Essays in Biochemistry (2016) **60** 371–379
DOI: 10.1042/EBC20160039

Societal impact of synthetic biology: responsible research and innovation (RRI)

Daniel Gregorowius[1] **and Anna Deplazes-Zemp**[1]

[1]Institute for Biomedical Ethics and History of Medicine, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 30, 8006 Zürich, Switzerland

Correspondence: Anna Deplazes-Zemp (deplazes@ethik.uzh.ch)

Synthetic biology is an emerging field at the interface between biology and engineering, which has generated many expectations for beneficial biomedical and biotechnological applications. At the same time, however, it has also raised concerns about risks or the aim of producing new forms of living organisms. Researchers from different disciplines as well as policymakers and the general public have expressed the need for a form of technology assessment that not only deals with technical aspects, but also includes societal and ethical issues. A recent and very influential model of technology assessment that tries to implement these aims is known as RRI (Responsible Research and Innovation). In this paper, we introduce this model and its historical precursor strategies. Based on the societal and ethical issues which are presented in the current literature, we discuss challenges and opportunities of applying the RRI model for the assessment of synthetic biology.

Introduction

Synthetic biology as an emerging field at the interface between biology and engineering has raised many expectations for beneficial and revolutionizing applications, for instance, in medicine, for the production of biofuels, or for bioremediation. However, there are also concerns that synthetic biology might have negative consequences related to intellectual property rights, potential abuse, or unknown side effects. Moreover, it has been suggested that this new field could raise concerns related to the aim of producing new life forms, which may be perceived as artificial organisms and thus, unnatural. It is important to take the potentially negative side effects of biotechnologies and related concerns of the public seriously. Therefore, different strategies to study risks as well as economic, societal, and ethical implications of emerging technologies have been developed. The most recent model runs under the acronym of 'RRI', which stands for 'Responsible Research and Innovation'. This review will introduce RRI for synthetic biology. In the first part we provide an overview of the societal and ethical implications of synthetic biology, which have been examined in the academic literature. We then introduce the RRI model and its historical precursor strategies. The final part will discuss the challenges and future directions of the RRI model for synthetic biology by reflecting on the ethical and societal issues in the context of the RRI framework.

Different types of concerns on the societal and ethical implications of synthetic biology

Received: 27 May 2016
Revised: 5 October 2016
Accepted: 19 October 2016

Version of Record published: 30 November 2016

Synthetic biology is an interdisciplinary field at the interface between biology and engineering, which involves different disciplines such as molecular biology, system biology, biophysics, and biotechnology as well as engineering sciences and information technology. It is sometimes described as an extension of earlier forms of genetic engineering. However, the aim is not only to produce new kinds of modified organisms, but also to understand complex biological systems and networks by constructing biological

Essays in Biochemistry (2016) **60** 371–379
DOI: 10.1042/EBC20160039

modules and systems that may or may not exist in nature [1,2]. Possible applications of biological systems resulting from synthetic biology could range from energy production through the invention of biomaterials and tools for environmental remediation to various medical applications [3,4]. The latter include so-called theranostic systems, which can sense disease markers and respond by the direct production of therapeutic molecules [5].

The potential of synthetic biology generates hope and promise. However, at the same time there are also concerns and fears that this technology drifts too far away from nature. The academic literature has discussed different issues and concerns within the current debate [6–11]. Many concerns are known from the debate over 'genetically modified organisms' (GMO) and have been anticipated to be similar for synthetic biology [12]. However, synthetic biology allows new dimensions of creativity in biotechnology and novel products that are further away from their natural origins than previous forms of gene technology. Moreover, entirely new types of applications are discussed for this technology, which go along with novel opportunities as well as risks and economic challenges. In the following section, we distinguish between three types of societal and ethical concerns commonly addressed in the academic literature.

Technical and risk-related concerns

Concerns under this header deal with different risks for human health and the environment. Two types of concerns are distinguished related to respective risk-prevention strategies. Biosafety is the strategy to improve laboratory safety, avoid unintended consequences, and deal with the uncontrolled release of synthetic biology products. Biosecurity strategies deal with bioterrorism and the military usage of synthetic organisms.

