This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development, and demonstration under grant agreement no 289045.

Project acronym: INPROFOOD

Project title: Towards inclusive research programming for sustainable food innovations

Instrument:
FP7 CAPACITIES COORDINATION AND SUPPORT ACTION (SUPPORTING)

Action Line 1: A more dynamic governance of the science and society relationship Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML) Action Plans on societal challenges
Specific Challenge 2: A food dilemma: are technological innovations and health concerns reconcilable?

Deliverable Report for D2.3

(Analysis Report on the Second Series of Scenario Workshops)

Due date of deliverable: M 18
Actual submission date: M 29

Start date of project: November 1st 2011 Duration: 3 years

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: WLW (Partner 13)

Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	**x**
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

1. Statement

The deliverable is completed.

The submission has been delayed for two reasons. Firstly, some workshop reports were received after the planned date of the deliverable. Secondly, because of unexpected variations of the workshop agenda, structures, thematic framing and grouping categorization demanded changes to the originally intended analysis scheme, which required some more time.

2. Use and Verification of Deliverable in INPROFOOD

The following document details an analysis of the second series of scenario workshops from WP2. The document presents an analysis of the second 13 adapted European Awareness Scenario Workshops having been conducted in the INPROFOOD project by describing the organization of the workshops from stakeholder recruitment through workshop conduct to documentation stage and presenting an analysis of the workshop outcomes.

Analysis Report 2 on the INPROFOOD Scenario Workshops

Michael Strähle, Christine Urban & Regina Reimer-Chukwu / Wissenschaftsladen Wien – Science Shop Vienna

Partners

University of Hohenheim
Life Science Center
Klaus Hadwiger: klaus.hadwiger@uni-hohenheim.de
Susanne Braun: s.braun@uni-hohenheim.de

University of Copenhagen
Faculty of Life Science
Derek Victor Byrne: dby@life.ku.dk
Vicki Lei: vil@life.ku.dk

Comenius University
in Bratislava
Zuzana Kiczková: kiczkova@fphil.uniba.sk
Mariana Szapuová: szapuova@fphil.uniba.sk
Janka Kottulová: j.kottulova@gmail.com

Science Shop Vienna
Wissenschaftsladen Wien
Christine Urban
Michael Strähle
wilawien@wilawien.ac.at

University of Surrey
Monique Raats: M.Raats@surrey.ac.uk
Lada Timotijevic: L.Timotijevic@surrey.ac.uk

World Health Organization
Regional Office for Europe
Caroline Bollars: CAR@euro.who.int

Observa – Science in Society
Federico Neresini: Federico.neresini@unipd.it
Giuseppe Pellegrini: Giuseppe.pellegrini@unipd.it

European Network of Science
Centres and Museums
Maria Zolotonosa: mzolotonosa@ecsite.eu

DIALOGIK gemeinnützige Gesellschaft
für Kommunikations
Ludger Benighaus, Christina Benighaus:
benighaus@dialogik-expert.de
Dr. Marion Dreyer: dreyer@dialogik-expert.de

Hacettepe University
Dilek Aslan: diaslan@hacettepe.edu.tr

European Food Information
Council (EUFIC)
Stefan Storcksdieck: stefan.storcksdieck@eufic.org

Sociedade Portuguesa
de Inovação (SPI)
Rachel Newton: rachelnewton@spi.pt

Maastricht University
Zamira Xhaferri: zamira.xhaferri@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Centro tecnológico
agroalimentario (ctaex)
Patricia Mora: patriciamora@ggir.es

Foundation for Research and
Technology (FORTH)
Kathy Kikis-Papadakis: katerina@iacm.forth.gr

AGROPOLIS
Fabien Boulier: inprofood@agropolis.fr

Lebensmittelwissenschaftliche
Beratung (LWB)
Herbert Buckenhueskes: hjbuckenhueskes@web.de

Gene Rowe Evaluations
Gene Rowe: generowe00@gmail.com

Contents

Tables 6
Acknowledgements 8
Executive summary 9
Introduction 12
The workshop plan 15
The workplan in a nutshell 15
Targeted stakeholders 17
Recruitment 20
Agenda, common discussion themes 22
Common procedures 23
Implementation 26
Comparability of the workshops 35
Outcomes 41
References to outcomes of deliberations (posters) 41
What sources were used for the analysis of the workshops? 42
Common topics 43
Final remarks 112
References 114
Annex: Workshop Reports 117

Tables

Table 1: Common agenda 23
Table 2: Workshop dates and titles 26
Table 3: Recruitment methods and participant hierarchy level 28
Table 4: Framing 29
Table 5: Organizations by consolidated stakeholders 30
Table 6: Re-categorization of participants 32
Table 7: Individuals by consolidated stakeholder category 34
Table 8: Distribution of female and male participants by workshop 35
Table 9: Instructions for working groups 39
Table 10: Availability of food / Nutrition & income 44
Table 11: Health effects 45
Table 12: Changing consumer behaviour 48
Table 13: Understanding consumer behaviour 49
Table 14: Consumer information 50
Table 15: Control & regulation 51
Table 16: Environmental sustainability 53
Table 17: Seeing the whole picture, creating synergies 54
Table 18: Local food production 56
Table 19: Health impact of certain diets 57
Table 20: Food ingredients and food additives 58
Table 21: Specific nutrition needs 59
Table 22: Food industry 60
Table 23: Food safety 61
Table 24: Packaging 62
Table 25: Genetically modified food 63
Table 26: Health conditions: obesity 63
Table 27: Food quality 64
Table 28: Food production 66

Table 29: Meta level: How to arrive at research topics reflecting societal demands .67
Table 30: Worst case on decision making on topics/areas/themes 72
Table 31: Best case on decision making on topics/areas/themes.....74
Table 32: Worst case on decision making on funding.....77
Table 33: Best case on decision making on funding 79
Table 34: Worst case on quality criteria for funding.....81
Table 35: Best case on quality criteria for funding 83
Table 36: Worst case on the exploitation of results 86
Table 37: Best case on the exploitation of results 87
Table 38: Worst case on evaluation 88
Table 39: Best case on evaluation.....89
Table 40: Best case on project design 91
Table 41: Worst case on project design 92
Table 42: Worst case on other important issues 93
Table 43: Best case on other important issues.....94
Table 44: List of common topics: Research topics 108
Table 45: List of common topics: Research programming – Analysis 1 109
Table 46: List of common topics: Research programming – Analysis 2 110
Table 47: Clusters of common research topics/areas.....111

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without all the organizations and their representatives who participated in the thirteen scenario workshops in Ankara, Berlin, Bratislava, Brussels, Copenhagen, Guildford, Maastricht, Madrid, Montpellier, Porto, Thessaloniki, Vicenza and Vienna. Based on their experiences and expertise, they gave all the input on how to optimise research programming in the field of sustainable and healthy food. The authors of this report and the INPROFOOD consortium would like to thank all organizations and their delegates, who participated in the INPROFOOD scenario workshops. The whole input of the workshop participants is available in the workshop reports, which can be downloaded at http://www.inprofood.eu/documentation/.

A special thanks goes to Kathy Kikis-Papadakis and Pavlos Hatzopoulos for their support on writing this report.

Executive summary

Commissioned by the European Commission under the Seventh Framework Programme on Research (FP7)'s Work Programme Science in Society in 2011, the project *Towards inclusive research programming for sustainable food innovations* (INPROFOOD) brings together researchers, scientists, policy makers, civil society, business and industry to tackle the question of how research programming and funding on the environmentally responsible production of healthy food can be designed to benefit society. Eighteen partner organizations in thirteen countries, which are representing academia, health authorities, business consultants, extra-university research organizations, food industry and science museums, are investigating processes and structures of research programming in food and health research, developing and testing new approaches to stakeholder involvement, and, based on the insights achieved in the various project activities, will be drawing up an action plan to stimulate future societal engagement in food and health research beyond INPROFOOD.

Designed as stakeholder involvement activities, 35 scenario workshops on research programming for an environmentally sustainable production of healthy food took place from October 2012 to September 2013 in 13 different countries[1]. The scenario workshops were the core activity in INPROFOOD.

The general objective was to bring together a broad range of stakeholders to develop shared visions of socially acceptable, trustworthy, and transparent conditions for developing health-related innovations in the food area. This was achieved in three series of adapted European Scenario Workshops. The specific objectives were to:

- Involve additional relevant stakeholder groups which might be strongly affected by health related food safety issues and/or which could add valuable new perspectives, but which have not been sufficiently integrated into participatory discussions on food and health, yet. This applies especially to regional CSOs and SMEs.
- Circumvent some frequent shortcomings of participatory methods by a Workshop

[1] Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

Plan that allows the retrospective comparison of the outcomes of several scenario workshops, conducted without influencing each other.

• Bring together stakeholders in three series of regional workshops.

• Document the input of workshop participants."

The outcomes of the workshops, together with those of other activities, fed into a WHO Europe Region workshop in May 2014 in Copenhagen.

To the knowledge of the INPROFOOD consortium, this was the largest transnational stakeholder involvement activity applying scenario workshops and it aimed to answer to some methodological shortcomings of stakeholder involvement by introducing high standards of transparency in stakeholder recruitment, workshop conduct and output documentation.

This report presents an analysis of Series 2 of these scenario workshops. The thirteen workshops saw altogether 181 participants from 169 organizations, of which 32 (18.9%) represented non-profit organizations without business ties, 62 (36.7%) the private sector, 45 (26.6%) the public sector; and 30 (17.8%) were organizations that do not fall into the targeted categories or for which it remained unclear to which category they belong (e.g. they perhaps overlapped between more than one category).

