

# Editorial

This third issue of the EJRR hosts a set of timely legal and policy analyses that touch upon virtually all aspects of risk regulation. Our hope is that you will find these contributions inspirational and relevant for your daily practice, research and teaching.

At a time characterised by a political *impasse* on the regulation of GMOs in the EU, Christoph Klika, Jinhee Kim and Esther Versluis examine the impact of the entry into force of the new 'comitology rules' on this regime. By relying on delegation theory as well as on an empirical analysis of the most recent Commission's decisional practice, they predict that, despite the reform, the overall level of politicisation of GMO authorisation is poised to remain unchanged.

In a second article, Vincent Gonçalves discusses the dominant models of economic understanding of the precautionary principle. He makes the case for establishing a regulatory framework for the implementation of this principle specific to environmental decision-making. In particular, he highlights the need to clarify concepts and management procedures that are appropriate to the nature of environmental risks.

In 'Paternalism and Health Law', Fernando D. Simões explores the limits of legal intervention aimed at inducing behavioural change in the area of lifestyle risks. After analysing several distinctive methods of legal intervention targeted at counteracting overweight and promoting healthier lifestyles, he discusses the threats of falling into a paternalistic attitude when devising any regulatory intervention aimed at promoting a healthier lifestyle. In turn, the last research article explores the role of 'a very specific population of European experts, the notified bodies' within the framework of the EU 'New Approach' to standardisation. Jean-Pierre Galland examines the technical and political difficulties encountered by the Commission and the Member States in ensuring both the independence and the competences of these certifiers. He provides a critical analysis of the organisational architecture devised in response to many of the identified problems.

As usual, our correspondents keep us abreast of the latest developments in different risk regulation policies by covering issues related to biotechnologies, food, pharmaceuticals, lifestyle risks as well as regulatory impact assessment.

Besides our well-established reports, this issue hosts a rich selection of case notes covering the most significant judgments delivered by the Court of Justice of the EU and the US Supreme Court (Artegoda, Fra.bo and Myriad).

Finally, three book reviews of recently published volumes that might trigger the interest of our readership complete this issue.

Let me draw your attention to the Call for Papers 'Nudging in Europe – What EU law can learn from behavioural sciences?'. Selected papers will be discussed at a Work-

shop organised by the University of Liège and HEC Paris in Liège on December 13, 2013. The submission deadline is October 1, 2013.

As I often do, I encourage you to consider submitting your work for consideration to the EJRR. At last I wish you a smooth transition to post-summer life and a happy reading.

*Alberto Alemanno*