
410 posted online at www.umilabo.jp) and holds *TaboLabo* events (literally ‘checking and eating
411 lab’) in conjunction with a local aquarium at which participants view radiation monitoring of
412 marine produce in real-time before eating freshly-prepared Iwaki seafood (UmiLabo, n.d.).

413

414 In short, *within* Iwaki City, the assessment of risks associated with restarting fisheries post-
415 disaster is (a) governed to stricter standards than legally required, with a drive from those

416 who have the most to gain from restarts (i.e. fishers) for more stringent practices; (b)
417 undertaken by institutions whose staff themselves live and work in the community; and (c)
418 independently verifiable in terms of both process and results due to citizen science actions.
419 Moreover, the communication aims and messaging between the national or regional scales
420 and the local and municipal scales differ. On one hand, the national and prefectural framing
421 of post-disaster fisheries as a ‘Fukushima’ issue is perhaps more closely associated with one-
422 way, top-down risk governance. Interviewees associated with fisheries described
423 representatives coming ‘up from Kasumigaseki¹’ once a month to pass on information about
424 marine radiation (interviews with FPFCA and Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative
425 representatives, Central Iwaki). National- or regional-scale literature makes heavy reference
426 to dispelling ‘harmful rumours’ via information provision (e.g. Fukushima Prefecture, 2011;
427 Reconstruction Agency, 2013). By contrast, efforts to frame post-disaster fisheries as an
428 ‘Iwaki’ issue focus not only on safety, but also on local identity and pride in the area’s
429 fisheries. This can be seen in the development of the *Joban-Mono* brand for Iwaki fish.
430 Advertising campaigns since October 2015 focusing on the humans involved in fisheries
431 restarts and also the geographical conditions giving Iwaki fish a distinctive taste (interview
432 with Iwaki City Fisheries Office, Central Iwaki). The old place name for Iwaki – *Joban* –
433 which transcends modern-day Fukushima and Ibaraki Prefectures has been evoked for this
434 purpose (Iwaki City, 2015). Similarly, UmiLabo members spoke of their pride in the history
435 and quality of Iwaki fish as a driving factor in commencing research, monitoring not only to
436 check radiation but also for the social activity of eating and learning about locally-caught
437 produce (interviews with aquarium scientists/citizen monitoring group members, Onahama).
438

¹ Kasumigaseki is the area of Tokyo in which the Fisheries Agency of Japan’s head offices are located.

439 Local attempts to frame post-disaster fisheries at the municipal (i.e. Iwaki) scale thus move
440 the aim of risk governance away from dispelling ‘harmful rumours’ and towards admitting
441 where remaining uncertainties lie, making visible the processes through which these
442 uncertainties are reduced or at least managed, and respecting informed decisions made by
443 citizens and fishers alike. Further, framing risk governance at the municipal scale means that
444 those undertaking the practices of risk governance – fishers, market staff, informed
445 consumers – become risk-bearers as well as risk assessors, with a vested interest in
446 understanding their own risk exposure and also in upholding the quality of marine produce
447 which is key to their own local identity. It is this role of individuals within risk governance
448 processes that we now unpackage further.

449

450 4.3. Specific and historically evolving relations to other units within hierarchy

451

452 To more fully understand why it is that municipal- or local-scale actors and institutions
453 appear to be the most significant in moving Iwaki fisheries forwards, we look to the specific
454 and historically evolving relations to other units within the hierarchy. Based on field work
455 and documentary analysis, Table 5 outlines how actors and processes affect – and are
456 effected by – processes occurring at different spatial scales.

457

458 Significant is that the extension officers and citizen science groups who were discussed as
459 reliable sources of information in interviews with fishers, fisheries cooperatives and
460 community groups (e.g. interviews with fishers, Onahama/Cental Iwaki; interviews with
461 FPFCA and Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative representatives, Central Iwaki; interview with
462 local politician, Central Iwaki) are those who possessed the least knowledge about radiation
463 pre-2011 yet are able to work effectively across scales. Vital to engaging fishers in dialogue

464 on radiation in the marine environment are Fukushima Prefecture's Fisheries Extension
465 Officers, and also the research scientists based at Onahama Fisheries Research Station run by
466 Fukushima Prefecture. Whilst employed by Fukushima Prefecture – a scale and institution in
467 which some observed citizen discomfort or distrust due to associations with 'big' and distant
468 government (e.g. interview with sociology professor, Fukushima) – the Extension Officers
469 enact risk governance at the local, small group or individual level. Formalised discussions
470 between Extension Officers and Prefectural Fisheries Scientists and fishers on the results of
471 radiation monitoring are supplemented with informal, face-to-face consultations with fishers
472 either in their ports or before/after large group meetings. Information meetings are held in a
473 building belonging to a prefecture-level actor - the Fukushima Federation of Fisheries
474 Cooperative Associations building in inland Iwaki. Yet as observed during ethnographic
475 observation, by making concessions such as allowing fishers to smoke in the entrance hall -
476 contrary to normal convention for public buildings – or tolerating them sitting in a less formal
477 way during the meetings (kneeling on chairs and/or putting their feet up on the tables),
478 practices associated with the household and personal level are drawn on to build rapport.
479 Further, the lifetime employment system of Fukushima Prefecture means many Extension
480 Officers and senior scientists have long personal relationships with fishers and fisheries
481 cooperative staff stretching back to well before the 2011 disaster. As such, actions at the
482 individual and personal scale become key to putting risk governance practices regulated at
483 the municipal level into practice, specifically by building support among fishers for
484 progression of trial fisheries.

485

486 Similarly, at the municipal scales and lower, 'local experts' and 'citizen activists' have an
487 important role in working across scales to connect citizens and potential consumers to
488 scientific discourses of radioactive contamination emerging at prefectural, national and

489 international scales. One example of this is the *TaboLabo* event series described in Section
490 4.2., where marine scientists use the local aquarium – a space they feel citizens will not be
491 intimidated entering – and the practice of eating seafood as the starting point for dialogue on
492 the scientific process of radiation monitoring. A second example is Quebec Delta, a group led
493 by a coastal engineering student daughter of an Iwaki fisher which undertook a programme of
494 information provision, fisher interviews and tasting events across Fukushima and north-east
495 Japan (Quebec Delta, n.d.). The aim of doing so was to situate the restart of Iwaki fisheries
496 and the management of radiation risk within a wider context of local recovery and the
497 significance of fisheries to the history and identity of Iwaki. A third example is the fact that
498 both monitoring and trial fishery screening processes are open for public viewing, allowing
499 consumers to discuss issues of significant scientific complexity on a one-to-one basis with
500 staff who are simultaneously radiation ‘experts’ yet also local citizens (interview with
501 prefectural fisheries scientists, Onahama).