The first part of this document presents a short version of the workplan, the instructions and the methodology. The full version can be found in the report *Detailed Plan for the INPROFOOD Scenario Workshops. Final version* by Michael Strähle, Christine Urban and Regina Reimer-Chukwu.[2] In the second part, the implementation of the workshop plan, instructions and methodology by the workshop organizers is described. The third part presents analyses of the workshop outcomes in regard to participants' proposals for research topics and participant's suggestions for research programming on food and health regarding decision-making on topics/ areas/themes, decision making on project funding, quality criteria for funding, exploitation of results, evaluation of projects and research programmes, and project design.

[2] See http://www.inprofood.eu/documentation/

Stakeholder input was analysed for common topics: research topics/areas and common demands from research programming on food and health. Altogether, stakeholders named 400 research areas/topics. Those that were mentioned more than once were clustered into 18 more general topics, which address agricultural, economic, medical, natural, social and technical sciences and the humanities. Common demands from research programming were analysed in two ways: along the guiding discussion themes and across them. Lists of the topics and the suggestions can be found at the end of this report.

The report concludes with a reflection on the ability to draw generalizations and the representativeness of the outcomes of such stakeholder involvement activities. Whether it is considered as a tool for efficient decision-making or as an initiative for open governance, stakeholder involvement raises questions of political legitimacy, which need to be addressed.

Introduction

This report presents analyses of the second series of scenario workshops on research programming for socially and environmentally sustainable food innovations that have been conducted in the INPROFOOD project.[3]

INPROFOOD is a so-called "Mutual and Mobilization Learning Action", a new funding scheme in the governance of research and technological development that aims "to promote deeper and more systemic collaboration between a wide range of actors around the ERA Grand Challenges".[4] This political objective is based on the Lund declaration of 2009, which has been released at the beginning of the Swedish presidency of the European Union.[5] The declaration calls the Council and the European Parliament to re-direct research priorities to developing sustainable solutions for so-called Grand Challenges. "Identifying and responding to Grand Challenges should involve stakeholders from both public and private sectors in transparent processes taking into account the global dimension."[6] While the declaration states that the Grand Challenges are still to be identified, it does name some areas creating challenges: "global warming, tightening supplies of energy, water and food, ageing societies, public health, pandemics and security."[7] For the call under which INPROFOOD is funded, the European Commission named three challenges to be tackled: Moving towards a low-carbon society; A food dilemma: are technological innovations and health concerns reconcilable?; and Marine resources, inland activities and sustainable development. Among others, stakeholders identified in the call comprise public authorities, education establishments,

[3] To allow for comparability, it was planned that all workshops of all series follow a common methodology and are implemented in an at least similar way. This is reflected in a common structure for all three analysis reports. Where appropriate, the executive summary, this introduction, the chapters on the workplan, its implementation, the first pages of the chapter on the outcomes and the final remarks are partly similar, partly almost identical in all three analysis reports.

[4] European Commission, Work Programme 2011, Capacities, Part 5, Science in Society 2011, C(2010)4903, 19 July 2010, p. 3

[5] Swedish presidency of the European Union, The Lund Declaration, July 2009, http://www.era.gv.at/attach/1lund_declaration_final_version_9_july.pdf, last access on 30 August 2013

[6] Lund declaration, p. 1

[7] op.cit, p. 1

research organizations, museums, media organizations, civil society organizations[8], professional organizations and businesses.

The objective is to "develop forms of dialogue and cooperation between science and society at different stages of the research process:"[9] "To facilitate sustainable and inclusive solutions to key challenges facing European society."[10] INPROFOOD addresses the food dilemma challenge, which in the call text is described as the necessity to forge new alliances of scientific disciplines to counter a trend in increasing food and nutrition related negative chronic health conditions such as obesity, cardiovascular diseases, diabetes and allergies AND to direct food innovation and new technologies in a more sustainable and healthy way.[11] It is made clear that food innovation is expected to aim at sustainable, i.e. environmentally responsible, production of healthy food.

The adapted European Awareness Scenario Workshops (EASW) were the largest activity in the INPROFOOD project. Representatives of public entities, the business world and non-profit organizations without business ties met to discuss desirable research programming in the area of sustainable and healthy food and name barriers and opportunities to its implementation. Altogether 39 workshops were planned: three series, respectively waves, of thirteen workshops in thirteen countries[12] with 12 – 16 participants for each workshop; eventually from October 2012 to September 2013 three series of altogether 35 workshops took place.[13] To the best knowledge of the authors, this was the first time that many scenario workshops on a common topic were organized across several countries under an umbrella. The outcomes of the workshops, together with those of other activities, fed into an international WHO Europe workshop in Spring 2014.

Invented by the Danish Board of Technology (DBT), the scenario workshop methodology has been widely applied, often in urban planning, and further developed in the FLEXIMODO

[8] In the call text a civil society organization is defined as a legal entity which is non governmental, non profit, not representing commercial interests and pursuing a common purpose in the public interest. (Work Programme, p. 8, footnote 8).
[9] op.cit., p. 7
[10] op.cit., p. 10
[11] op.cit, p. 8
[12] The countries are Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.
[13] It was planned to conduct 39 workshops. For different reasons some workshop organizers had to merge their workshops in Series 2 and 3.

project, which was commissioned by the European Commission. In a few role groups it brings together social actors with quite different knowledge, expertise, experiences and perspectives, such as urban planners, citizens of a city on which the workshop is about, and policy makers, who usually do not come together in such a heterogeneous setting and on an equal footing.[14] The method allows for a high degree of interaction in different group constellations. On the agenda are alternating plenum and breakout sessions. To create a basis for local action, in working groups of varying composition and in plenary sessions, participants develop scenarios, respectively visions of realizing a given objective, which usually is the workshop topic, name barriers and propose strategies for realizing the visions and overcoming the barriers.

[14] This description follows the Danish Board of Technology's own description at http://www.tekno.dk/subpage.php3?article=1235&toppic=kategori12&language=uk#scenario and Bilderbeek, Rob & Andersen, Ida, Local Scenario-Workshop Sustainable Urban Living in the Coming Decades: Organization Manual, http://cordis.europa.eu/easw/src/cookbook.htm, both last accessed on 30 August 2013.

The workshop plan

The workplan in a nutshell

This chapter presents the workshop plan in a nutshell. All three series of workshops followed the same plan. In full detail the workshop plan is described on pp. 16 – 31 of the report *Detailed Workplan for the INPROFOOD Scenario Workshops. Final version*, which is available for download at http://www.inprofood.eu. It is advisable to read this document in order to understand how the results of the workshops came about.

The DBT methodology is tailored to local and regional agendas, so we adapted it to allow for implementing them in the framework of a Mutual Mobilization and Learning Action. The target number of participants was reduced from 24 – 30 to 12 - 16. Instead of four, there were three role groups. Before the workshop, participants received a briefing paper with some general information about research programming, explanations on food innovation and some background information on food and health. This background information was based on the Joint Programming Initiative *A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life*'s Vision Paper.[15] This information provided the starting point instead of a scenario developed by the organizers. The workshop topic was not a local or regional issue, but one of European dimension. And the workshops did not result in an action plan.

The call under which the workshops were funded, asked for stakeholder involvement, not for public engagement in general. Thus organizers targeted highly knowledgeable practical and theoretical experts sent by organizations in an official role of delegates.

The INPROFOOD scenario workshops not only aimed at bringing together different interest groups but also at contributing to the development of a more robust methodology for stakeholder involvement. Stakeholder deliberation activities are in an experimental phase, and there are unsolved questions concerning democratic legitimacy and representation. For example, do certain persons, organizations, interest groups or "stakeholders" have better

[15] http://www.healthydietforhealthylife.eu/images/documents/vision_paper.pdf, last access on 21 February 2014. For more information on European Joint Programming Initiatives, see http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/joint-programming_en.html.

chances to take part in policy related debate? Is stakeholder participation a non-elitist and inclusive procedure, or does it create power imbalance? Does it open up or close down governance of science? Another set of questions relates to the reliability of results: Would the results of any given deliberation activity be reproduced if it was conducted again? Would other individuals or organizations, allocated to the same stakeholder group, bring forward the same ideas? Different scholars come to quite sobering conclusions when analyzing public/stakeholder engagement practices. They point out some gaps between the rhetoric of inclusiveness and furthering democracy by involving a broad range of interests, on the one hand, and the practical implementation of public/stakeholder engagement, on the other. One has to assume that each participation event is strongly influenced by situational factors. The background of individual organizers, the style of individual facilitators and the group dynamics of individual personalities may all have some impact on the results, as may resources that often only well-established and powerful organizations and individuals possess in abundance: time, staff, reputation and money.[16] To lessen the influence of such factors, it was attempted to avoid power imbalances among participants by conducting three workshop series, each one targeting organizations on different scales of hierarchy, size and/or regional outreach, to implement transparent recruitment, have professional facilitators for the workshops, and to document the workshops in a style, which does not disempower participants, but instead authentically reflect participants' input with as little interpretation as possible. The workshop topic was framed in a way to balance health and sustainability concerns. Because the workshops would be on research programming for socially and environmentally sustainable food innovations, the following aspects of research programming were determined: research priorities, research designs, evaluation of research, research proposals and research programmes, funding instruments, the exploitation of results, intellectual property rights, the dissemination of results, the development of research programmes, and stakeholder involvement at whatever level.