- *Biosafety:* pathogens, toxins, or otherwise harmful or potentially harmful biological material produced through synthetic biology could be released accidently from a laboratory [1,7,13]. Moreover, unintended side effects of synthetic biology products created for a certain task (e.g. modified microorganisms used for bioremediation) could occur in the environment and negatively influence human health and other organisms [1,13]. Other risks include contamination of the natural gene pool through accidental release of synthetic biology products.
- *Biosecurity:* a risk that is widely recognized by the scientific community is that synthetic biology could be misused for the design of pathogens for the purposes of bioterrorism or biological weapons [6,14,15]. Although this dual-use dilemma has been known in life sciences before, the new technical potential of synthetic biology including the possibility of synthesizing the genome of pathogenic viruses or of combining different traits to render microorganisms more dangerous have exacerbated the risk of misuse [16].

Concerns about availability and distribution

Besides these risk-related issues there are concerns that deal with the availability and distribution of synthetic biology and its applications or products. These concerns touch social and economic implications as well as questions of justice and fairness.

- *Patenting and the creation of monopolies:* the great expectations of novel products in synthetic biology have triggered a debate over the role of patenting and intellectual property regimes [17]. It has been discussed, for instance, whether patenting of synthetic biology products and processes may lead to the creation of commercial monopolies [17,18]. Moreover, there is a risk that such patents might inhibit innovation in synthetic biology rather than promoting it [9,19,20].
- *Distribution of benefits and risks:* both patenting and the potential of monopolies on certain products or applications in the field of synthetic biology, raise concerns that access to the associated knowledge and applications will be unfairly restricted and controlled [11,21]. These concerns – subsumed under the header of justice and fairness – are related to the distribution of benefits and burdens within a society and across the globe. Besides the distribution itself, the question of who should decide how benefits and risks should be distributed has been raised [21,22].

Concerns about 'unnatural life'

The third type of concern relates to the application of engineering principles and procedures to living organisms in order to design new forms of life. This mechanistic view has, for instance, been expressed in context of the famous synthetic biology competition iGEM ('International Genetically Engineered Machine'), where scientists describe their products as genetically engineered *'machines'*.

- *Creating artificial life:* the engineering-driven approach of understanding living organisms raised moral concerns about the possibility that artificial life might be created and that this could amount to interfering with nature [10,23,24]. Some ethicists argue that living organisms have a moral status, meaning that they should be treated differently from mere things: for such positions, synthetic biology raises the question of whether this status may be affected by the artificial nature of these organisms [25–27]. Speaking of a moral status in living organisms evokes the fear that researchers in synthetic biology are 'playing God' or – in a more secular wording – are 'tampering with nature'. The question 'What is life?' can be interpreted differently – referring to a variety of philosophical, religious, or scientific concepts [24,28,29]. Certain views on life go along with the idea that life should be 'natural'. This raises concerns about the unnatural aspect of synthetic biology products [30,31]. Another common moral concern claims that synthetic biology has a reductionist approach and erodes the distinction between organisms and machines [20].

Responsible research and innovation in the field of synthetic biology – challenges and prospects

Not only academics in the literature but also the lay public have expressed issues and concerns such as those mentioned above [31–33]. Since it is the scientific work that caused these concerns, it has been suggested that scientists should interact with the public and discuss societal and ethical implications of their work. Various approaches towards the assessment and governance of emerging technologies – such as synthetic biology – have been developed. Recent approaches put a particular emphasis on considering societal and ethical concerns of the public: it has been suggested that scientists could assume their responsibility towards society in participatory approaches. In such approaches scientists interact with the public in the form of stakeholders or selected representatives to assess the technology in question. Particularly in Europe, the currently most influential model of assessing, evaluating, and accompanying emerging technologies together with the public is known as 'Responsible Research and Innovation' (RRI). In the following section, we introduce the model of RRI and compare it with its historical precursors. Subsequently, we will give a short overview of the current debate over the application of the RRI model in synthetic biology and name some recent RRI projects.

RRI and its historical precursors

The idea that the development of technologies goes along with responsibilities of scientists and engineers towards society is not new. Historical precursors or related concepts of RRI are different versions of 'technology assessment' (TA) and so-called ELSI/ELSA programs*, where the acronym stands for 'ethical, legal, and social implications' or 'aspects'. Although these different models all deal with the impact of science and research on society and the environment, the focus of what constitutes responsible research has slightly shifted with the transition from one model to the other.

Technology assessment is one of the main roots of RRI. It was the leading approach of evaluating and regulating new technologies from the 1970s to the 1990s [34]. The aim of the traditional TA approach was to evaluate new technologies in order to give early warnings and avoid or compensate anticipated negative effects. This model was originally more focused on technical evaluation than on the discussion of ethical issues. In the mid-1980s Schot and Rip refined this model by considering feedback from users and society for the design and construction of new technologies [35]. This revised version of TA was called 'constructive technology assessment' (cTA) [35]. Another TA model called 'participatory technology assessment' (pTA) does not set as much emphasis on the design of the assessed technology as cTA. Instead, it evaluates the impact that a technology has on society by involving public actors [36]. Such representatives from the public include citizens, consumers, and interest groups; they are part of the process of assessing and debating socially sensitive scientific and technological issues [37].