502

503 Common to all of these practices is that the activities are undertaken within the community,
504 and are led by people with multiple identities as scientists yet also citizens and enthusiasts.
505 Such ‘local experts’ are hence an important conduit for simultaneously safeguarding local
506 livelihoods and ensuring consumer safety. They provide a means of making visible larger-
507 scale discourses on environmental radioactivity through open and transparent monitoring
508 activities taking place within the confines of the local area, and thus help consumers reach
509 informed decisions on whether or not to consume Iwaki produce. It is also worth noting that
510 Iwaki citizens and community groups (and indeed those elsewhere in Fukushima Prefecture)
511 can ‘jump scales’ (Smith, 2004) to understand and support post-disaster fisheries, using social
512 media to directly consult with national and international environmental science ‘experts’ (for
513 instance Ryugo Hayano of Tokyo University and Jay Cullen of University of Victoria) on

514 uncertainties, or even to directly promote local produce through hashtag campaigns such as
515 #life_in_fukushima and #yummyfukushima. By speaking as citizens who live, work and in
516 cases were even born in the area, these ‘local experts’ and ‘citizen activists’ are able to frame
517 risk governance decisions not as a purely-techno scientific matter, but rather as a process
518 taking place in a wider context of daily living and local recovery post-disaster.

519

520 5. Discussion: policy implications

521

522 What makes environmental risk governance in situations of high complexity like Fukushima
523 fisheries especially challenging is that the livelihoods of the local communities need to be
524 protected along with the interests of other stakeholders such as consumers. Risk governance
525 must thus balance differing perspectives on what constitutes an appropriate course of action.
526 The causes and immediate effects of the Fukushima nuclear disaster may be very specific, but
527 the wider context of complex, uncertain and potentially irreversible environmental change is
528 far from unique. As such, we conclude by drawing three policy implications from our
529 analysis which carry wider lessons beyond fisheries in Iwaki.

530

531 **1. Those setting standards and monitoring requirements (such as national-level**
532 **regulatory bodies) ought to reflect on how effective risk governance processes developed**
533 **at larger spatial scales may be in meeting the concerns and expectations of communities,**
534 **consumers and other local-level risk-bearers such as fishers**

535

536 Different ‘types’ of risk operate at different levels (Wynne, 1992; Riesch, 2012). For
537 instance, specific to Fukushima Morris-Suzuki (2014) observes disconnect between large-
538 scale government-led assessments of environmental radioactivity from air doses, versus the

539 complexities and indeterminacies of people’s lived experiences. In Iwaki too, the traceability
540 of the monitoring and screening process appears more important than outright assurances of
541 safety, with fishers and citizens very aware of the heterogeneity of ecosystems and fisheries
542 within the prefecture and its districts and the indeterminacy this may engender. When
543 developing processes for marine risk governance, policymakers may thus wish to consider
544 means of allowing risk assessment processes (e.g. monitoring, decision-making meetings) to
545 proceed as far as possible within the community scale, using local institutions and people
546 where possible, so that citizens and consumers may more fully understand the grounds on
547 which risk governance decisions have been made and reach their own informed decisions on
548 what constitutes an acceptable level of uncertainty or indeterminacy.

549

550 **2. National-level regulators and operators ought to take steps to understand which**
551 **individuals and people – and why – are perceived as trustworthy and reliable sources of**
552 **information within communities.**

553

554 This is important because, as the Fukushima nuclear accident shows us, decisions about
555 operating infrastructure and about nationwide safety standards may well be taken at national
556 (or even international) scales, and yet the livelihood of the local community will be affected
557 by such decisions. However, lack of trust in those assessing or managing risks from ‘on high’
558 is a major issue not only for Fukushima, but also for other pieces of environmental
559 infrastructure where citizen and stakeholder input is sought (e.g. Terwel et al (2012) on
560 carbon dioxide capture and storage, Colvin et al (2015) on coal seam gasification).
561 Understanding where the points, people and forums are to engage communities and those
562 tasked with putting risk governance into practice (e.g. fishers, municipal government
563 extension officers) is hence a crucial step in facilitating dialogue across scales on what a

564 scientifically appropriate yet socially acceptable course of action may be. In Iwaki, for
565 instance, extension officers and citizen scientists are simultaneously citizens and ‘insiders’
566 (McKechnie, 2003) able to connect local consumers and fishers with complex discourses of
567 marine environmental science. It is hence important to ensure, perhaps as part of the
568 environmental and social impact assessment process and reviewed regularly across the
569 lifespan of a project, that local-level actors who can work across scales, and especially who
570 may be perceived as giving citizens or less empowered stakeholders an opportunity to engage
571 or connect with processes operating at larger scales, are well-resourced and well-staffed to
572 respond to any arising environmental risks. This understanding may be gleaned through, for
573 example, collaboration with local authority environmental officials who hold rich contextual
574 knowledge.

575

576 **3. Policymakers ought to pay cognisance to fact that the spatial delineation of an**
577 **environmental problem may have social effects.**

578

579 Post-disaster, national government monitoring is divided into ‘Fukushima Prefecture’ and
580 ‘Other Prefectures’ (Fisheries Agency of Japan, 2014) with restrictions on all Fukushima
581 coastal fisheries except trial operations. Confining the risk of marine radiation to
582 ‘Fukushima’ whilst simultaneously encouraging revitalisation of the same ‘Fukushima’
583 Prefecture and branding concerns over Fukushima produce as *fuhyo higai* (harmful rumours,
584 rumour damage) may have the effect of contributing to confusion and distrust by marking a
585 scale/space for consumption out as a landscape of risk at the same time. Morimoto (2015)
586 sees a ‘Fukushima/non-Fukushima’ binary as harmful to the recovery of the area, in that it
587 marks Fukushima produce – and only Fukushima produce – out as having the potential to be
588 contaminated. Interviewed fishers too expressed concern and frustration that fish landed in

589 Fukushima Prefecture were subject to stricter regulation than fish which may have swum in
590 the same waters but been landed across the border in an adjacent prefecture. Clear in the
591 above is that risk governance of a complex environmental issue based on simple spatial
592 delineation may not only struggle to encompass the complexity of ecosystems, but may also
593 disproportionately expose the community concerned to risk of negative perception, delayed
594 recovery or stigmatisation. Decision-makers hence ought to be aware of the potential social
595 effects which can arise from mapping out areas of contamination, perhaps developing
596 alternative strategies such as restrictions based on species type or branding and
597 communication – as with *Joban-Mono*- which helps to break place name association.