The plan was for the workshops to be matched as far as possible: with similar participant numbers, addressing the same stakeholder categories and similar stakeholder groups, following a common agenda and a common methodology, being dedicated to a common topic, and common recruitment and reporting schemes. Under these conditions, the

[16] For a discussion on this see the authors' report Detailed Workplan for the INPROFOOD Scenario Workshops. Final version at http://www.inprofood.eu.

comparison of the workshop outputs can provide more reliable results than isolated stakeholder meetings following different approaches. The reproduction (or matching) of the deliberations adds value to each single event: in each workshop a broad range of interest groups from civil society, research and innovation, business and trade and public administration will participate. Hence it can be investigated, if similar stakeholders confirm or contradict each other.

The organizers of the INPROFOOD scenario workshops project partners in INPROFOOD had been asked to implement the workplan as closely as possible, optimally until after the presentations of the second working group sessions. For the remaining time, workshop organizers were given more leeway for how to finish the workshop. This gave room for some experimentation. Some workshop organizers had the participants vote on topics, others formulated some general conclusions or discussed the workshop procedures. These final sessions are not for comparison and were not included in this report, but details on them can be found in the respective workshop reports.

To avoid mutual influences of workshops on each other, it was agreed in the consortium not to talk about results of a workshop until a whole series had been finished. Exchange about experiences should only take place *after* organizers had documented the outcomes. Otherwise it would not be possible to avoid, influencing future workshops.

Targeted stakeholders

In Series 2 a lower hierarchy level of organizations was targeted than in the first workshop series. In INPROFOOD three "sizes" of stakeholder organizations have been targeted: "large" (Series 1), "medium" (Series 2) and "small" (Series 3). In the context of the INPROFOOD workshops, "size" refers to a rough estimation of hierarchy levels, normative and decision-making power, and geographic outreach. In general a national research council is more powerful than a public research funder targeted at the regional level; and a national business association representing large industry has advantages over a regional SME association. Strict separations between these "levels" would have required in-depth research exceeding the project budget. Desk research showed that the stakeholder landscapes differed between countries, because in some countries specific stakeholders such as public research funders or large environmental organizations simply do not exist, or

the private sector fulfills tasks, which are considered public ones in other countries. Hence, as also in the previous workshop series it turned out that establishing matching categories across different European regions and recruiting organizations accordingly may be feasible only to a certain extent. Investigating how far this could be done would merit a project in its own right. Thus pragmatic decisions had to be made, sometimes case by case. Within this frame there was a lot of room for flexibility so partners could set up criteria adapted to their countries: the number of organizations of a certain type in a certain area, available travel budgets, etc.

The idea behind targeting stakeholders of different "size" is diversification in terms of power and influence: Because highly ranked organizations and participants are more often involved in policy debate, it was deemed necessary to pro-actively broaden the range of interest groups not only in terms of disciplines, working areas and concerns, but also in respect to geographic outreach, size and/or other "hierarchy" characteristics. In this way we find organizations or interest groups that could be easily over-looked, although they do not necessarily bring forward the same concerns. Medium or smaller players were actively addressed in order to broaden the spectrum of targeted organizations and to avoid that the workshops turn into a hearing of mostly "large players".

Three categories have been identified:

- *public organizations (PUB)*
- *business-related organizations (BUS)* and
- *non-profit organizations without business ties (NPO)*

The core distinction was: to whom is an organization responsible? Where does its income or funding come from? Who are the members?

In contrast to the first series, in which no single enterprises had been eligible, but only business associations, Series 2 allowed for participation of some single businesses, provided that they were small to medium enterprises (SMEs). During the preparation phase it was found that SMEs would be difficult to recruit. They also seemed to be not as often organized in regional associations as to make their sufficient participation likely.

As to the public academic sector, while in Series 1 all public universities were a target group, in Series 2 medium sized research institutes, smaller universities and/or university

departments were targeted. It was specified that the disciplinary angle should remain open to include also the humanities and the social sciences and to make interdisciplinary deliberation possible. Even if food technologists and dieticians presumably would be more interested than other experts, no disciplinary pre-selection should be performed in the recruitment phase.

In general, the terms *non-profit organization* and *civil society organizations* designate a wide field of quite different actors and are used differently. In INPROFOOD's scenario workshops, "***non-profit organizations without business ties"*** meant organizations with a non-profit mission, which are also not otherwise affiliated to the private sector, in terms of members or funding. For example, an association with enterprise members or being financially dependent on one or more companies did not fall into the NPO category, but the business category.

In Series 1 it had turned out that ***NPOs without business ties*** were more difficult to attract, and consequently they participated in INPROFOOD workshops less often than had been planned. To give these stakeholders better chances for participation, the category remained as open as possible. There were almost no eligibility restrictions apart from the named independence from profit organizations. Additionally, in Series 2 national umbrella organizations of nonprofit organizations were excluded. For NPOs without business ties and for small organizations, participation is more difficult, because they often have to economize on time and budget. Subsequently, if all workshops are taken together, NPOs without business ties were under-represented in the workshops.

Determining if an organization is eligible or to which of the defined stakeholder categories it belongs, can make extensive background research necessary. For example, NPOs which are run or dominated by enterprises, constitute a quite different interest group than civil society organizations. For reasons of practicability, workshop organizers pre-categorized the entries of their stakeholder databases beforehand as far as they could know. After being randomly selected the respective entities were investigated more closely. Only for this smaller group a more detailed investigation on decision-making structures and financial sources was performed whenever necessary. If it turned out that a selected organization really belonged to a different category, partners were instructed to reassign it accordingly. For example, it was necessary to shift NPOs with strong ties to industry to the business category.

Recruitment

The target number of participating organizations was about **12 to 16** in total and **4 to 6 delegates** from each of the three pre-defined categories. Because it was impossible to predict how many registrants really appear on a workshop day, 24 to 27 registrations were given as a goal. This gave enough elbow room for short term cancellations, so that hopefully enough delegates from each category would actually attend the workshop. With the exception of universities, which were mostly targeted at department level, participation in the workshops was restricted to one representative or delegate per organization.

It goes without saying that the outcomes of such deliberations depend on who actually participates. If arbitrary selection or hand picking participants needs to be avoided, a proper recruitment scheme is crucial. Two recruitment schemes were introduced in INPROFOOD: recruitment by sortition and transparent calls for participation. The first one was the recruitment scheme of choice for Series 1, and several partners decided to apply it in Series 2 and 3, too. The second one was only used in Series 2 and 3.

Recruitment by sortition

In this scheme, stakeholder databases were compiled from public sources accessible via the Web such as registers of NPOs, then the databases were published on inprofood.eu. Among the sometimes several hundred entries, participants have been selected by sortition based on public lottery draws. According to the instructions, the dates of the draws should be published on inprofood.eu before the draws took place. It turned out that there are not enough transparent and reliable sources in all countries, in which the workshops took place, to fill such databases. If there was no better source available, it was agreed to document this lack of resources and to go on pragmatically. Public phone books or even Wikipedia were an option, too, if no better sources were available. Compiling stakeholder databases proved especially difficult for the civil society organizations and the private sector.

Call for Participation

Some organizers reported challenges to recruit sufficient participants for their Series 1 workshop. For this reason, an alternative way to recruit participants was developed: a Call for Participation. In case too many participants signed up, sortition would have been used also here.

A general call text, containing the criteria interested organizations had to meet, was adapted to national, regional and local circumstances by specific participation criteria for public entities, NPOs and SMEs, as well as their respective associations. Then workshop organizers released and promoted them within a short time interval by sending them to media, umbrella organizations, mailing lists, universities, business associations, etc. Additionally, European umbrella organizations of civil society organizations were asked to spread the calls among their regional members. For the Calls for Participation a website was set up on which each call was published in the language(s), in which the respective workshop was held. The Calls for Participation can be found at http://scenario-workshops.net.

Agenda, common discussion themes

Together with Katharina Novy, the professional facilitator, who also guided through the Austrian workshops, Regina Reimer, Michael Strähle and Christine Urban of Wissenschaftsladen Wien – Science Shop Vienna, the organization coordinating the workpackage in which the workshops took place, set up an agenda for the workshops. To allow for future comparison, the same structure was proposed for all three workshop series.

According to the common agenda, in the introduction to the workshops, participants should be informed about the framework of the workshops and the INPROFOOD project, they heard about the objectives of the workshop they would participate in and what would be done with the results, and the workshop organizer summed up the briefing paper the participants received before the workshop. Instead of a conventional round, in which participants introduced themselves, exercises in action sociometry should make visible the commonalities and dissimilarities of participants by literally taking a place or position in the room. After this introduction, the workshop plan included a dynamic switching between breakout sessions and plenaries. Before the workshop each participant should be assigned to one of the three stakeholder categories. At the beginning in three homogeneous groups, each one representing one of the stakeholder categories, participants would then discuss which topics should be researched, and after this develop worst case scenarios on research programming on food and health. The aim was for participants to look for mutual understanding and consensus whenever possible, but it was made clear that disagreement should not be ironed out and differences should be named. According to the plan, all working groups should put the outcomes of their sessions to discussion in a plenary. In the next round participants should develop best case scenarios on research programming on food and health in heterogeneous (mixed) groups, which were designed to consist of representatives of all three stakeholder categories, as far as possible in even numbers and according to participants' personal preferences. Also the results of the heterogeneous groups should be discussed in a plenary, in which participants examined commonalities and similarities as well as dissent between the heterogeneous groups. Dissent should retain its place.