The *ELSA/ELSI model* became well-known in the 2000s and had its 'golden years' between 2002 and 2012 [38]. The first example of such a program dates back to 1988 when James Watson as Director of the 'Human Genome Project' (HGP) declared at a press conference that the ethical and social implications of genomics warrant a special

* While the acronym 'ELSA' is commonly used in Europe, 'ELSI'is more prevalent in the U.S.

Essays in Biochemistry (2016) **60** 371–379
DOI: 10.1042/EBC20160039

effort and should be directly funded as part of the HGP by the U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH) [39]. The first program funded by the NIH was then launched in 1990. Since 2000, ELSA/ELSI became rather popular and programs were initiated in Canada, South Korea, and Europe. Typically, the ELSA/ELSI model is embedded in large-scale scientific programs and addresses the interaction between internal technological and external social processes that could shape technological evolution. In contrast with the classical TA approaches, these programs explicitly address ethical and legal aspects. As a consequence, the ELSA/ELSI model focuses on interdisciplinary collaborations as well as interactions with different stakeholders from society.

The *RRI model* is a recent science governance approach, which emerged around the 2010s. The RRI model takes up many elements of ELSA/ELSI; therefore, it has been argued that the differences between ELSA/ELSI and RRI tend to be exaggerated [38]. However, RRI aims to introduce a shift from only evaluating consequences and implications that arise after the technology in question has been developed, towards an involvement in the innovation process while the technology is being developed [40]. This means that in contrast with the ELSA/ELSI model, the RRI model not only addresses the regulation of a technology in light of its consequences and effects on society or the environment, it explicitly addresses the use and governance of the technology in question for enabling innovation with the help of actors from both science and society [41,42]. In this respect, input on ethical issues is not only requested to assess an existing technology – like in other models, but rather as a driving force for technical developments, resulting in the shaping of technology already at the time of innovation [34].

How can responsible research and innovation be implemented? RRI accompanies the research process rather than evaluating its consequences [44,45]. Moreover, RRI considers societal needs and concerns through an interactive process in which societal stakeholders and innovators respond to each other [40,42,43]. The RRI model suggests that responsible developments in science, technology, and industry should be combined in a way that responsible innovations are anticipatory, reflective, deliberative, and responsive [46]. The inclusion of ethical acceptability and societal desirability in the process of innovation is considered to be helpful to better embed scientific and technological advances in society [40]. Thus, it has been suggested that ethical reflection and anticipation should be included in the research agenda of the assessment and development of emerging technologies and their applications. The involvement of these topics should help not only to analyze and interpret but also shape technological applications and their presumable future impact on society and the environment. Besides the shift from assessing established technologies to the involvement in the innovation process, RRI is characterized by the central role that it assigns to public participation. The idea is that the public must be included at an early stage, not only for assessing this single technology, but also in order to get to know the needs and wishes of a society for future times – and to identify the technologies that best address the needs and wishes of the public. This distinguishes the RRI model from its precursors, especially cTA and pTA, which both stress the importance of public participation but focus on assessing a single technology. Anticipation and deliberation as envisaged by RRI mean, in consequence, that a society can define the purposes of science [42].

Another shift that can be observed with the transition from ELSI/ELSA to RRI is a stronger focus on socio-economic benefits and collaboration with private and industrial partners [38]. For the purpose of including the different players in the innovation process, the research community and education community are brought together with representatives from industry and business as well as from the general public and policymakers. According to the European Union (EU), RRI is not only characterized by public engagement and the inclusion of ethical issues, but also by aspects such as science education and open access to knowledge [47]: the inclusion of these aspects should provide future researchers and other societal actors with the necessary knowledge and adequate tools to participate and take responsibility in a transparent and accessible research and innovation process.

The literature on RRI discusses various mechanisms that might allow innovation to be anticipatory, reflective, and inclusive: the application of the precautionary principle, a moratorium or a code of conduct may be appropriate approaches in some cases [43,48]. These mechanisms allow scientists to have time to interact with the public to find solutions on common ground. This interaction should take place in a democratic deliberative approach, or, in other words, as an active participation of citizens and a form of collaborative decision-making that embraces a respectful debate of opposing views [9]. More specifically, the inclusion of the public can occur in the form of consensus conferences, citizens' juries, deliberative mapping, deliberative polling, or focus groups [43].