598

599 6. Conclusion

600

601 As a final point, it is important to remember framing risk governance at a smaller spatial
602 scale does not guarantee the revival of Iwaki fisheries. Other spatial units within the
603 hierarchy render Iwaki fisheries vulnerable. As well as requiring local households willing to
604 consume fish, future recovery may depend on the support of brokers working at the regional
605 scale – engaging with buyers outwith the prefecture across north-east Japan - who believe
606 that Fukushima fish are safe *and* can be sold at an economically viable price. Likewise,
607 whilst relations of trust between TEPCO and fishers are low, the absence of full-scale
608 commercial operations also makes fishers dependent upon TEPCO. This dependence may be
609 financial through receipt of compensation payments, and also material in that decisions taken
610 by a national-scale actor like TEPCO on the management of the FDNPP site may have very
611 real consequences if, for instance, radioactively contaminated matter is purposely or
612 accidentally released into the sea with associated effects (either actual or perceived) on fish
613 stocks. Nonetheless, the case of Iwaki fisheries illustrates the challenges of risk governance

614 in a locality where not only economically, but also culturally, significant practices such as
615 fishing are under threat and where livelihoods and sense of identity may be at stake from
616 exposure to risk. In such situations, scalar accounts can help identify where the scales and in
617 turn spaces at which discussions and decisions over the most appropriate trajectory forwards
618 for a landscape of risk may be held.

619

620 Acknowledgements

621

622 The authors are grateful to Fukushima Prefectural Fisheries Extension Office, Fukushima
623 Prefectural Fisheries Research Station, Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative, and Onahama
624 Danish Trawl Seines Fisheries Cooperative for support in arranging the field work in Iwaki;
625 and to all members of the Iwaki fishing communities and citizens of Fukushima Prefecture
626 who participated in this research.

627

628

629 References

630

631 Arvai, J. 2014. The end of risk communication as we know it. *Journal of Risk Research* 17 (10): 1245-1249.

632

633 Bickerstaff, K. 2012. "Because we've got history here": Nuclear waste, cooperative siting, and the relational
634 geography of a complex issue. *Environment and Planning A* 44(11): 2611-2628.

635

636 Blowers, A. 1999. Nuclear waste and landscapes of risk. *Landscape Research* 24(3): 241-264.

637

638 Boyes, S.J. and Elliott, M. 2014. Marine Legislation – the ultimate 'horrendogram': International Law,
639 European Directives & National Implementation. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 86: 39-47.

640

641 Bradbury, J. 1989. The Policy Implications of Differing Concepts of Risk. *Science, Technology and Human
642 Values* 14 (4): 380-399.

643

644 Brenner, N. 2001. The limits to scale? Methodological reflections on scalar structuration. *Progress in Human
645 Geography* 25(4): 591-614.

646

647 Buesseler, K. 2012. Fishing for Answers off Fukushima. *Science* 338:480-482.

648

649 Colvin, R.M., Witt, G.B. and Lacey, J. 2015. Strange bedfellows or an aligning of values? Exploration of
650 stakeholder values in an alliance of concerned citizens against coal seam gas mining. *Land Use Policy* 42: 392-
651 399.

652

653 Duckett, D., Wynne, B., Christley, R.M., Heathwaite, A.L., Mort, M., Austin, Z., Wastling, J.M., Latham, S.M.,
654 Alcock, R. and Haygarth, P. 2015. Can policy be risk-based? The cultural theory of risk and the case of livestock
655 disease containment. *Sociologia Ruralis* 55 (4): 379-399.

656

657 Edelstein, M.R. 2002. 'Contamination: The Invisible Built Environment' in Robert B. Bechtel and Arza
658 Churchman, eds., *Handbook of Environmental Psychology* John Wiley and Sons: Chichester, 559-588.

659

660 Fisheries Agency of Japan. 2014. *The Leakage of Contaminated Water at TEPCO's Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear*
661 *Power Station and the Safety of Fishery Products (provisional translation)*. Fisheries Agency of Japan: Tokyo.
662 <http://www.jfa.maff.go.jp/pdf/140305e.pdf>

663

664 Fisheries Agency of Japan. 2015. Information on radioactive matter in marine produce (in Japanese).

665

666 Fukushima InForm. 2015. Fukushima Contamination Detected at Shoreline in British Columbia
667 <http://fukushimainform.ca/2015/04/06/fukushima-contamination-detected-at-shoreline-in-british-columbia/>

668

669 Fukushima Prefecture. 2011. 'Vision for Revitalization in Fukushima Prefecture' Fukushima Prefecture:
670 Fukushima. https://www.pref.fukushima.lg.jp/download/1/vision_for_revitalization.pdf

671

672 Fukushima Prefecture. 2017. 'Marine seafood' Fukushima Prefecture: Fukushima.
673 <http://www.pref.fukushima.lg.jp/uploaded/attachment/218392.pdf>

674

675 Fukushima Prefecture Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations. 2014. Inspection system (in Japanese),
676 PPFCA, Iwaki. <http://www.fsgyoren.jf-net.ne.jp/siso/buhin/kensa20140827.pdf>

677

678 Fukushima Prefectural Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations. 2017. 'The undertaking of trial
679 fisheries in Fukushima Prefecture' (in Japanese). <http://www.fsgyoren.jf-net.ne.jp/siso/sisotop.html>

680

681 Henwood, K. and N. Pidgeon. 2012. 'Grounded theory' In *Research Methods in Psychology* edited by
682 Breakwell, G.M., Smith, J.A. and Wright, D.B. 461-484. London: Sage.

683

684 Hicks C.C., Stoeckl N., Cinner J.E. and Robinson J. 2014. 'Fishery benefits and stakeholder priorities associated
685 with a coral reef fishery and their implications for management' *Environmental Science and Policy* 44: 258-270.