Common agenda[17]

Time	Who	Agenda item
		Arriving, coffee
9:00	*Workshop organizer*	**Formal welcome/opening**
	Facilitator	**Welcome by facilitator, presentation of workshop schedule**
	Workshop organizer	**Clarification of project's scope and project environment**
9:45	*Facilitator*	**Action sociometry**
10:10	*Facilitator*	**Instructions for homogeneous groups**
10:20		***Break***
10:35	*Homogeneous working groups*	**Topics and worst case scenario**
12:05		***Break***
12:20	*All participants, facilitator*	**Plenum**
13:05		***Lunch break***
14:30	*All participants, facilitator*	**Plenum**
	Heterogeneous working groups	**Best case scenario**
16:00		***Break***
16:25	*All participants, facilitator*	**Plenum: Exhibition of posters on best case scenario**
	All participants, facilitator	**Plenum: Talking and clarification**
17:20	*All participants, facilitator*	**Reflection on the workshop: Muttering pairwise, very short feedback**
17:45	*Facilitator, Workshop organizer*	**Thanking, soft transition to buffet**
	All participants	**Filling in evaluation sheets**
18:00		***Buffet***

Table 1: Common agenda

Common procedures

Common information materials

For the first recruitment scheme, there a common invitation letter was developed with an information sheet on the workshop and the INPROFOOD project, in general. Participants should have received a briefing paper[18] with general information about research programming, explanations on food innovation and some background information on food and health before the workshop. At the workshop they should have received a general

[17] For a detailed agenda with all instructions see Annex G of For more detailed information on this see Annex F of Strähle, M./Urban, Ch./Reimer-Chukwu, R., Detailed Plan for the Scenario Workshops. Final version.

[18] See Annex E of Strähle, M./Urban, Ch./Reimer-Chukwu, R., Detailed Plan for the Scenario Workshops. Final version.

information sheet about the nature and the objectives of the workshop and with information on why and how the participants have been invited and how the results will be documented and what will be done with them, a list of participants (with each participant identified by name, their affiliation and stakeholder category), the INPROFOOD brochure, and perhaps also some information about the organizers. Small organizations often do not have the resources for participating in such deliberation activities. To allow for their participation, several partners offered to cover the travel expenses of these participants.

Professional facilitators

Dominating participants, controversies and power imbalances among participants can create undesired group dynamics with questionable results. To diminish such effects professional facilitators guided through the workshops.

Evaluation

Feedback questionnaires designed by an evaluator embedded in the consortium were developed for participants to fill. The evaluator also visited about one third of the workshops. Because the evaluator did not have a command of all the languages in which the workshops were being held, as the proverbial fly on the wall, he mainly analysed participants' and facilitators' nonverbal behaviour for the purpose of evaluation.

Instructions for breakout sessions[19]

According to the common instructions, participants were asked to discuss the worst and best case scenarios along the following themes: decision making on topics/ areas/themes, decision making on project funding, quality criteria for funding, exploitation of results, evaluation, project design, and other important aspects. For the discussion of important research fields concerning the development of high-quality, healthy, safe and sustainable food products, they were asked to identify topics, which from their point of view, should be researched, and, if possible, to cluster them in a reasonable way.

[19] For more detailed information on this see Annex F of Strähle, M./Urban, Ch./Reimer-Chukwu, R., Detailed Plan for the Scenario Workshops. Final version.

Documentation

It was decided that each workshop was documented descriptively using photos and transcripts of flipchart posters. There should at least be a report in English on each workshop. Participants should be named in the report's list of participants, but they should not be named as the contributors of specific input. According to the instructions all workshop organizers received, participants were instructed by the facilitators to write on flipchart posters all outcomes of their deliberations – topics and issues they consented or dissented on -, because the posters are the core documentation of the workshops. Participants' input would be descriptively analysed for common topics, themes and issues, but not be subject to in-depth analyses. During the presentation of the flipchart posters in the plenaries, organizers could either take notes (by more than one person) or record the plenary sessions (this was strongly advised by the evaluator). Taking notes or recording served only for clarification purposes, but not for adding new thoughts to the poster documentation. The flipchart posters were photographed and then transcribed word by word. If necessary, explanations were added to make the sentences on the flipchart more comprehensible. The analysis phase occurred only when considering together the results of all workshops of a series or all together between the series. The objective then was to identify common ideas, such as suggested guidelines and criteria, issues and topics, but also differences, having been named in more than one workshop, preferably in different countries. The analysis may take into account as explaining factors stakeholder categories (for the outputs of homogeneous groups), but also the stakeholder level being addressed. - All reports are available for download at the INPROFOOD website[20] and remain available there without being changed.

[20] http://www.inprofood.eu/documentation/

Implementation

Workshop dates, places and titles

Place	Date	Workshop title
Vienna (Austria)	23 May 2013	*Szenarioworkshop „Forschungsförderung in der Lebensmittel- und Gesundheitsförderung" (Scenario workshop „Research programming on food and health")*
Berlin (Germany)	26 February 2013	*Ernährung und Lebensmittel – Forschung 2020 (Nutrition and Food – Research 2020)*
Copenhagen (Denmark)	13 March 2013	*How can research programmes foster future healthy eating and well-being in our society?*
Thessaloniki (Greece)	21 March 2013	*Ερευνητικός Σχεδιασμός στους τομείς της Υγείας και της Διατροφής (Research Programming on food and health)*
Vicenca (Italy)	24 May 2013	*Scenario workshop Verso una ricerca alimentare sicura e sostenibile (Towards a safe and sustainable food research)*
Maastricht (The Netherlands)	24 June 2013	*Scenario workshop "Onderzoeksprogrammering op het gebied van Voeding en Gezondheid"(Research programming on food and health)*
Porto (Portugal)	23 April 2013	*Scenários para o planeamento da investigação em Alimentação e Saúde (Scenario workshop on food and health research programming)*
Bratislava (Slovakia)	15 May 2013	*Research programming in the field of food and health*
Ankara (Turkey)	7 June 2013	*Nutrition and Innovative Approaches on Food Production*
Brussels (Belgium)	13 June 2013	*Inprofood European Awareness Scenario Workshop*
Madrid (Spain)	17 July 2013	*About Financial Politics/Programmes Search to Foster Food Innovation in the Health Area*
Montpellier (France)	7 June 2013	*Atelier d'échanges sur l'implication de la société civile dans la programmation de la recherche relative à l'alimentation en lien avec la santé (Participative workshop on the involvement of civil society in the research programming process, in the field of food and health)*
Guildford (United Kingdom)	22 May 2013	*Scenario workshop - Research programming on food and health*

Table 2: Workshop dates and titles

Before the results can be analysed, it is important to establish in which context these results came about. For example, all aspects of workshop preparation and recruitment can influence the outcomes, which, among others, most likely depend on who is actually involved or excluded from the discussions. Not only the workshop structure, the agenda, the

facilitation and the documentation, but also the recruitment strategy is relevant for comparability. Again there are circulatory effects to be expected: A demonstratively transparent recruitment procedure most likely attracts different organizations than an invitation to a networking event with important players. Apart from the question, which specific organization types were targeted, selected, invited and subsequently represented during the workshop, variations of the common agenda, the information given to the deliberating participants and how the workshops were conducted, determines if and in which ways workshops and working group results are comparable to each other. Beyond this, the thematic framing of a workshop and its agenda have a more obvious impact on comparability. If a workshop is about research programming that deals with food, health and sustainability the deliberators may come up with different ideas than if they believe they are participating in a workshop on food and health research in general or if the workshop started with the presentation of an obesity epidemic that leads to certain health challenges. Deliberations will mostly move within the framework defined by the organizer's information materials and introductions. Additionally, the information given to potential organizations before the workshop takes place, impacts on which organizations are interested enough to send a delegate to stay a whole workshop day. Slightly different information can attract different participants, and different participants can come to different conclusions.

Recruitment

As explained in the workplan (see D2.1), two recruitment schemes have been used for Series 2: the one from Series 1, which was based on sortition from public sources, and, as the preferred scheme, Calls for Participation.[21] In general the Call was for two workshops, the one in Series 2 and the next one in Series 3. Some workshop organizers used only the scheme from Series 1, some combined them by sending the call to all organizations they have listed in their databases or invited them by email, other organizers used a different approach. There are also differences in implementation among organizers who launched a Call for Participation. According to the instructions participants were asked to sign up at the Call website. One organization used a website of its own. In some cases less organizations signed up than eventually participated, in three cases no organization signed up at all, but the workshops had participants (in one case less than 12). Probably quite a few participants

[21] http://scenario-workshops.net

signed up directly with the organizers. The methods used and a rough estimation of the hierarchy level of participants are shown in Table 2.

Recruitment methods

Place	Recruitment method	"Power, outreach hierarchy" (rough estimation)
Ankara	CfP & other	S, M & L
Berlin	Database & invitations by e-mail	Not available
Bratislava	CfP	Mostly M
Brussels	CfP	S, M & L
Copenhagen	CfP & other	Mostly L
Guildford	CfP (own call website)	S & M
Maastricht	CfP & other	L, M, S
Madrid	Database & "lottery" & other	L & M
Montpellier	Database & "lottery"	M & S
Porto	Database & "lottery"	Mostly M
Thessaloniki	Database & "lottery"	Mostly M
Vicenca	CfP & other	M & S
Vienna	CfP	Mostly M

Table 3: Recruitment methods and participant hierarchy level

CfP: Call for Participation, call text available at http://scenario-workshops.net
Database & "lottery": Recruitment method of Series 1
Other: Different recruitment method. Explained in the workshop report available at http://www.inprofood.eu/documentation.
L, M, S: stands for rough estimations of hierarchy and power levels: large, medium and small "players"

Thematic framing

Discussions with different starting points are difficult to compare. To investigate the framing, we asked: What information did the participants receive at the beginning? Was different material used in the workshops than the briefing papers or was there a different workshop topic? These aspects are summarised in Table 3.

