



Australia's National
Science Agency

Public perceptions of using synthetic biology to reduce pollution in waterways

Synthetic biology technologies, such as genetic engineering, could create detoxifying pseudo-organisms, to help clean up polluted waterways around Australia



Synthetic biology at CSIRO

Synthetic biology is an emerging field of research that combines genetics, chemistry and engineering. Scientists working in synthetic biology design, build, and test DNA to enable plants, animals and other organisms (e.g. bacteria, fungi, algae) to function in different ways. These organisms could then be used to help manage environmental and societal problems such as pollution, waste, land degradation and biodiversity loss.

The CSIRO Synthetic Biology Future Science Platform has developed a range of synthetic biology techniques, such as genetic engineering, gene editing and gene marking. But what do Australians think about these techniques? Involving the public is a critical step in the development of any new technology. By understanding Australians' needs, researchers can develop technology that is both fit-for-purpose and helpful to the community.

This brochure is part of a series that explores people's views towards several synthetic biology tools to help solve environmental, industrial and health challenges facing Australia. The full brochure series is available:

www.csiro.au/synbiosurvey

We surveyed the Australian public, asking for their initial impressions on using synthetic biology to genetically engineer pseudo-organisms:

- What do people **think and feel** about this new technology?
- What **risks** do they perceive?
- How would people want to be **engaged** in decision-making in the future?



Assessing a technology's suitability

CSIRO has adopted a three-pronged process to explore the development and application of new technology. These three aspects include (1) problem assessment, (2) technical feasibility and (3) social feasibility.

1. Problem assessment

Identification and conceptualisation of a problem and how it fits within the broader human-environment system.

Example: Why are waterways polluted, and why is this a concern?

2. Technical feasibility

Assessment of current solutions to the problem and proposed new solutions (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats).

Example: What is being done to manage the problem and how effective are these strategies?

3. Social feasibility

Assessment of user and stakeholder perceptions, and acceptability of a range of solutions.

Example: What do communities think of the proposed solutions and what are their views on how the problem is best managed?

Synthetic biology to reduce pollution in waterways

Clean and healthy waterways are critical for environmental and human health. Waterways include oceans, lakes, rivers, aquifers and ground water sources. Each of these can be integral to sustaining life.


Waterway health is being threatened by pollution, which can make these sources uninhabitable for plants, fish and animals, and unsafe for human use.

Pollution in waterways is currently managed through manual clean-up methods, which may include the use of cleaning chemicals or remediating bacteria. But these solutions can often introduce more problems and may be unable to keep up with the rate and scale of water pollution.

Synthetic biology technologies – such as using genetic tissue engineering to create detoxifying pseudo-organisms – have the potential to clean up contaminated waterways in a more targeted, thorough way. Genetically engineered pseudo-organisms are made from living tissue that allows them to move around. These synthetic organisms are missing reproductive organs though and cannot

multiply themselves. The tiny biological machines are designed to target, break down and remove pollution in water, and are made from degradable material so they can disintegrate over time, leaving no trace. Such pseudo-organisms could restore waterways so that they are safe for humans, plants and animals.

Story board sequence shown to survey participants, before they were asked their thoughts about reducing pollution in waterways using synthetic biology.



Public attitudes towards using synthetic biology for cleaning up polluted waterways

Awareness of polluted waterways

Our research found most Australians (about 89%) were at least moderately aware that polluted waterways exist in Australia. The majority (96%) also believed this was a moderate to very big problem.

Initial impressions of genetically engineering pseudo-organisms to clean up polluted waterways

After viewing a storyboard presentation on the use of genetic engineering to clean up polluted waterways, Australian participants reported being moderately-to-strongly supportive of the development of this technology.




Figure 1 Australians' support of genetically engineering pseudo-organisms to clean up polluted waterways.







Figure 2 Australians' support for engaging with waterways treated by pseudo-organisms.

How do Australians feel about synthetic biology? Genetically engineering pseudo-organisms




Emotions indicated by Australians*



*Data range: 1 – 5

Attitudinal pairs*



Perceptions of benefits and risks associated with the technology

The majority of Australians (around 94%) rated synthetic biology technologies as moderately to very helpful in helping to restore polluted waterways. Most Australians (59%) also agreed or strongly agreed, that this technology would be better than current methods of cleaning up waterways.

Despite their support, Australians did have some reservations about the technology. Most were concerned that genetic engineering could have negative long-term consequences:

- 81% were at least moderately concerned about the consequences for humans and animals
- 81% were at least moderately concerned about the effects on the natural environment
- 87% were at least moderately concerned about whether consequences arising from this technology could be controlled or managed.

Trust and regulation

The majority of Australians (90%) moderately-to-strongly trusted scientists to develop this technology responsibly. However, 75% of people were at least moderately concerned about the possibility of the technology being used for 'bad' purposes. Additionally, 82% were at least moderately concerned that technology misuse could lead to unintended negative consequences.

Most Australians (75%) held at least moderate trust towards the government agency responsible for approving and regulating the technology. On average, people moderately agreed that legislation and regulation would ensure the technology would be developed in a safe way – 41% agreed strongly that the technology would be well regulated, and 43% also agreed strongly, that legislation and regulation would ensure its safe development.





Public engagement in future

Most Australians (about 87%) indicated they were keen to know more about this synthetic biology technology. They said they wanted to know more about:

- the possible risks
- what is being done to regulate and control the technology
- the scientific processes and techniques being used.