686

687 Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative: Hisanohama Section Youth Group. 2015. 'For fisheries in the Hisanohama
688 area in the future: area recovery events and efforts to secure support' (in Japanese). Iwaki City Fisheries
689 Cooperative: Hisanohama Section: Hisanohama.
690 <https://www.zengyoren.or.jp/ninaite/kouryu/download.php?docid=1038>

691

692 Iwaki City Fisheries Section. 2015. What is Joban-Mono? (in Japanese) Iwaki City: Iwaki. [http://misemasu-
693 iwaki.jp/joban/item/A5guidebook-201510.pdf](http://misemasu-iwaki.jp/joban/item/A5guidebook-201510.pdf)

694

695 Iwaki City Fisheries Section. 2016. 'Heisei 28: Fisheries in Iwaki City' (in Japanese) Iwaki City: Iwaki.
696 <http://www.city.iwaki.lg.jp/www/contents/1001000000620/simple/H28iwakisinosuisan.pdf>

697

698 Iwaki Sea Survey Team UmiLabo (n.d.) 'Iwaki Sea Survey Team 'UmiLabo'' (in Japanese)
699 <http://www.umilabo.jp>

700

701 Kasperson, R. 2014. Four questions for risk communication. *Journal of Risk Research* 17(10): 1233-1239.
702
703 Kempton, W., Firestone, J., Lilley, J., Rouleau, T. and Whitaker, P. 2005. The Offshore Wind Power Debate:
704 Views from Cape Cod. *Coastal Management* 33 (2): 119-149.
705
706 Kimura, A.H. 2016. *Radiation Brain Moms and Citizen Scientists: The Gender Politics of Food Contamination*
707 *after Fukushima* Duke University Press: Durham, NC.
708
709 Klinke, A. and Renn, O. 2002. A New Approach to Risk Evaluation and Management: Risk-Based, Precaution-
710 Based, and Discourse-Based Strategies. *Risk Analysis* 22 (6): 1071-1094
711
712 Mabon, L. and Kawabe, M. 2015. Fisheries in Iwaki after the Fukushima Dai'ichi nuclear accident: lessons for
713 coastal management under conditions of high uncertainty? *Coastal Management* 43 (5): 498-518.
714
715 Marshall. M.N. 1996. 'Sampling for qualitative research' *Family Practice* 13 (6): 522-525.
716
717 Marston S.A. 2000. The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography* 24 (2): 219-242.
718
719 Mays, N. and Pope, C. 1995. 'Rigour and qualitative research' *British Medical Journal* 311: 109-112.
720
721 McDaniels, T., Longstaff, H. and Dowlatabadi, H. 2006. 'A value-based framework for risk management
722 decisions involving multiple scales: a salmon aquaculture example' *Environmental Science and Policy* 9(5):
723 423-438.
724
725 McKechnie, R. 2003. 'Insiders and outsiders: identifying experts on home ground' in Irwin, A. and Wynne, B.
726 (eds.) *Misunderstanding Science?: The Public Reconstruction of Science and Technology* Cambridge University
727 Press: Cambridge pp 126-151.
728
729 Ministry of Environment. 2017. 'Progress on Off-site Cleanup and Interim Storage Facility in Japan' Ministry
730 of Environment: Tokyo.
731 http://josen.env.go.jp/en/pdf/progressseet_progress_on_cleanup_efforts.pdf?141022.html
732
733 Morimoto, R. 2015. 'Interpretative frameworks of disaster in society close-up' in Collins, A.E, Jones, S.,
734 Manyena, B. and Jayawickrama, J. (eds.) *Hazards, Risks, and Disasters in Society* Elsevier: Amsterdam pp 324-
735 353.
736
737 Morris-Suzuki, T. 2014. Touching the grass: Science, uncertainty and everyday life from Chernobyl to
738 Fukushima. *Science, Technology and Society* 19: 331-362.
739
740 Nadai, A. and van der Horst, D. 2010. Introduction: landscapes of energies. *Landscape Research* 35(2): 143-
741 155.
742
743 Oughton, D. 2013. Social and ethical issues in environmental remediation projects. *Journal of Environmental*
744 *Radioactivity* 119: 21-25.
745
746 Parkhill, K., Butler, C. and Pidgeon, N. 2014. Landscapes of Threat? Exploring Discourses of Stigma around
747 Large Energy Developments. *Landscape Research* 39(5): 566-582.
748
749 Pellizzoni, L. 2003. Uncertainty and participatory democracy. *Environmental Values* 12 (2): 195-224.
750

751 Pezullo, P. and Depoe, S.P. 2010. 'Everyday Life and Death in a Nuclear World: Stories from Fernald' in
752 Brouwer, D.C. and Asen, R. (eds.) *Public Modalities: Rhetoric, Culture, Media, and the Shape of Public Life*,
753 University of Alabama Press: Tuscaloosa pp85-108.
754

755 Prior, L. 2003. *Using Documents in Social Research* Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.
756

757 Quebec Delta (n.d.) 'QD Fukushima – Big Catch' <http://quebec-delta-gyogyou.jimdo.com>
758

759 Reconstruction Agency. 2013. *Towards the Creation of "New Tohoku" (The Interim Compilation of*
760 *Discussions)* Reconstruction Agency: Tokyo
761 http://www.reconstruction.go.jp/english/topics/2013/08/20130823_Towards_the_Creation_of_New_Tohoku.pdf
762

763 Renn, O. 2008. *Risk Governance: Coping with Uncertainty in a Complex World* Earthscan: London.
764

765 Riesch, H., 2012. 'Levels of uncertainty'. In: *Essentials of Risk Theory* Roeser, S., Hillerbrand, R., Sandin, P.,
766 and Peterson M. (eds). Springer: New York pp 29-56.
767

768 Sato, A. 2014. Structure of the issues surrounding the nuclear accident evacuees: What has been seen while
769 supporting town meetings. *Japanese Sociological Review* 64 (3): 439-459.
770

771 Shi, P., Ye, Q., Han, G., Li, N., Wang, M., Fang, W. and Liu, Y. 2012. Living with global climate diversity –
772 suggestions on international governance for coping with climate change risk. *International Journal of Disaster*
773 *Risk Science* 3(4): 177-184.
774

775 Smith, N. 2004. 'Scale Bending and the Fate of the National', in *Scale and Geographic Inquiry: Nature, Society,*
776 *and Method* Sheppard, E. and McMaster, R.B. (eds). Blackwell Publishing Ltd: Malden, MA, USA.
777 doi: 10.1002/9780470999141.ch10
778