Framing

Place	Briefing Paper	Additional information*	Introduction & presentation
Ankara			Information on INPROFOOD and presentation of the agenda.
Berlin	Has not been sent out**	No	Agenda
Bratislava	Sent to participants before the workshop**	No	Presentation of agenda + introduction to INPROFOOD and topic.*
Brussels	Sent to participants before the workshop	Press Release	Agenda, list of participants, briefing paper, including the posters for selection of topics.*
Copenhagen	Sent to participants before the workshop**	No	Introduction to INPROFOOD, presentation of state-of-art research programming .
Guildford	Sent to participants before the workshop	No	Overview of the overall INPROFOOD project and how the workshop fits within it, short overview of the project's environment.
Maastricht	Has not been sent out	Leaflet on INPROFOOD	Presentations of the INPROFOOD objectives, expected impacts, scope and purpose of the workshop, recruitment methodology.*
Madrid	Sent to participants before the workshop**	No	Presentation of agenda + introduction to INPROFOOD and research programming, short overview of the project's environment, information on how the results will be used.*
Montpellier	Sent to participants before the workshop**	Leaflet on INPROFOOD	Presentation of agenda + introduction to INPROFOOD and research programming, short overview on the project's environment, information on how the results will be used (2 Power Point presentations).
Porto	Sent to participants before the workshop	Agenda, facilitator profile, list of organizations participating	Short presentation on the workshop format, summary of the key points (e.g. main actors and organization of food and health research in Portugal).*
Thessaloniki	Sent to participants before the workshop**	INPROFOOD press release	Presentation of agenda + introduction to INPROFOOD and research programming, short overview of the project's environment, information on how the results will be used.
Vicenza	Sent to participants before the workshop	No	Information about the purpose of INPROFOOD, the consortium, presentation of the agenda.*
Vienna	Sent to participants before the workshop	No	Presentation of agenda + introduction to INPROFOOD and research programming, short overview of the project's environment, information on how the results will be used.

Table 4: Framing

* Some organizers used a (summarized) press release on INPROFOOD in which the project, and consequently the workshop, is framed as being on research programming in food and health, especially fighting obesity and diet-related chronic diseases.
Briefing Paper: Before the workshop participants received a briefing paper on research programming and food & health.
Additional information: Information in addition to the general information sheet and briefing paper.
** This information was taken from questionnaires sent out by the evaluator and from the reports.

Participant structure

Altogether 181 representatives from 169 organizations participated in the workshops of Series 2. Of those 169 organizations 42 (24,85 %) were finally categorized as NPOs without business ties, 53 (31,36 %) as public entities, 67 (39,64%) organizations were from the private sector and 7 (4,14 %) organizations either do not fall into the targeted categories or it was not possible to allocate them to a certain stakeholder category (e.g. due to overlaps between categories).

	NPOs without business ties	Public organizations	Business associations	Other stakeholders	Total
Ankara	1	4	11	0	16
Berlin*)	8	8	7	0	23
Bratislava	3	3	1	2	9
Brussels	2	0	7	3	12
Copenhagen	0	5	9	0	14
Gilford	6	3	4	0	13
Maastricht	2	2	5	0	9
Madrid	1	3	5	0	9
Montpellier	4	6	2	0	12
Porto	3	7	4	1	15
Thessaloniki	2	2	3	0	7
Vicenca	4	6	3	1	14
Vienna	6	4	6	0	16
	42	53	67	7	169

Table 5: Organizations by consolidated stakeholders

* The identity of these organizations is unknown because of their anonymity.
These numbers were provided by the workshop organizers.

Comparing different “stakeholders” across the different scenario workshops only makes sense if the pre-defined categories in the overall plan are used the very same way by all workshop organizers. Where this was not the case, workshop categories were retrospectively harmonized, otherwise analysing interest groups across the different regions would have led to severely biased conclusions.

The evaluation of organizations' backgrounds - and possible re-categorisation - was limited to the availability of online information.

Compared to the other two categories, "NPOs without business ties" seemed to be the most difficult to determine. Sometimes extensive background research was necessary to find out if a registered NPO did or did not have business ties, if it was an NPO at all or fitted into another defined category. The distinction between NPOs without and with business ties must not be read as higher or lower appreciation of participating organizations. Enterprises or their associations can aim at high environmental objectives or corporate social responsibility" (CSR), but they still belong to the private sector. Otherwise only enterprises behaving with less integrity would be allowed to represent "the economy".

Re-classifications

From originally 56 representatives from "NPOs without business ties", 42 stayed in this category, 9 were shifted to Business and 5 to Other. From originally 63 public entities, 2 were shifted to Business and 3 did not quite fit into any of the pre-defined categories, so they were re-categorized as "Other". Under this category we subsumed organizations which were not eligible for participation because they did not match the participation criteria. Among others, participants having been re-categorized, represented research projects, technology platforms, or international organizations. Sometimes desk research was not sufficient to clearly decide into which category an organization belongs; in this case we categorized it as "other". All of the 53 delegates from business associations and SMEs remained in this category. The following table presents the performed re-categorization of individual participants (except for two workshops).

Shifts in stakeholder categories (individual participants)

Workshop 2nd series (EASW2)	Stays in NPO	Shifted from NPO to BUS	Shifted from NPO to OTH	Stays in PUB	Shifted fro PUB to BUS	Shifted from PUB to OTH	Stays in BUS
Ankara	1	2	0	5	0	0	9
Berlin*)	8	0	0	8	0	0	7
Bratislava	3	0	2	3	0	0	1
Brussels	2	1	0	0	0	3	6
Copenhagen	0	4	0	5	0	0	6
Guildford	6	0	0	3	1	0	3
Madrid	1	2	0	4	0	0	3
Montpellier	4	0	0	7	0	0	2
Porto	3	0	2	7	0	0	5
Thessaloniki	3	0	0	6	0	0	3
Vicenca	5	0	1	6	1	0	2
Vienna	6	0	0	4	0	0	6
	42	9	5	58	2	3	53

Table 6: Re-categorization of participants

*) Due to anonymity of stakeholders, the categorization of the organizer was not examined.

At the time of writing we did not know which participants in the Maastricht workshop were allocated to which categories; we only knew the general stakeholder distribution: 2 participants from the NPO, 2 from the public sector, and 5 from the private sector category. Thus no shifting could be made and thus Maastricht is not listed in table 5. In Berlin, participants remained fully anonymous, so the categorization was not checked for harmonization and remains unchanged.

Due to a categorisation that is much more rigid than usual in such activities, some partners had more participants from one or another pre-defined category, but when all the workshops are taken together, the different participation patterns partially counter-balanced each other. It must be pointed out that according to the feedback of the workshop organizers, there are differences in the organizational landscapes in the diverse countries that could make the recruitment even in the three relatively flexible categories (NPOs without business ties, business associations and SMES, public organizations) extremely

difficult: For example, the recruitment of *"NPOs without business ties"* can only be successful, if the country possesses a rich diversity of non-profit organizations which are fully independent from the business sphere.

The categorization difficulties indicate a major problem: a fairly inconsistent definition of the NPO category across political institutions and countries. As it is now, an industrial association often is considered a non-profit organization as is an environmental grassroots organization. If the definition of NPOs is stricter than usual, it becomes much more difficult to recruit what appear to be non-profit organizations – organized civil society - than is generally assumed, at least, if these organizations are expected not to depend on the private sector in terms of members or funding. The outcomes of stakeholder involvement processes might be less often based on civil society's input than is claimed.

This is not a specific weakness of the workshops in this project but a weakness of stakeholder involvement in general. The workshops in INPROFOOD are among the very first to clearly acknowledge some challenges connected to stakeholder involvement and respond to them. A model is created for future participatory deliberations. Defining less generously than usual, who should be included in which stakeholder category, unveils some practical difficulties to allocate certain organizations to categories, which could earn a project of their own.

The inclusion of some more stakeholder categories than planned does not principally compromise the comparability of the workshop as far as it is made transparent who participated and as far as there is sufficient participation according to the original stakeholder categories, which aimed at giving room to those are not so frequently asked for their opinions. Where a larger than intended variability developed, it made some of the intended comparison more difficult but at the same time opened up new possibilities, and it is interesting to look for similarities that come even up in spite of the larger variability of deliberating stakeholder groups.

Addressing a lower hierarchy level (size or geographical outreach) differed widely. For several organizers it was more difficult to recruit this "level" than recruiting "large" players. Most likely, these organizations do not have sufficient resources to spend a whole workshop day, or in the case, where travelling is necessary, even more time. Additionally, according to

recent literature[22], another obstacle could be the so-called "participation fatigue". This may have developed in some of the Northern countries, where participatory involvement activities are performed frequently. In some of the partner countries, the economic crisis most likely had an impact on the participation of medium sized organizations as well.