Establishing RRI in the field of synthetic biology

The reflection on the societal and ethical implications of synthetic biology began at an early stage – almost in parallel with the emergence of this novel field. Based on the experience with the debate over green gene technology, the scientific community wanted to avoid making the same mistakes of introducing a new technology before its ethical and

societal implications were discussed. Shortly after the first viral and bacterial genomes were produced synthetically at the beginning of the new millennium, first publications – authored, among others, by scientists – discussed synthetic biology from the perspective of 'technology assessment' [6,14,16,49,50]. Issues that were discussed in these publications included the previously introduced concerns on bioterrorism, biosecurity, laboratory safety, environmental protection, intellectual property rights, and general ethical concerns. With the shift from ELSI/ELSA models to the RRI approach, the inclusion of societal and ethical concerns in synthetic biology to innovations for future challenges were also discussed.

Since the emergence of synthetic biology, different initiatives and programs have been launched worldwide to anticipate and discuss its societal and ethical implications. Examples include the U.S. programs 'Synthetic Biology Engineering Research Center' (SynBERC), running since 2006, and 'Synthetic Biology Project' (www.synbioproject.org), which started in 2008, as well as the European project 'Making Perfect Life', which was launched in 2009 by the Science and Technology Options Assessment (STOA) panel of the European Parliament, or the national projects 'Engineering Life' and 'SynbioTA', both launched in 2010 by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research in Germany. Other national and transnational activities were, for instance, the programs 'SYNBIOSAFE' (2007–2008), 'SYBHEL' (2008–2012), 'Synthetics' (2009–2011), 'GEST' (2011–2014), 'SynGovernance' (2012–2014), and 'Synenergene' (2013–2016). All of these initiatives and programs included or focused on the ethical and societal implications of synthetic biology and referred to the ELSI/ELSA or RRI model. Despite differences in their scopes and aims, there is a broad consensus among scientists within these programs that public engagement is essential for the development of regulatory regimes [41,51,52].

Another example of public engagement in synthetic biology is the previously mentioned iGEM Program [53]. It is supported by the iGEM Foundation, a non-profit organization dedicated to education and competition, and aims to advance synthetic biology and develop an open community for collaboration in this field.[†] Public engagement is an important part of the iGEM Program. Although RRI is particularly influential in Europe and iGEM is a U.S. initiative, the iGEM Program takes up many central aims of the RRI model. This leads to a bottom-up approach by involving students and the public in the development of the innovative potentials of synthetic biology. It also aims to stimulate interactions and mutual learning between the iGEM community, the synthetic biology field, and several other stakeholders from society [53].

Challenges and future directions of RRI for synthetic biology

So far the debate over synthetic biology and its societal and ethical implications has produced an impressive number of reports and academic publications. However, these documents are usually based on anticipated implications and the anticipated risks and benefits of synthetic biology as there have not been any applications on the market yet [54]. Therefore, societal and ethical implications have usually been considered in comparison with similar applications from other biotechnologies (e.g. green gene technology) or by analyzing the worldviews conveyed by the aims of synthetic biology that speak of engineered living organisms and synthetic cells [29]. This speculating nature is one of the main challenges for RRI programs on synthetic biology.

As introduced above, RRI is usually implemented in the form of a participatory approach, meaning that scientists interact with the public by, for instance, establishing a dialogue to scrutinize ways in which emerging science is imagined, to explore possible future ways including societal and ethical issues, or to define the direction of innovations [55]. Moreover, the research agenda of the RRI model includes the point of view of ethics and social sciences. In the following paragraphs we will address some of the challenges of implementing such an RRI model for synthetic biology.

Challenges of applying RRI to synthetic biology

One of the main challenges of applying the RRI model to synthetic biology is dealing with responsibility under the conditions of a high degree of uncertainty concerning the future directions of this novel field: compared with established technologies such as green gene technology there is almost no valid prospective knowledge available [54]. If the

[†] The iGEM Foundation runs an international competition for students interested in genetic engineering and synthetic biology. Moreover, it is responsible for a growing collection of genetic parts used for building biological devices and systems.