779 Smith, N. 2006. 'There's no such thing as a natural disaster' *Understanding Katrina: Perspectives from the*
780 *Social Sciences* (Social Science Research Council: New York) <http://understandingkatrina.ssrc.org/Smith/>
781

782 Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. 1997. *Grounded Theory in Practice* Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.
783

784 Tatsuta, K. 2016. *Ichi-Efu: A Worker's Graphic Memoir of the Fukushima Nuclear Plant (Vol. 2)*. Morning:
785 Tokyo.
786

787 Terwel, B.W., ter Mors, E., Daamen, D.D.L., 2012. It's not only about safety: Beliefs and attitudes of 811 local
788 residents regarding a CCS project in Barendrecht. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control* 9: 41–51.
789

790 UNSCEAR. 2016. *Developments since the 2013 UNSCEAR report on the levels and effects of radiation*
791 *exposure due to the nuclear accident following the great east Japan earthquake and tsunami: a 2016 white*
792 *paper to guide the Scientific Committee's future programme of work*. UNSCEAR: Vienna.
793

794 Wada, T., Nemoto, Y., Shimamura, S., Fujita, T., Mizuno, T., Sohtome, T., Kamiyama, K., Morita, T. and
795 Igarashi, S.. 2013. Effects of the nuclear disaster on marine products in Fukushima. *Journal of Environmental*
796 *Radioactivity* 124:246-254.
797

798 Wynne, B., 1992 Uncertainty and environmental learning: reconceiving science and policy in the preventative
799 paradigm. *Global Environmental Change* 2(2) 111-127.
800

801 Wynne, B. 1996. 'May the sheep safely graze? A reflexive view of the expert-lay knowledge divide' in Lash, S.,
802 Szerszynski, B. and Wynne, B. (eds) *Risk, Environment and Modernity: Towards a New Ecology* Sage: London.
803

804 Yoshida, N., and J. Kanda. 2012. Tracking the Fukushima Radionuclides. *Science* 336:1115-1116.
805

806 Table 1: overview of interviewees

Scale	Number of interviewees	Sectors/institutions sampled (number of persons)	Justification
National	2	Universities involved in risk research and communication around Fukushima with national/international focus (2).	Evaluate how knowledge produced at national scale feeds into risk governance, and how Fukushima marine risk is communicated nationally and internationally.
Regional/ prefectural	6	Prefectural fisheries researchers (2); prefectural radiation monitoring team (1); prefectural federation of fisheries cooperatives (2); universities involved in risk communication with regional focus (1).	Understand how radiation and risk governed in Fukushima Prefecture – the scale at which control orders on fisheries are enacted, and over which over three quarters of fish landed in trial fisheries are distributed.
Municipal	8	Municipal government fisheries office (2); municipal government environmental planning (2); municipal fisheries cooperative (2); fisheries extension officer (1); municipal politician (1).	Understand how radiation and risk governed within Iwaki fishing district – the scale at which trial fisheries are governed and at which over half of fish landed in trial fisheries are sold.
Local	15	Fishers who are members of village fisheries cooperatives (13); scientists at local aquarium/citizen monitoring group members (2).	Encompass range of ports within Iwaki landing different fish types; solicit views of scientists working and living in community.
Household/ individual	9	Administrative staff of fish markets and cooperatives (9).	Administrative staff give representation of 'informed consumers' – themselves living in community and consuming seafood.

807

808

809 Table 2 – documents sampled for in-depth analysis

Scale	Sampled institution / individual	Title of sampled document and year (in Japanese unless otherwise stated)	Source
National	Japan Fisheries Agency	Information on radioactive matter in marine produce (2015)	http://www.jfa.maff.go.jp/j/press/kakou/pdf/150406-01.pdf
National	Ministry of Environment	Progress on Off-site Cleanup and Interim Storage Facility in Japan (in English) (2017)	http://josen.env.go.jp/en/pdf/progress_seet_progress_on_cleanup_efforts.pdf?141022.html
Regional prefectural	Fukushima Prefecture	Marine seafood (2017)	http://www.pref.fukushima.lg.jp/uploaded/attachment/218392.pdf
Regional prefectural	Fukushima Prefecture Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations	Inspection system (2014)	http://www.fsgyor.en.jf-net.ne.jp/sono/buhin/kensa20140827.pdf
Municipal	Iwaki City Fisheries Section	What is Joban-Mono? (2015)	http://misemasu-iwaki.jp/joban/item/A5guidebook-201510.pdf
Municipal	Iwaki City Fisheries Section	Heisei 28: Fisheries in Iwaki City (2016)	http://www.city.iwaki.lg.jp/www/contents/1001000000620/simple/H28iwakisinosuisan.pdf
Local	Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative – Hisanohama Section Youth Group	For fisheries in the Hisanohama area in the future: area recovery events and efforts to secure support (2015)	https://www.zengyoren.or.jp/ninaite/kouryu/download.php?docid=1038
Local	Iwaki Sea Survey Team UmiLabo	Iwaki Sea Survey Team UmiLabo (n.d.)	http://www.umilabo.jp/
Household individual	Tatsuta Kazuto	Ichi-Efu: A Worker's Graphic Memoir of the Fukushima Nuclear Plant (Vol. 2). (2015)	Tatsuta, K. 2015. Ichi-Efu: A Worker's Graphic Memoir of the Fukushima Nuclear Plant (Vol. 2). Morning: Tokyo.
Household individual	Quebec Delta	QD Fukushima – Big Catch	https://quebec-delta-gyogyo.jimdo.com/