Although ideally only one delegate per participating organization should come, sometimes more than one attended the workshop. Hence there are more participants than organizations. Altogether, the Series 2 workshops saw 181 participants

	NPOs without business ties	Public organizations	Business associations	Other stakeholders	Total number of participants
Ankara	**1**	**5**	**11**	0	**17**
Berlin	**8**	**8**	**7**	0	**23**
Bratislava	**3**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**9**
Brussels	**2**	0	**7**	**3**	**12**
Copenhagen	0	**5**	**10**	0	**15**
Guildford	**6**	**3**	**4**	0	**13**
Maastricht	**2**	**2**	**5**	0	**9**
Madrid	**1**	**4**	**5**	0	**10**
Montpellier	**4**	**7**	**2**	0	**13**
Porto	**3**	**7**	**5**	**2**	**17**
Thessaloniki	**3**	**6**	**3**	0	**12**
Vicenca	**5**	**6**	**3**	**1**	**15**
Vienna	**6**	**4**	**6**	0	**16**
	44	**52**	**63**	**31**	**181**

Table 7: Individuals by consolidated stakeholder category

Again, the question appears, if there is a cultural issue. In some countries, organizations might more easily accept that only one delegate is allowed. In other countries, it might make the workshop less attractive to certain groups of participants. The following table presents the gender distribution of the workshop participants.

[22] Horst, 2014

	Ankara	Bratislava	Brussels	Copen-hagen	Guildford	Maas-tricht	Madrid	Mont-pellier	Porto	Thessa-loniki	Vicenca	Vienna
Female	8	4	7	7	8	4	5	4	13	6	6	7
Male	9	5	5	8	5	5	5	9	4	6	9	9

Table 8: Distribution of female and male participants by workshop

Realization of the agenda

Among other things, the comparative analysis of the workshop results depends on the agenda and how it was implemented. Thus we looked to see if there are deviations from the original common agenda and if the workshops were conducted and facilitated as agreed on.

Documentation

It was agreed that the documentation of the workshop should be as authentic as possible: Participants would be informed that the output would be what they write on the flipchart posters. This was to give them some security that the documentation would be what they actually wrote on the posters and not interpretations of what they have said. Thus, when analysing the workshop reports, we looked for a complete set of readable photos of flipchart posters, translated transcripts (which we checked, if possible, for accuracy) and a list of participants, preferably with their names and affiliations.

Comparability of the workshops

As in the first workshop series, there are some differences between the way workshops were conducted by the different organizers. During the implementation it became clear how the different cultural, political and expertise backgrounds of the workshop organizers played out in different implementations of the workplan. Across the different workshops we detected variations of recruitment, workshop topic, thematic framing, targeted stakeholders, agenda, information given to participants, and documentation. In some cases, matching workshops worked, in other cases it seemed not practical to the organizers. In some cases the translation of the posters was not sufficiently accurate. As far as could be assessed during the analyses, topics and issues could get lost by insufficient translation.

Distinguishing categories correctly is a most important condition in these workshops in which different "stakeholders" are grouped into homogeneous and heterogeneous teams.

After categorization homogeneous groups can become mixed groups, heterogeneous groups can turn into more homogeneous groups.

To find out, in which ways deliberation outcomes can be used for comparison, the degree of matching was estimated working group by working group. In most cases, the morning groups could be matched better than the afternoon groups.

Instructions for working groups

	Working groups	**Tasks**
Ankara	• Homogeneous groups • "NPO", red group • "BUS"; green group • "PUB"; blue group	Worst Case: Basic Themes
	Heterogeneous groups	Best Case: Basic Themes
	Remarks:	Only in the category "NPO without business ties" category, two CSOs in the food production sector are shifted to the BUS category. All other organizations remain unchanged.
Berlin	• Small group science • Small group stakeholder nutrition • Small group consumer protection • Small group representatives of patients	Nutrition and food - contemporary situation: *Describe the contemporary nutrition. / Which contemporary research does exist and which innovations are developed right now?*
	• Small group 1 in the afternoon • Small group 2 in the afternoon • Small group 3 in the afternoon • Small group 4 in the afternoon	
	Remarks:	Participants remain anonymous and unknown to the authors. No online research is performed. This workshop yields some interesting outcomes, but is in too different from the other workshop to allow for sound comparison in series 2.
Bratislava	• Homogeneous group 1 – "Public Sector" • Homogeneous group 2 - "NPOs" • Homogeneous group 3 - "Business Sector"	Topics Worst Case/s
	• Mixed group 1 • Mixed group 2 • Mixed group 3	Best Case/s
	Remarks:	In the "NPO without business ties" category two CSOs are shifted to the "OTH" category, as they work in the economic fields of regional development/tourism. The agenda has been followed very closely.

Brussels	• Homogenous group 1: PUB • Homogenous group 2: BUS (CSOs with business ties) • Homogenous group 3: NPO (NPOs without business ties) • Homogenous group 4: BUS	Topics Worst Case/s
	• Heterogeneous group 1 • Heterogeneous group 2 • Heterogeneous group 3	Best Case/s
	Remarks:	In the NPO category one organisation is shifted to BUS. In the PUB category, two organisations are shifted to OTH: a political party and an international CSO which is maintained mainly by the US government. The group sees two business related working groups, one of which consists of CSOs rooted in the business world.
Copenhagen	• Homogeneous Group 1 (Private) • Homogeneous Group 2 (Public) • Homogeneous Group 3 (NGO)	Topics (to be studied/not to be studied) Worst case/s
	• Mixed Group 1 • Mixed Group 2 • Mixed Group 3	Best Case/s
	Remarks:	The whole NPO category is shifted to a second BUS category consisting of large CSOs rooted in economy. Hence, the afternoon groups turn into groups with each 2 delegates from the BUS and from the PUB category. The agenda has been largely maintained. Only the Topic question is enlarged by "not to be studied". A communication question is added to the sub-questions in the scenario tasks. The Danish workshops are as special case because they address the Nordic region. Subsequently, it attracted mostly large entities.
Guildford		
	• Homogeneous Group 1 (npo/charities) • Homogeneous Group 2 (public sector) • Homogeneous Group 3 (food production sector)	Research topics and fields & Worst Case/s
	• Mixed group 1 • Mixed group 2 • Mixed group 3	Best Case/s
	Remarks:	One shift from the PUB to the BUS category is carried out for a social care provider. The agenda has been largely maintained.
Maastricht	• Homogenous Group - Non-Profit Stakeholders Group • Homogenous Group – Business Stakeholders Group A • Homogenous Group – Business	Research topics (sticky notes) Worst Case/s

	Stakeholders Group B • Homogenous Group – Public Stakeholders Group	
	Remarks:	The workshop sees two business groups, mainly CSOs rooted in the food production sector. The report names all organisations without specifying categorisation for the homogeneous group. (The categorisation in this report was performed by its authors.) The agenda has been roughly followed.
Madrid	• Homogeneous group Blue - Business sub-group • Homogeneous Group Red - Public interest sub-group • Homogeneous group Green - Sub-groups of social interest	Important fields discussion Worst Case/s
	• Mixed group 1 • Mixed group 2 • Mixed group 3	Best Case/s
	Remarks:	The workshop followed the agenda closely. No re-grouping was performed. The hierarchy levels are somewhat higher than intended, some organisations are medium, some are large.
Montpellier	• Homogeneous Group 1: public institutions • Homogeneous Group 2 civil society • Homogeneous Group 3: business sphere	Research topics Worst Case/s
	• Mixed Group A • Mixed Group B • Mixed group C	Best Case/s
	Remarks:	No regrouping was performed. The agenda roughly follows the working plan.
Porto	• Homogeneous Group 1 – Public Organisations • Homogeneous Group 2 – Non-Profit Organisations • Homogeneous Group 3 – Business Organisations	Topics Worst Case/s
	• Heterogeneous Group #1 • Heterogeneous Group #2 • Heterogeneous Group #3	Best Case/s
	Remarks:	The agenda follows closely the working plan. In the NPO without business category one CSO (2 participants) is re-classified because of sponsoring. The homogeneous working group maintains nevertheless a “NPO without business ties” majority.
Thessaloniki	• Homogeneous group 1: public organizations group • Homogeneous Group 2: NGO-Private group	Topics Worst Case/s
	• Mixed Group 1 • Mixed group 2	Best Cases

	• Mixed group 3	
	Remarks:	In the morning the NGO and the private group are merged into one group. The public group is dominated by one institutions with several representatives. The agenda is followed closely. No re-categorisation is performed.
Vicenza	• Homogeneous Group 1: Businesses & industries • Homogeneous Group 2: Not-for-profit, citizen groups • Homogeneous Group 3: Public authorities & Policy makers	NEGATIVE VISION in health food year 2030. The unwanted developments in the next 17 years in relation to food and quality of life, research policy and programming in the food, food innovation.
	• Mixed Group 1 • Mixed Group 2 • Mixed Group 3	Mixed groups: positive vision 2030, conditions, actors, actions
	Remarks:	Although the workshop yields some very interesting outcomes, the framing, agenda and tasks are quite different from the working plan, which hampers comparability profoundly.
Vienna	• Homogeneous working group "Business - SMEs" • Homogeneous working group "Public organizations" • Homogeneous group "NPOs without business ties"	Topics Worst Case/s
	Mixed working group 1 Mixed working group 2 Mixed working group 3	Best Case/s

Table 9: Instructions for working groups

According to the agendas published in the workshop reports, workshops also had different durations due to differing lengths of breaks and sessions.

On the previous pages all workshops have been described according to these variations. This overview allows the grouping of the workshops according to their similarities and the determination of which parts of them can be compared to others, and in which respect. While all workshops have triggered vivid discussion and interesting outputs, comparing them has its challenges. Differences in the implementation of the workplan limit the comparability of stakeholder input across workshops. Two workshops followed a different agenda, two workshops had a different topic than suggested in the working plan, a few workshops targeted stakeholders of quite a different "size" than planned (by focussing on mostly "large" stakeholders or targeting stakeholders irrespective of their "size"), the recruitment schemes for a few workshops was less transparent than planned, some workshops framed the area of food and health without the sustainability angle and/or as food and obesity. It is

questionable whether, due to cultural differences, it is possible to conduct matched workshops. From this we might conclude that achieving sufficient matching of workshop for analysis is quite a challenge.