Most Australians (82%) also indicated that the public should have access to an easy-to-read summary of scientific results, and 74% agreed that any risk documentation should be made available.

About 44% of Australians thought it was important to consult the public, so their opinions could be considered when making decisions about this technology. Fewer people (36%) thought it was necessary for the public to be kept informed of decisions made about synthetic biology.

Around 13% of Australians indicated that they did not need, or want, to know anything more about this technology than was already provided within the storyboard presented. Our survey also suggests that people may be more interested in understanding the risks and the process of managing these risks, than understanding the benefits of the technology.




Figure 3 Personal preferences for further engagement with technology development.



Impact

Understanding Australians' attitudes to synthetic biology can help scientists and research organisations to decide how to approach the development and implementation of new technologies.

Our survey findings have many applications and can be used in a variety of ways.


1. By government: to inform policy and regulatory decision-makers on how new technologies will be perceived by the public and how best to engage people.

2. By the science community: to inform scientists on how they can develop and plan future science activities in ways that address users' needs. This approach supports a responsible science agenda and acts as a quality-control measure to ensure that technology is being developed in a worthwhile and meaningful way. The survey findings also build the capacity of scientists to reflect on the social and ethical considerations of their work. Understanding the science and technology needed by Australians to solve current issues can lead to greater and more effective scientific innovation.



3. To benefit society: surveys provide insights into the public's understanding and perceptions of Australian science. Survey data can highlight the extent of society's trust in science and identify knowledge gaps. Increased understanding can shape future science directions and inform better ways for communities and scientists to work together.

This is one of the world's first comprehensive national surveys examining public perceptions across a range of synthetic biology technologies.



Research methods

The study involved presenting an online public opinion survey to 8,037 Australians. It examined how novel synthetic biology technologies could help address a range of important issues facing Australia.

In the survey, we presented information on one of seven environmental, industrial or health challenges in Australia:

- **Reducing pollution in waterways**
- **Changing the properties of natural fibres**
- **Eliminating the culling of male chicks in the egg-laying industry**
- **Protecting endangered species**
- **Managing invasive pest species**
- **Reducing mosquito-borne diseases**
- **Restoring the Great Barrier Reef**

The survey sample was representative of the Australian population in key demographics including age, gender, and location, including representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

The research methodology for this CSIRO study was externally reviewed by a panel of three Australian social and behavioural science experts:

- Professor Kelly Fielding
(The University of Queensland)
- Professor Catherine Waldby
(Australian National University)
- Professor Iain Walker
(Australian National University)



Information was presented in the form of a PowerPoint-style slideshow, known as a 'storyboard'. The storyboards had a standard format with similar sequencing of information, language, use of visuals and length.

Social scientists teamed up with biotechnology scientists and professional science communicators to develop the storyboard content and visuals. The storyboards were validated and tested in seven public focus groups to ensure they were easy to understand and included the necessary information.

The Online Research Unit (ORU) hosted the online surveys throughout October and November 2018 and recruited a representative sample of Australians. Participants received a small standard payment from the ORU for participation. Research participants were randomly assigned to view just one of the seven storyboards.


The survey asked participants how they felt about the development of the synthetic biology technology, what concerns they had about the technology, and if they would like to receive more information and be involved in further surveys.

The survey has provided CSIRO with important insights into Australian attitudes. It is a powerful new contribution to decision making in Australia about issues facing the country.


This research was approved by the CSIRO Social and Interdisciplinary Research Human Research Ethics Committee (Ethics Clearance 013/18).

Australian demographic data

All surveys and this specific survey



● Overall data ● Study specific data




Next steps in understanding public perceptions of synthetic biology

Our study incorporated a representative sample of the Australian public. However, some topics may be more relevant to particular communities. Future community- or place-based research will therefore be more targeted. It will involve identifying places where a particular synthetic biology technology could help in addressing a problem.

Researchers would engage with local people to understand their views about using new technologies to tackle problems directly affecting them.

This direct engagement will help communities, government and researchers decide whether, and how best, to deliver evidence-based programs to manage waterway pollution.





As Australia's national science agency and innovation catalyst, CSIRO is solving the greatest challenges through innovative science and technology.

CSIRO. Unlocking a better future for everyone.

Contact us

1300 363 400
csiro.au/contact
csiro.au

For further information

csiro.au/synbiosurvey

Citation

Synthetic Biology Future Science Platform (2020) *Public perceptions of using synthetic biology to reduce pollution in waterways*. CSIRO, Australia.

Copyright

© Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation 2020. To the extent permitted by law, all rights are reserved and no part of this publication covered by copyright may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means except with the written permission of CSIRO.

Important disclaimer

CSIRO advises that the information contained in this publication comprises general statements based on scientific research. The reader is advised and needs to be aware that such information may be incomplete or unable to be used in any specific situation. No reliance or actions must therefore be made on that information without seeking prior expert professional, scientific and technical advice. To the extent permitted by law, CSIRO (including its employees and consultants) excludes all liability to any person for any consequences, including but not limited to all losses, damages, costs, expenses and any other compensation, arising directly or indirectly from using this publication (in part or in whole) and any information or material contained in it.

CSIRO is committed to providing web accessible content wherever possible. If you are having difficulties with accessing this document please contact us csiro.au/contact.