810

811

812 Table 3: steps taken to ensure rigour in study, in line with qualitative research ‘best practice’

Question(s) (from Mays and Pope, 1995)	Response
Did the researcher make explicit in the account the theoretical framework and methods used at every stage of the research?	Section 2 lays out the theoretical basis for the paper – namely risk governance and scale – whereas Section 3 describes methods.
Was the context clearly described?	Sections 1 and 4.1. provide an overview of the current situation in Fukushima fisheries, with as far as possible reference to peer-reviewed work.
Was the sampling strategy clearly described and justified? Was the sampling strategy theoretically comprehensive to ensure the generalisability of the conceptual analyses (diverse range of individuals and settings, for example)?	The sampling strategy is laid out in Section 3.1, and is intended to be reflective of the scales at which risk governance practices are undertaken and Iwaki fish mainly consumed. Within this, however, effort was made to interview fishers and residents from different ports, involved in catching different fish species, and also to interview participants separate from the trial fisheries process who may offer a more critical perspective.
Could the evidence (fieldwork notes, interview transcripts, recordings, documentary analysis, etc) be inspected independently by others?	Whilst the release of full interview data is not possible in this case on ethical grounds (protection of anonymity given the sensitive nature of the topic), we provide reference to publicly-available documentation supporting the observations made around risk governance.
Was sufficient of the original evidence presented systematically in the written account to satisfy the sceptical reader of the relation between the interpretation and the evidence (for example, were quotations numbered and sources given)?	Although we do not give full quotations in the interests of brevity, we explain in brackets the interviews in which the points made arose when referred to in-text. Moreover, we also refer to publicly-available documentation which demonstrates the risk governance and communication strategies described.
Was the analysis repeated by more than one researcher to ensure reliability? Did the investigator give evidence of seeking out observations that might have contradicted or modified the analysis?	Analysis was undertaken by both researchers, working together dialogically. To verify and refine the theories and concepts developed, input was sought from academic and policy peers (e.g. presentation at policy-focused conferences) and also from participants themselves (e.g. feedback session at New Onahama Fish Market, May 2015).

813 Table 4: summary of different risk communication approaches and perceptions at different scales

814

Scale	Risk governance style / role / process	Communication method / style	Main theme(s) / aim(s) of risk governance actions	Perception / trustworthiness issues raised in field work	Example(s)
National	Regulation - set regulatory limit for radioactive caesium (100 Bq/kg), based on sampling in sea and in FDNPP port.	Information provision through online explanations and 'town hall' meetings.	Consumer safety.	Data produced by Fisheries Agency / TEPCO generally considered reliable, but concern over transparency around activity at FDNPP.	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 'Risk communication on food - Thinking about how to inspect radioactive materials in food' town hall meeting series (http://www.maff.go.jp/j/press/syouan/hyoji/170106.html)
Regional / prefectural	Refinement - undertake monitoring to review suspensions. Self-regulation - voluntary suspension by fisheries cooperatives, stricter 50 Bq/kg radioactive caesium limit (with additional screening over 25 Bq/kg).	Information provision through online explanations, consultation with citizens/stakeholders on monitoring needs.	Dispelling 'harmful rumours', regional revitalisation.	Fukushima Prefecture as an entity seen as difficult for citizens to trust, but individuals working within Fukushima Prefecture (e.g. fisheries scientists and extension officers) viewed as trustworthy by fishers.	Fukushima Prefecture 'Situation of trial fisheries' website (http://www.pref.fukushima.lg.jp/site/portal/list274-860.html)
Municipal	Enactment - catch fish for monitoring/trial fisheries operations; undertake screening of trial fisheries catches (as above, additional screening for catches over 25 Bq/kg).	Branding campaign within area (posters, stickers, leaflets), television adverts, open viewing of screening, data provision.	Transparency, local identity, quality of produce.	Municipal scale – Iwaki City Government and Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative – viewed positively due to attempts to promote transparency in screening and develop 'Joban-Mono- branding. Municipal cooperative building in Central Iwaki acts as site for fishers to meet and discuss trial fisheries progress.	Iwaki City Fisheries Section <i>Joban-Mono</i> campaign (http://misemasu-iwaki.jp/joban/) FPFFCA trial fisheries screening data portal (http://www.fsgyoren.jf-net.ne.jp/siso/sisotop.html)
Local	Verification - collect data to verify government/cooperative results, no influence on policy.	Co-creation of data – citizen science and monitoring in collaboration with 'local experts'.	Enjoyment of food, pride in local produce, building social relations.	Importance of monitoring of marine produce seen as independent / distinct from national government and prefecture.	Iwaki Sea Survey Team UmiLabo / Aquamarine Fukushima <i>TaboLabo</i> events (http://www.umilabo.jp/archives/category/tabelabo)
Household / individual	Engagement - decision to consume local fish (or not) based on evaluation of risk	Use of social media – including English language – to engage with academics,	Pride in local identity, personal motivation to counter negative images	Value of individuals living within the community but also carrying scientific knowledge in explaining and translating	'#life_in_fukushima' and '#yummyfukushima' Twitter hashtags

	governance process; engagement with knowledge and other citizens to inform (and influence) decision-making.	share understanding of radiation and project imagery of locality.	of Fukushima, motivation to better understand radiation as citizens.	risk assessment processes. Also citizens as 'champions' for Iwaki produce.	https://www.fukushimatrip.com/en citizen-run website encouraging consumption of prefectural produce Featuring of Iwaki seafood quality in 'Ichi-Efu' manga series.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

815

816 Table 5: cross-scale relations in risk governance from interviews (read horizontally)

817

Affected > Effecting V	National	Regional/prefectural	Municipal	Local	Household/individual
National		National-level expertise (both government and academia) supports prefecture rehabilitation committees.	Continued recovery of Iwaki fisheries contingent on competence (both real and perceived) of TEPCO and related companies to keep FDNPP under control.	Fishers remain dependent on TEPCO (via national government) for compensation payments in absence of full-scale fisheries.	National government standards play fundamental role in setting maximum level of consumer exposure.
Regional / prefectural	<i>Not raised in data.</i>		Prefectural scientists crucial in providing and communicating evidence base for fisheries restarts to municipal cooperatives.	Face-to-face contact in ports between fishers and prefectural extension officers builds support for trial fishing operations.	Move towards direct consultation with individuals/households on monitoring data requirements.
Municipal	Remaining suspicion among fisheries cooperatives of trustworthiness and competence of TEPCO to release timely information about FDNPP.	Emphasis on 'Iwaki' fisheries (e.g. <i>Joban-Mono</i>) and local environmental characteristics breaks name association with Fukushima		<i>Not raised in data.</i>	Fisheries cooperatives in Iwaki screen to stricter standards (50 Bq/kg) than national (100 Bq/kg).
Local	<i>Not raised in data.</i>	Fishers/groups of fishers operating out of individual ports collect monitoring data which feeds into Fukushima Prefecture monitoring data prior to trial operations.	Decisions on nature and extent of fishing operations within Iwaki made by fishing cooperatives in individual ports.		'Local experts' (e.g. UmiLabo, Aquamarine Fukushima, Quebec Delta) engaging with citizens on collaborative monitoring or education activities to build understanding
Household / individual	Individual actions by 'citizen activists' (especially via social media) facilitate engagement with national-level actors on radiation data, and transmit nuanced image of Fukushima/Iwaki.	Value of Fukushima Prefecture produce and environment contingent on decisions taken at household level as to safety or otherwise.	Perception of prefectural scientists/cooperative staff as 'citizens' (hence exposed to any risk) as well as employees may help trust-building with fishers and consumers. Also invocation of household scale activities (e.g. smoking) to build dialogue in consultation with fishers.	Motivation/pride/identity of individual citizens as Iwaki consumers led to formation of local groups e.g. UmiLabo.	