Some framing is inevitable, and every framing is limiting and has some blind spots. In some cases a narrow framing of the issue could be countered by targeting stakeholders usually not being addressed within such a framing. These stakeholders opened up the framing by bringing in additional perspectives. We consider this an indication that the basic assumption was not wrong: targeting a quite broad range of stakeholders since this counters organizers' blind spots and contributes to more robust results.

Outcomes

References to outcomes of deliberations (posters)

For the purpose for the analysis and making references, some abbreviations are used, which are also used for the purpose of reference to the respective posters in the report.

Boxes:

> Delegates: 6 PUB
>
> *Homog. group 1 „Public" / p3*

reads as: *6 public sector participants in Homogeneous group 1, Poster 3.*

Footnotes:

> AT_EASW2/*And this is important, too/* **"too narrow time frame (especially no forerun and follow-up phase)"**/Hom2 poster 3/Worst Case/4PUB

reads as: *During the second workshop (EASW2) in Austria (AT), dealing with the topic "And this is important, too", the second homogeneous group (Hom2) wrote on its 3rd poster: "too narrow time frame (especially no forerun and follow-up phase)". The group discussed worst case scenarios and consisted of 4 delegates from entities categorized as PUB after consolidation of stakeholder categories for the purpose of this analysis.*

The purpose of this reference is to give the reader occasion to look for the respective context in the respective reports on inprofood.eu/documentation.

Abbreviations concerning deliberators:

- PUB: Public entities
- BUS: Business associations (including also charities with economic ties). Later also small to medium single enterprises were added to this category.
- NPO: Non-profit organizations without business ties, neither in funding nor decision making
- OTH: Other organizations. Difficult to categorize or fits in an additional category
- BoP: Business or public group
- BUS[number]: Group of private sector representatives [number]
- REC: Person employed by organizers to write on the posters for the working group

deliberators

- FAC: Person employed by organizers to facilitate the group
- Ho[number]: Homogeneous group [number]
- p[number]: Poster [number]
- Sticky N.: Sticky note
- facil, fac: Facilitated

What sources were used for the analysis of the workshops?

The scenario workshops in INPROFOOD were about collecting and analysing the authentic output of stakeholders; no re-interpretation of their input was intended. The analysis is predominantly based on the visual output produced by delegates from a broad range of organizations. These delegates deliberated in small groups and were instructed to write the results of their deliberations on flipcharts for the purpose of public documentation. The flipchart posters are the main material for analysis. Additionally, some short explanations were added to the posters by authors of the respective workshop reports. In a next step the contents on the posters were fed into spreadsheets, together with reference to the respective workshop, working group, poster number, the originally posed question and, after the consolidation of stakeholder categories, the constellation of the respective working group. The contents were tagged and then clustered. The authors aimed at staying as close as possible to the original statements put on the posters.

Although the workshop structures, procedures and participant profiles are less homogeneous than originally planned, several common topics appear across this broad variety of workshops. Such topics are described in the following chapter.

Common topics

Topics to be researched

To provide a better overview on the research preferences and topics workshop participants named, we clustered them. A cluster comprises at least two topics. Topics that could not been subsumed under a cluster are not mentioned here. All topics can be found in the respective workshop reports available at http://www.inprofood.eu/documentation/. In general in all those clusters stakeholders of all three categories are represented. The diversity of named topics made a considerable number of clusters necessary. This diversity extends to the workshops at large. The variability of topics indicates that one should be cautious with generalisations on the basis of the outcomes of one or a few workshops. If only half of the workshops had been conducted, which would still be an impressive number, the outcomes would give a different impression on topic preferences. Our interest was looking for crossing points on which participants might agree in spite of their possibly different reasons and views. The results of stakeholder involvement should not be so much the views of a few in/outsiders, but at best be principally confirmed by most citizens if these views would be debated in public.

Regarding the research topics brought forward in different working groups in the workshops, one has to remember that the time given for the task was not excessive. Together with the "worst scenarios" on research programming, the topics were part of the homogeneous group session. A lot of working groups focussed on the second task. Asking on which topics research should be conducted, aimed at learning about the research priorities different working groups would find important. A lot of variation can be seen. The strongest communality across the diverse working groups and workshops is a focus on local food systems, holistic approaches and consumer behaviour.

Availability of food / Nutrition & income

The issue of food availability was raised in terms of sufficient food available and purchasing power.

	Ankara (TK)	**Bratislava (SK)**	**Guildford (UK)**	**Maastricht (NL)**	**Madrid (ES) "large"**	**Montpellier (FR)**	**Porto (PT)**
BUS	- not determining the Lacking points in food supply				iii. Food availability		
	Ho2 p1-3 / 9 BUS				*Ho1 p1 / 3 BUS, fac*		
NPO				Difficulties to finance certain patient groups. E.g. necessary supplements or special food products.*		Access to healthy, quality, cheap food (how? Difficult). Precarious public/food aid	- Relationship between the purchasing power and obesity ↓ the purchasing power ↑obesity
				Ho1 Sticky N. / 2 -3 NPO		*Ho2 p1 / 4 NPO*	*3 NPO, 2 OTH*
PUB		Global hunger Social shops – expired food	Access - to healthy food			Sufficient – healthy production Accessibility//means	
		Ho1 p2 (1,1) fac / 3 PUB, 1 REC	*Ho2 p2 (fig. 7) / 3 PUB, 1 BUS*			*Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB*	

Table 10: Availability of food / Nutrition & income

Health effects

Public and NPO stakeholders mentioned health effects as an important research area.

	Bratislava (SK)	**Copenhagen (DK) "large"**	**Guildford (UK)**	**Maastricht (NL)**	**Montpellier (FR)**
NPO	Health – Impact of: o Quality o Way of processing and preserving o Specific needs of organism o Food as medicine/poison	• Methods for studying effects of food on future diseases	Benefits of plant - based diets on health - cancer - concentration - diabetes etc. mpacts of diet on behaviour/ health - food as therapy - food choices – nutrition (physiology and psychology) health - plant - based diet, micro - nutrient – evidence and promoting awareness Affect of the the food chain process on young people's emotional, psychosocial, physical wellbeing	- Interaction nutrition ↔ medication such as e.g. chemo. *	
	Ho2 p1 (2,0) fac / 3 NPO, 2 OTH, 1 REC	*Ho3 p1 / 4 BUS*	*Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 6 NPO*	*Ho1 Sticky N. / 2 -3 NPO*	
PUB			Food nutrition- types of fats to eat Cholesterol – dietary food – education	Influence on health.*	Interest of questioning the health impact of food?
			Ho2 p2 (fig. 7) / 3 PUB, 1 BUS	*Ho4 Sticky N. / 2 -3 PUB*	*Ho1 p2 / 7 PUB*

Table 11: Health effects

Understanding consumer behaviour and consumer information appear as common topics**.** Consumer behaviour (re-)appears in several workshops as a

suggested research topic and also in different working groups. Most of the time it is viewed as a problem, and the necessity to change it seems unquestioned, but the contexts in which it is discussed are not identical. The focus can lie on healthy food choices, psychological issues or consumer education. The focus can also lie on purchasing power or on a food culture, with the implicit question of how willing or able consumers are to spend more money on food with higher quality. It could be seen more as result of faulty education or information, or be rather attributed to societal conditions under which citizens live and work.

A fundamental difference in conceptualization could be drawn between topics relating to the consumer as a target group, whose behavior ought to be changed, and the consumer, who has the right to be informed accurately about the food products s/he consumes. Stakeholders of all categories considered consumer behaviour to be an important research topic. On the one hand there was interest in inducing more healthy nutrition by consumers; on the other hand there was interest in understanding consumer behaviour: what appeals to consumers (by representatives of the private sector), their habits and how they are formed (by representatives of NPOs and public entities). Open questions remain as to how exactly consumers are supposed to behave. Understanding and evaluating *methods* does also not necessarily imply that the consumer is responsible for “non-compliance” to dietary advice. In respect to consumer behaviour it would be interesting to compare the different working groups across all workshop series. Stakeholders of all three categories expressed a demand for research on improved consumer information; food labelling was mentioned several times.