Essays in Biochemistry (2016) **60** 371–379
DOI: 10.1042/EBC20160039

aim involved in the innovation process, by anticipating and reflecting on the impact of synthetic biology, and the idea of a participatory approach of RRI are taken seriously, responsibility will not be demanded from scientists alone. It is a question of the distribution of responsibility [47]: stakeholder groups, the lay public as well as policymakers have to bear responsibility, too. Thus, as Cecilie Glerup and Maja Horst put it, responsibility is something that different actors learn together in a deliberative process [56]. In that sense, the RRI model – applied to synthetic biology – should be a task carried out by the whole of society and not only by the scientific community. According to Richard Owen and colleagues, the RRI model can be characterized as a collective response of scientists and other members of society to uncertain and complex future challenges [42]. This model thus seems to be the best fit for synthetic biology with its high degree of uncertainty.

Another important challenge for applying RRI to synthetic biology is the great variety of possible products, applications, and potential uses. Amy Wolfe, for instance, suggests establishing goals that do not just cover the type of production, but also determine how research findings are used [57]. According to Wolfe, this kind of specificity in assessing and defining goals could support the research on societal aspects of synthetic biology as well as the process of public engagement [57]. Consequently, it may not be sufficient to define scientific and technical goals; in addition, a research agenda on societal and ethical perspectives has to be established. This would mean that – in parallel to the development of scientific and technical goals – there is a need for a strategy on how to integrate societal and ethical perspectives into the research agenda [58]. However, that seems to be a huge challenge due to the different kind of societal and ethical concerns raised by synthetic biology. Moreover, the integration of societal perspectives should influence innovation without interfering with scientific curiosity and engineering creativity.

The idea of giving strong weight to the inclusion of the public in the RRI process goes along with several other challenges. One of them directly relates to the issues and concerns introduced in the first section: the public should certainly be involved because some concerns only come to light in direct consultation of lay people. However, the identification of other issues requires the insight of experts. Moreover, experts are necessary for the analysis and interpretation of concerns, including those originally raised by the public. Such expert analysis should generate arguments that help to evaluate how these issues could influence further development of, and innovation in, synthetic biology. For this purpose, different types of expertise and collaborations between scientists, engineers, and researchers in social sciences and humanities are crucial [59]. In the following, we will address the concerns listed in the first part and discuss how they could be addressed within an RRI agenda:

1 *Technical and risk-related concerns* could be considered during the development of synthetic biology tools. Innovative strategies could be developed to avoid risks that are perceived as particularly threatening by the public or as particularly serious by experts. However, this cannot replace or obviate the need for well-established technology-assessment tools that examine how synthetic biology products react, for instance, to different environmental conditions.

2 *Concerns regarding the availability and distribution* of synthetic biology products could be included in the public engagement agenda, completed by professional analysis and interpretations by experts from ethics and law as well as from social science and economics. A better understanding of these concerns and problems ideally helps to define the direction of technological innovations (including the role of open access and patenting for innovations) towards more just and fair developments in the future.

3 *Concerns regarding creating artificial life* should be discussed with the public and various experts at an early stage. This may not only influence the innovation process with respect to the development of tools and applications, but also with respect to communication and labeling. In that sense such debates could, for instance, address the questions of whether synthetic biology products should be called machines or whether forms of artificial life are really being produced.

In spite of the important role of public engagement it is important that the RRI framework should leave enough space for experts and their role in examining the different societal and ethical issues, develop strategies on how to deal with them, and how to communicate them to the public. It is crucial that experts from science and other disciplines should communicate their analysis and interpretation in an open and transparent way to lay people via public education as well as in an engagement process [29]; in doing so these experts can stimulate a well-informed public debate. Experts are relevant stakeholders – beside policymakers and actors from the lay public – in shaping science and developing applications of synthetic biology towards innovative solutions for current or future problems. The involvement of these stakeholders – including the public – in the innovation process

can, however, lead to only general directions for the development of 'responsible innovation'. In the end it is up to the responsible researcher to include the assessment of specific applications and products of synthetic biology into his/her work.

Future directions for the assessment of synthetic biology

The discussion of societal and ethical implications of synthetic biology started at a very early stage. Therefore, a debate was established long before any concrete products had been developed; to some extent this anticipated the RRI strategy because societal and ethical issues have been discussed during the innovation phase. This discussion has been based, for instance, on the anticipation of new possibilities associated with synthetic biology as well as an analysis of the worldviews and aims conveyed by that technology, including the human relationship with nature. Perhaps an early debate regarding the impact of synthetic biology, as well as the 'official' introduction of RRI, might help to avoid conflict as experienced with, for instance, green gene technology. However, it is still possible that the availability and commercialization of specific synthetic biology products might create novel conflicts. Helge Torgersen and Markus Schmidt argue that conflict might be unavoidable and could be the best stimulus for an open and transparent debate [60]. This could mean that the aim of the RRI model to promote interactions between scientists, experts from other fields, and the public might be a suitable framework to deal with certain conflicts in a constructive way.