821 **Making sense of complexity in risk governance in post-disaster Fukushima fisheries: a scalar**
822 **approach: supplementary material**824 **1. Interviews**826 (a) List of interviewees

828 Sampling: interviewees sampled through combination of drawing on existing contacts the research
829 team had through previous research; 'snowball' sampling based on contacts given during interviews;
830 and search of online media/news outlets to ensure key sectors related to Iwaki and Fukushima
831 fisheries covered. Recruitment of fishers and cooperative staff through trusted intermediary
832 (Fukushima Prefecture Fisheries Section). Caution exercised to avoid bias by independently setting up
833 interviews with local politicians sceptical of nuclear power and academics at nearby university, in
834 order to solicit opinions of those more distant from the restart of Iwaki fisheries.
835

Role	Place of interview (place lived if known)	Gender	Date
Fisheries Resources Manager, Fukushima Prefecture	Fukushima Prefecture Fisheries Research Station	Male	July 2014
Senior Researcher, Fukushima Prefecture	Fukushima Prefecture Fisheries Research Station	Male	July 2014
Fisheries Extension Officer, Fukushima Prefecture	Iwaki Coast	Male	July 2014
Market Staff, Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative	Onahama Fish Market (Yotsukura)	Male	July 2014
Market Staff, Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative	Onahama Fish Market (Nakanosaku)	Male	July 2014
Fisher (crab)	Onahama Fish Market (Hisanohama)	Male	July 2014
Fisher (crab)	Onahama Fish Market (Yotsukura)	Male	July 2014
Fisher (crab, surf clam, whitebait)	Onahama Fish Market (Hisanohama)	Male	July 2014
Board Member, Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative	Iwaki Fisheries Building	Male	July 2014
Project Manager, Fukushima Prefecture Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations/Onahama Danish Trawl Seines Fisheries Cooperative	Iwaki Fisheries Building	Male	July 2014
Market Staff, Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative	Fukushima Prefecture Fisheries Research Station (Onahama)	Male	July 2014
Market Staff, Iwaki	Fukushima Prefecture	Male	July 2014

City Fisheries Cooperative	Fisheries Research Station (Onahama)		
Office Staff, Onahama Danish Trawl Seines Fisheries Cooperative	Onahama Fish Market (Onahama)	Female	July 2014
Office Staff, Onahama Danish Trawl Seines Fisheries Cooperative	Onahama Fish Market (Onahama)	Female	July 2014
Office Staff, Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative	Onahama Fish Market (Ena)	Female	July 2014
Fisher (sea urchin, abalone)	Nakanosaku	Male	July 2014
Fisher (sea urchin, abalone)	Nakanosaku	Female	July 2014
Village chief fisher (sea urchin, abalone)	Usuiso Fisheries Office, Toyoma	Male	July 2014
Office Staff, Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative	Iwaki Fisheries Building (Kabeya)	Female	July 2014
Office Staff, Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative	Iwaki Fisheries Building (Uchio)	Male	July 2014
Fisher (whitebait, surf clam)	Iwaki Fisheries Building (Yotsukura)	Male	July 2014
Fisher (flounder, greenling)	Iwaki Fisheries Building (Nakoso)	Male	July 2014
Fisher (crab)	Iwaki Fisheries Building (Ena)	Male	July 2014
Fisher (sea urchin, abalone, whitebait)	Iwaki Fisheries Building (Ena)	Male	July 2014
Fisher (whitebait, surf clams)	Iwaki Fisheries Building (Toyoma)	Male	July 2014
Fisher (abalone)	Iwaki Fisheries Building (Obama)	Male	July 2014
Fisher (whitebait, abalone)	Iwaki Fisheries Building (Ena)	Male	July 2014
Chief fisher (whitebait, sand eel, surf clam)	Iwaki Fisheries Building (Numanouchi)	Male	July 2014
Local politician	Iwaki City Hall	Male	July 2014
Sociology professor	Fukushima City	Male	July 2014
Disaster management professor	Fukushima City	Male	July 2014
Team Leader, Radiation Monitoring Team, Fukushima Prefecture	Fukushima City	Male	July 2014
Research student	Tokyo (Iwaki)	Female	August 2014
Chief Scientist, local aquarium	Onahama	Male	June 2015
Scientist, local aquarium	Onahama	Male	June 2015
Project Manager,	New Onahama Fish	Male	June 2015

Fukushima Prefecture Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations/Onahama Danish Trawl Seines Fisheries Cooperative	Market		
Senior Environmental Planner, Iwaki City Environment Section	Iwaki City Hall	Male	March 2016
Environmental Planner, Iwaki City Environment Section	Iwaki City Hall	Male	March 2016
Manager, Iwaki City Fisheries Section	Iwaki City Hall	Male	March 2016
Staff, Iwaki City Fisheries Section	Iwaki City Hall	Female	March 2016

836

837 (b) Topic guide (fisher/fisheries cooperative staff interviews)

838

839 *Interviews narrative in nature, with respondents taking lead and interviewer asking follow-up*
840 *questions (Mabon and Kawabe, 2015). However, each interview sought to cover the following key*
841 *areas:*

842

843 1. Local environment

844 a) Where in Iwaki do you live?

845 b) What kind of place is it? How would you describe it to me?

846

847 2. Fisheries

848 a) Tell me when you started fishing - have you always done it?

849 b) What kind of fishing do you do - types of fish/techniques?

850 c) What sort of boat do you own?

851 d) If I were to want to try a typical Iwaki fish, which one would you recommend and why?

852

853 3. Trial fisheries

854 a) For how long have you been participating in the trial fisheries?

855 b) Why did you decide to get involved in trial fishing?

856 c) How do you think the trial fisheries have been going so far?

857 d) What message should I bring back to Scotland with me about Iwaki fisheries?