The RRI model emphasizes that the focus on assessing an emerging technology like synthetic biology should not be focused on concerns about risks and negative consequences of a technology alone. Instead, technology assessment should also be included in the process of innovation and invention. One of the huge challenges certainly is to include the public in this process and to collectively analyze societal and ethical (future) objectives amongst natural *and* social scientists to define what constitutes responsible research and responsible innovation. The implementation of the RRI model for synthetic biology has to manage the balancing act between shaping research and innovation through public participation and leaving enough space for scientific curiosity and engineering creativity.

Summary

- Synthetic biology as an emerging field at the interface between biology and engineering has raised concerns about risks, distribution and about the aim of producing new forms of living organisms.
- RRI (Responsible Research and Innovation) is the most recent model to deal with risk and societal or ethical concerns. Well-known RRI precursors are: technology assessment (TA) and ELIS/ELSA (ethical, legal and social implications/aspects).
- In comparison to the precursors, RRI sets a particularly strong focus on addressing ethical and societal issues already in the phase of innovation which should allow to include societal needs and priorities in shaping technological applications. For this purpose RRI emphasizes the importance of involving lay people in participatory processes.
- Challenges for applying the RRI model to synthetic biology include 1) the uncertainty with respect to the possibilities in this techno-science, 2) finding apt models of involving the public, and 3) influencing the innovation process without hindering scientific curiosity and engineering creativity.

Author Contribution

The first author had the lead in developing the concept of this paper. Both authors contributed equally to the text.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for valuable comments of a previous version of this paper.

Funding

This publication is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation as part of the NCCR Molecular Systems Engineering.

Essays in Biochemistry (2016) **60** 371–379
DOI: 10.1042/EBC20160039

Conflict of interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Abbreviations

cTA, constructive technology assessment; ELSI, ethical, legal, and social implications; ELSA, ethical, legal, and social aspects; pTA, participatory technology assessment; TA, technology assessment; RRI, responsible research and innovation.

References

1 Tucker, J.B. and Zilinskas, R.A. (2006) The promise and perils of synthetic biology. New Atlantis **12**, 25–45 PubMed
2 Deplazes, A. (2009) Piecing together a puzzle: an exposition of synthetic biology. EMBO Rep. **10**, 428–432 CrossRef PubMed
3 Marguet, P., Balagadde, F., Tan, C. and You, L. (2007) Biology by design: reduction and synthesis of cellular components and behavior. J. R. Soc. Interface **4**, 607–623 CrossRef PubMed
4 Khalil, A.S. and Collins, J.J. (2010) Synthetic biology: applications come of age. Nat. Rev. Genet. **11**, 367–379 CrossRef PubMed
5 Kojima, R., Aubel, D. and Fussenegger, M. (2016) Toward a world of theranostic medication: programming biological sentinel systems for therapeutic intervention. Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev. **105**, 66–76 CrossRef PubMed
6 de Vriend, H. (2006) Constructing life. Early social reflections on the emerging field of synthetic biology. Working Document 97, Rathenau Institute, The Hague (NL)
7 Schmidt, M., Ganguli-Mitra, A., Torgersen, H., Kelle, A., Deplazes, A. and Biller-Andorno, N. (2009) A priority paper for the societal and ethical aspects of synthetic biology. Syst. Synth. Biol. **3**, 3–7 CrossRef PubMed
8 European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (EGE) (2009) Ethics of synthetic biology. Opinion of the European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies to the European Commission; No. 25. Date: 17 November 2009. PubMed
9 Presidential Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues (PCSBI) (2010) New directions – Ethics of synthetic biology and emerging technologies. December 2010, Washington, D.C.
10 Link, H.-J. (2013) Playing God and the intrinsic value of life: moral problems for synthetic biology? Sci. Eng. Ethics **19**, 435–448 CrossRef PubMed
11 Kaebnick, G.E., Gusmano, M.K. and Murray, T.H. (2014) The ethics of synthetic biology: next steps and prior questions. Hastings Cent. Rep. **44**, S4–S26 CrossRef PubMed
12 Gregorowius, D., Lindemann-Matthies, P. and Huppenbauer, M. (2012) Ethical discourse on the use of genetically modified crops: a review of academic publications in the fields of ecology and environmental ethics. J. Agric. Environ. Ethics **25**, 265–293 CrossRef
13 Bhutkar, A. (2005) Synthetic biology: navigating the challenges ahead. J. Biolaw. Bus. **8**, 19–29 PubMed
14 Garfinkel, M.S., Endy, D., Epstein, G.L. and Friedman, R.M. (2007) Synthetic genomics: options for governance. J. Craig Venter Institute, Rockville, MD. URL (retrieved: 4 November 2016): http://www.synbiosafe.eu/uploads/pdf/Synthetic%20Genomics%20Options%20for%20Governance.pdf
15 Douglas, T. and Savulescu, J. (2010) Synthetic biology and the ethics of knowledge. J. Med. Ethics **36**, 687–693 CrossRef PubMed
16 Miller, S. and Selgelid, M.J. (2007) Ethical and philosophical consideration of the dual-use dilemma in the biological sciences. Sci. Eng. Ethics **13**, 523–580 CrossRef PubMed
17 Saukshmya, T. and Chugh, A. (2009) Commercializing synthetic biology: socio-ethical concerns and challenges under intellectual property regime. J. Commerc. Biotechnol. **16**, 135–158 CrossRef
18 Kumar, S. and Rai, A.K. (2007) Synthetic biology: the intellectual property puzzle. Tex. Law Rev. **85**, 1745–1768
19 Henkel, J. and Maurer, S.M. (2007) The economics of synthetic biology. Mol. Syst. Biol. **3**, 1–4 CrossRef
20 Calvert, J. (2008) The commodification of emergence: systems biology, synthetic biology and intellectual property. BioSocieties **3**, 383–398 CrossRef
21 Bubela, T., Hagen, G. and Einsiedel, E. (2012) Synthetic biology confronts publics and policy makers: challenges for communication, regulation and commercialization. Trends Biotechnol. **30**, 132–137 CrossRef PubMed
22 Hunter, D. (2013) How to object to radically new technologies on the basis of justice: the case of synthetic biology. Bioethics **27**, 426–434 CrossRef PubMed
23 Boldt, J. and Müller, O. (2008) Newtons of the leaves of grass. Nat. Biotechnol. **26**, 387–389 CrossRef PubMed
24 van den Belt, H (2009) Playing God in Frankenstein's footsteps: synthetic biology and the meaning of life. Nanoethics **3**, 257–268 CrossRef PubMed
25 Baertschi, B. (2012) The moral status of artificial life. Environ. Values **21**, 5–18 CrossRef
26 Deplazes-Zemp, A. (2012) The conception of life in synthetic biology. Sci. Eng. Ethics **18**, 757–774 CrossRef PubMed
27 Douglas, T., Powell, R. and Savulescu, J. (2013) Is the creation of artificial life morally significant? Stud. Hist. Philos. Biol. Biomed. Sci. **44**, 688–696 CrossRef PubMed
28 Dabrock, P. (2009) Playing God? Synthetic biology as a theological and ethical challenge. Syst. Synth. Biol. **3**, 47–54 CrossRef PubMed
29 Deplazes-Zemp, A., Gregorowius, D. and Biller-Andorno, N. (2015) Different understandings of life as an opportunity to enrich the debate about synthetic biology. NanoEthics **9**, 179–188 CrossRef
30 Preston, C.J. (2008) Synthetic biology: drawing a line in Darwin's sand. Environ. Values **17**, 23–39 CrossRef
31 Dragojlovic, N. and Einsiedel, E. (2013) Framing synthetic biology: evolutionary distance, conceptions of nature, and the unnaturalness objection. Sci. Commun. **35**, 547–571 CrossRef
32 Dragojlovic, N. and Einsiedel, E. (2012) Playing God or just unnatural? Religious beliefs and approval of synthetic biology. Sci. Commun. **22**, 869–885