858

859 (c) Topic guide (expert/stakeholder interviews)

860

861 *Again, interviews narrative in nature and led by respondents, with interviewers probing further to*
862 *follow up on points raised. The following questions were therefore developed as a 'guide' for the*
863 *interview of topics the respondents may wish to talk about, and the interviewers attempted to ensure*
864 *these were covered during the interview (Mabon and Kawabe, 2015).*

865

866 1. Fisheries and the marine environment

867 a) Tell me about fisheries in Iwaki today - how important is it, what is the current situation,
868 how was it in the past?

869 b) What kinds of fish is Iwaki famous for? What is it that has historically made fish from this
870 area so sought after?

- 871
- 872 2. The nuclear accident
- 873 a) What is the current status of fisheries in Iwaki, and in Fukushima more widely?
- 874 b) In your opinion, how is the radiation situation in the sea off Iwaki and Fukushima?
- 875 c) How do you think the trial fisheries are progressing?
- 876 d) From now on in, what do you think the biggest challenges are for restarting Iwaki fisheries?
- 877
- 878 3. Information and communication
- 879 a) Where do you get information from about radiation?
- 880 b) What are the hardest things to understand for you?
- 881 c) What is the thing you most want to know?
- 882 d) When you communicate with fishers and/or regular citizens, what is the hardest thing to
- 883 explain?
- 884 e) What kinds of questions do fishers and/or regular citizens ask you? Which are hardest to
- 885 answer?
- 886
- 887 4. Society and culture
- 888 a) What kind of place would you say Iwaki is?
- 889 b) What do you think has changed since the disaster?
- 890 c) What are the major social issues in Iwaki at the moment, both connected to and apart from
- 891 the disaster?
- 892 d) Apart from radiation, are there any other environmental issues on the coast and in the sea
- 893 that are becoming an issue at the moment?
- 894 e) What message would you like me to take back from Iwaki to Scotland to tell my colleagues
- 895 there?
- 896

897 2. **Focus group**

898

899 (a) Participant list

900

901 Recruitment through intermediary in Fukushima Prefecture Fisheries Section. Focus group held 18

902 July 2014 in Onahama Fish Market following landing of trial fisheries catch.

903

Port	Fish caught	Gender	Age
Yotsukura	Sea urchin, abalone	Male	60s
Yotsukura	Sea urchin, abalone	Male	60s
Hisanohama	Sea urchin, abalone	Male	60s
Hisanohama	Sea urchin, abalone	Male	70s
Usuiso (Toyoma)	Sea urchin, abalone	Male	60s
Usuiso (Toyoma)	Sea urchin, abalone	Male	40s
Usuiso (Toyoma)	Sea urchin, abalone	Male	20s
Nakoso	Whitebait	Male	60s

- 904
- 905 1. The local environment
- 906 a) What kind of place is Iwaki?
- 907 b) Where in Iwaki do you live?
- 908 c) What kinds of differences are there between the ports?
- 909
- 910 2. Fisheries in Iwaki

- 911 a) What kinds of fish are caught?
 912 b) What types and sizes of boats, what fishing techniques?
 913
 914 3. Trial fisheries
 915 a) How long have you been involved in trial fisheries?
 916 b) When did you start and why?
 917 c) How do you think the trial fisheries are progressing so far?
 918
 919 4. Information
 920 a) Who gives you information on radiation?
 921 b) What kinds of things do you find hard to understand?
 922 c) What would you like to know that you don't have an answer to?
 923

924 **3. Ethnography/participant observation**
 925

926 For each event attended, narrative field notes written up and where appropriate photographs taken to
 927 document events and experiences.
 928

Event	Location	Date
Landing and screening of trial fishery catch	Onahama Fish Market	July 2014
Landing and analysis of monitoring catch	Fukushima Prefecture Fisheries Research Station, Onahama	July 2014
Monitoring results information meeting (Fukushima Prefecture Fisheries Section and fishers)	Iwaki Fisheries Building	July 2014
Tour of New Onahama Fish Market including screening facilities	New Onahama Fish Market	June 2015
Exhibition detailing effects of accident and monitoring/screening efforts	Aquamarine Fukushima	June 2015
Promotion of fish and seafood to consumers	Iwaki LaLaMew Market	June 2015

929

930 **4. Documentary analysis**

931 The following documents relating to Iwaki and Fukushima fisheries were consulted, reading in
 932 particular for the language and imagery used to describe risks and uncertainties around marine
 933 radiation:

Scale	Sampled institution / individual	Title of sampled document and year (in Japanese unless otherwise stated)	Source
National	Japan Fisheries Agency	Information on radioactive matter in marine produce (2015)	http://www.jfa.maff.go.jp/j/press/ka kou/pdf/150406-01.pdf
National	Ministry of Environment	Progress on Off-site Cleanup	http://josen.env.go

		and Interim Storage Facility in Japan (in English) (2017)	.jp/en/pdf/progressseet_progress_on_cleanup_efforts.pdf?141022.html
Regional prefectural	/ Fukushima Prefecture	Marine seafood (2017)	http://www.pref.fukushima.lg.jp/uploaded/attachment/218392.pdf
Regional prefectural	/ Fukushima Prefecture Federation of Fisheries Cooperative Associations	Inspection system (2014)	http://www.fsgyoren.jf-net.ne.jp/sono/buhin/kensa20140827.pdf
Municipal	Iwaki City Fisheries Section	What is Joban-Mono? (2015)	http://misemasu-iwaki.jp/joban/item/A5guidebook-201510.pdf
Municipal	Iwaki City Fisheries Section	Heisei 28: Fisheries in Iwaki City (2016)	http://www.city.iwaki.lg.jp/www/contents/1001000000620/simple/H28iwakisinosuisan.pdf
Local	Iwaki City Fisheries Cooperative – Hisanohama Section Youth Group	For fisheries in the Hisanohama area in the future: area recovery events and efforts to secure support (2015)	https://www.zengyoren.or.jp/ninaite/kouryu/download.php?docid=1038
Local	Iwaki Sea Survey Team UmiLabo	Iwaki Sea Survey Team UmiLabo (n.d.)	http://www.umilabo.jp/
Household individual	/ Tatsuta Kazuto	Ichi-Efu: A Worker's Graphic Memoir of the Fukushima Nuclear Plant (Vol. 2). (2015)	Tatsuta, K. 2015. Ichi-Efu: A Worker's Graphic Memoir of the Fukushima Nuclear Plant (Vol. 2). Morning: Tokyo.
Household individual	/ Quebec Delta	QD Fukushima – Big Catch	https://quebec-delta-gyogyo.jimdo.com/

934