33 TNS Opinion & Social (2010), Eurobarometer 73.1: Biotechnology. Conducted by TNS Opinion & Social on request of European Commission. Survey co-ordinated by Directorate General Research. TNS Opinion & Social; Brussels (BE)
34 Grunwald, A. (2014) Technology assessment for responsible innovation. Responsible Innovation 1: Innovative Solutions for Global Issues (van den Hoven, J., Doorn, N., Swierstra, T., Koops, B.-J. and Romijn, H., eds), pp. 15–31, Springer, Dordrecht, Heidelberg, New York and London
35 Schot, J. and Rip, A. (1996) The past and future of constructive technology assessment. Technol. Forecast. Soc. **54**, 251–268 CrossRef
36 Hennen, L. (2012) Why do we still need participatory technology assessment? Poiesis and Praxis **9**, 27–41 CrossRef PubMed
37 Joss, S. (2002) Toward the public sphere: reflections on the development of participatory technology assessment. B. Sci. Technol. Soc. **22**, 220–231 CrossRef
38 Zwart, H., Landeweerd, L. and van Rooij, A. (2014) Adapt or perish? Assessing the recent shift in the European research funding arena from 'ELSA' to 'RRI'. Life Sci. Soc. Policy **10**, 1–19 CrossRef PubMed
39 Cook-Deegan, R. (1994/1995) The gene wars: science, politics and the human genome, Norton, New York and London
40 von Schomberg, R. (2013) A vision of responsible research and innovation. Responsible Innovation: Managing the Responsible Emergence of Science and Innovation in Society (Owen, R., Bessant, J. and Heintz, M., eds), pp. 51–74, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK CrossRef
41 Douglas, C.M.W. and Stemerding, D. (2014) Challenges for the European governance of synthetic biology for human health. Life Sci. Soc. Policy **10**, 1–18 CrossRef PubMed
42 Owen, R., Macnaghten, P. and Stilgoe, J. (2012) Responsible research and innovation: from science in society to science for society, with society. Sci. Public Policy **39**, 751–760 CrossRef
43 Stilgoe, J., Owen, R. and Macnaghten, P. (2013) Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Res. Policy **42**, 1568–1580 CrossRef
44 von Schomberg, R. (2011), Towards responsible research and innovation in the information and communication technologies and security technologies fields, pp. 7–15. A Report from the European Commission Services. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg
45 Nydal, R., Myhr, A.I. and Myskja, B. (2015) From ethics of restriction to ethics of construction: ELSA research in Norway. NJSTS **3**, 34–45
46 Owen, R., Stilgoe, J., Macnaghten, P., Gorman, M., Fisher, E. and Guston, D. (2013) A framework for responsible innovation. Responsible Innovation: Managing the Responsible Emergence of Science and Innovation in Society (Owen, R., Bessant, J. and Heintz, M., eds), pp. 27–50, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK CrossRef
47 European Union (2012), Responsible Research and Innovation: Europe's ability to respond to societal challenges. European Commission; Brussels (BE). URL (retrieved: 19 June 2016): http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document˙library/pdf˙06/responsible-research-and-innovation-leaflet˙en.pdf
48 Grunwald, A. (2011) Responsible innovation: bringing together technology assessment, applied ethics, and STS research. Enterprise and Work Innovation Studies **7**, 9–31
49 van Est, R., de Vriend, H. and Walhout, B. (2007) Constructing life: the world of synthetic biology, Rathenau Institute, The Hague (NL)
50 Commission on Genetic Modification (COGEM) (2008), Biological Machines? Anticipating developments in synthetic biology. COGEM Report CGM/080925-01. Commission on Genetic Modification, Bilthoven (NL)
51 König, H., Frank, D., Heil, R. and Coenen, C. (2013) Synthetic genomics and synthetic biology applications between hopes and concerns. Curr. Genomics **14**, 11–24 PubMed
52 Stemerding, D. and Rerimassie, V. (2013) Discourses on synthetic biology in Europe. Working Document 1305, Rathenau Institute, The Hague (NL)
53 Stemerding, D. (2015) iGEM as laboratory in responsible research and innovation. JRI **2**, 140–142
54 Grunwald, A. (2016) Synthetic biology: seeking for orientation in the absence of valid prospective knowledge and of common values. The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis: Reasoning About Uncertainty (Hansson, S.O. and Hirsch Hadorn, G., eds), pp. 325–344, Springer, Cham, CH CrossRef
55 Macnaghten, P. and Chilvers, K. (2015) The future of science governance: publics, policies, practices. Environ. Plann. C **32**, 530–548 CrossRef
56 Glerup, C. and Horst, M. (2015) Mapping 'social responsibility' in science. J. Resp. Inn. **1**, 31–50
57 Wolfe, A.K. (2015) Societal aspects of synthetic biology: organisms and applications matter!. J. Resp. Inn. **2**, 121–123
58 Wiek, A., Guston, D., Frow, E. and Calvert, J. (2012) Sustainability and anticipatory governance in synthetic biology. Int. J. Soc. Ecol. Sust. Develop. **3**, 25–38 CrossRef
59 Flipse, S.M., van der Sanden, M.C.A. and Osseweijer, P. (2013) The why and how of enabling the integration of social and ethical aspects in research and development. Sci. Eng. Ethics **19**, 703–725 CrossRef PubMed
60 Torgersen, H. and Schmidt, M. (2013) Frames and comparators: how might a debate on synthetic biology evolve? Futures **48**, 44–54 CrossRef PubMed