Changing consumer behaviour

	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	**Bratislava (SK) Facilitated**	**Brussels (BE)**	**Guildford (UK)**	**Montpellier (FR)**	**Thessaloniki (GR)**	**Vienna (AT)**
BUS	• Teach taste						
	Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS						
NPO			· consumer education (first parents then children)	'Mainstreaming' evidence and awareness Methods of changing behaviour - what works - change mechanism - food growing, preparation, service How to dietary BEHAVIOUR CHANGE	Modification of behaviour and representations (link with knowledge) Innovation/experimentation for changing behaviour Simple means (Nudge) (new communication means) ---> behavioural modification/ societal approach (public sector)		◊ Consumer behavior (changeing)
			Ho3 p1 / 2 NPO, 1 OTH	*Ho1 p1&2 (fig.1/ 2) / 6 NPO*	*Ho2 p1 / 4 NPO*		*Ho3 p1 / 6 NPO*
PUB	• Role models • Change of preferences (psychology) • Nudging • How to change habits • Initiative that does not require one to "think and count" • Effect of structured initiatives	Education of consumer					
	Ho2 p1 / 5 PUB	*Ho1 p2 (1,1) / 3 PUB*					
BUS/NPO						4. Increasing the effectiveness of educational methods to nutritional standards and on the ways to define	

	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	Bratislava (SK) Facilitated	Brussels (BE)	Guildford (UK)	Montpellier (FR)	Thessaloniki (GR)	Vienna (AT)
						Ho2 p1 / 3 NPO, 3 BUS	

Table 12: Changing consumer behaviour

Understanding consumer behaviour

	Ankara (TK)	Brussels (BE)	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	Maastricht (NL)	Madrid (ES) "large"	Montpellier (FR)	Porto (PT)
BUS	- Change in nutrition habits due to the new technology practices	- Behavior identification			ii. Appealing products		
	Ho2 p1-3 / 9 BUS	*Ho4 p1 / 3 BUS2*			*Ho1 p2 / 3 BUS, fac*		
BUS2			• Food behavior "social classes" • Structures in society – which make people take the right choice	Consumer perception:	0.3. Modification of food composition to be acceptable		
			Ho3 p1 / 4 BUS2	*Ho1 Sticky N. / 2 -3 NPO*	*Ho3 p1 / 1 NPO, 2 BUS, facil*		
NPO		- focus on lower SES - -> consumer behaviour		- Awareness of public.*			- Relationship between food consumption culture and diseases (e.g. lack of knowledge and organisation of the menu, influence of advertising) - Relationship between food consumption culture and school performance
		Ho3 p1 / 2 NPO, 1 OTH		*Ho1 Sticky N. / 2 -3 NPO*			Ho2 p2 / 3 NPO, 2 NtO
PUB		• *Social-psychological (consumer) behaviour: trends: insects*	• Food environments • Formation of food habits in children • Preference			What impacts on children's behavior? Cultural	

	Ankara (TK)	Brussels (BE)	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	Maastricht (NL)	Madrid (ES) "large"	Montpellier (FR)	Porto (PT)
			development in children • Relationships between taste and behavior • Consumer behavior in a purchase situation • Variables determining food choice • Uptake and intake • Choice architectures • Relationship between behavioral habits and participation			hurdles//alternative meals Communication lever// cultural hurdles	
		Ho1 p1 / 1 PUB, 2 OTH	*Ho2 p1 / 5 PUB*			*Ho1 p2 / 7 PUB*	

Table 13: Understanding consumer behaviour

Consumer information

	Ankara (TK)	Brussels (BE)	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	Maastricht (NL)	Madrid (ES) "large", (facilitated)	Thessaloniki (GR)
BUS	- Misleading information - Biased information - Disinformation	4) Education/Raising Awareness 5) Promotion – Valuation – Marketing 6) Cost *Ho2 p1 / 3 BUS1* 1) Communication towards consumers - Training - Information	• Clear food labeling	E-numbers - true story Honesty about raw materials: Complete picture.	iv. Improving labelling	
	Ho2 p1-3 / 9 BUS	*Ho4 p1 / 3 BUS2*	*Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS*	*Ho3 Sticky N. / 2 -3 BUS*	*Ho1 p2 / 3 BUS*	
NPO		· food labelling more transparent for consumer		Truthful information to consumers:		
		Ho3 p1 / 2 NPO, 1 OTH		*Ho2 Sticky N. / 2 -3 NPO*		
PUB		• Food labelling: transparency,		Bringing the human scale back in the picture,	- Publicity and its regulation /labelling	4. Food labelling based on what the consumer wants to

	Ankara (TK)	Brussels (BE)	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	Maastricht (NL)	Madrid (ES) "large", (facilitated)	Thessaloniki (GR)
		comprehensiveness, simplicity, calories, sodium?		appealing to own involvement of producers and consumers.*		know about the product (ex. country of origin, processing method, ingredients, variety, energy waste, ect.) & reduce 'advertising lies' or exaggerations with no evidence.
		Ho1 p1 / 1 PUB, 2 OTH		*Ho4 Sticky N. / 2 -3 PUB*	*Ho2 p1 / 3 PUB, facil*	*Ho1 p1 / 6 , PUB*

Table 14: Consumer information

Control & regulation

Representatives of all stakeholder categories named control and legislation as research topics: the private sector in regard to bureaucracy (as a kind of barrier), the NPOs and the public sector mainly in regard to better or more control and regulation. However, the sample is too small to generalise and say that the private sector on the one side and the public and NPO sector on the other are split over the control and regulation on food and health as a research area. In particular, one "public group" (in Montpellier) and one "business group" (in Ankara) elaborated on the question of legislation and control.

	Ankara (TK)	Brussels (BE)	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	Guildford (UK)	Madrid (ES) "large", facilitated	Montpellier (FR)
BUS	- Intensity of bureaucracy - Production without permission - Unfair competition (both internal and external) - Very easily licensing process/easy certification process		• Link between nanny state and happiness/quality of life			
	Ho2 p1-3 / 9 BUS		*Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS*			

	Ankara (TK)	Brussels (BE)	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	Guildford (UK)	Madrid (ES) "large", facilitated	Montpellier (FR)
NPO/BUS	- Bureaucratic handicaps - Influences of penalty on small scaled sector/companies					
	Ho1 p1-3 / 1 NPO, 2 BUS2					
NPO		· Norms & control on import of foreign (non -EU) food & ingredients		removing Trans fats from British foods		
		Ho3 p1 / 2 NPO, 1 OTH		*Ho1 p3 (fig. 3) / 6 NPO*		
PUB					Industry Law Possible conflict consumer	Impact of legislation => sociology/ anthropology of food (informing the consumer for choosing) Legislation (limiting factor) Example: legislation on school canteen ≠ environment Inconsistency seasonality and legislation Seeds//climate//legislation Sanitary benefits (legislation)//health benefits Nutritional impact of sanitary legislation (growing allergies)
					Ho2 p1 / 3 PUB	*Ho1 p2 / 7 PUB*

Table 15: Control & regulation

Environmental sustainability

Of course sustainability was an issue at the workshops. According to the workshop participants the question was not if but HOW it should be achieved. Sometimes this topic appears to be mentioned less as a research topic than a demand.

As in Series 1, in Series 2 the reduction of waste as a research field[23] came up too, although not as much as an isolated topic like in the first workshop series. In Series 2 waste is not always mentioned explicitly, but can be regarded as part of more systemic concepts, like investigating full supply chains and economic structures that allow for resource-saving production. Although "waste" does not completely disappear, the whole picture is different. This shows that even if 13 workshops are conducted in different places independently, the general picture can still change, if further workshops are conducted with similar interest groups and with an equally "broad range of stakeholders".

	Ankara (TK)	**Bratislava (SK)**	**Copenhagen (DK) "large"**	**Guildford (UK)**	**Madrid (ES) "large"**	**Montpellier (FR)**	**Porto (PT)**	**Vienna (AT)**
BUS			• Comparison of conventional, low-input and organic food		ii. Energy efficiency			Prevention: related to health, climate dependent regional farming
			Ho3 p1 / 4 BUS2		*Ho1 p1 / 3 BUS*			*Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS*
NPO		Sustainability: - Level of regulation - Economy (employment, price), Biodiversity - Education - Regional aspects, landscaping - Certification		Sustainability Revenue Generation – evidence - based policy - agricultural policy/ public health research Role of the community - environmental	0.2. Sustainable environmental impact of products and processes			

[23] Brussels: W2/**Food & waste management** /HOM1 poster 1/1PUB 2OTH
ES_MERGE/**Less wasting material**/HOM1 poster 1/3BUS +1FAC
FR_MERGE/**Food waste -> all public** /HOM2 poster 2/4NPO

	Ankara (TK)	Bratislava (SK)	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	Guildford (UK)	Madrid (ES) "large"	Montpellier (FR)	Porto (PT)	Vienna (AT)
				benefits Organic farming (broader benefits/ investment costs) wide health & organic & sustainability benefits of organic farming/ food. what is a sustainable food system (towards a common and inclusive definition) healthy benefits of agro-ecology SUSTAINABLE diets - what should we eat? Sustainability in growing projects.				
		Ho2 p1 (2,0) / 3 NPO, 2 OTH		*Ho1 p2 (fig. 2) / 6 NPO*	*Ho3 p1 / 1 NPO, 2 BUS2*			
PUB	- Sustainability in all process					Carbon footprint of meals	=- Environmentally-friendly/ Economically viable	
	Ho3 p1-7 / 5 PUB					*Ho1 p2 / 7 PUB*	*Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB*	

Table 16: Environmental sustainability

Seeing the whole picture, creating synergies

Participants proposed a systemic view on food, health and environmental sustainability in order to see the whole picture and to create synergies between research areas and actors in the areas of food production and health. This comes with no surprise because taking environmental sustainability seriously requires such a view.

	Brussels (BE)	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	Guildford (UK)	Maastricht (NL)	Madrid (ES) "large", facilitated	Thessaloniki (GR)	Vienna (AT)
BUS	Agriculture mode - Synergy	Social vs. price, Natural vs. additives			Topics relationships with economic impact on environment and health, production and final consumer,		
	Ho4 p1 / 3 BUS2	*Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS*			*Ho3 p1 / 1 NPO, 2 BUS2*		
NPO			A whole systems approach				Production chains (Sustainable) From the field into the blood
			Ho1 p3 (fig. 3) / 6 NPO				*Ho3 p1 / 6 NPO*
PUB				Holistic view.*		Environmental cost and health cost - to include the cost of each product on the environment and human health in the pricing (e.x proposing higher taxes on unhealthy or non-sustainable products)	
				Ho4 Sticky N. / 2 -3 PUB		*Ho1 p1 / 6 PUB*	

Table 17: Seeing the whole picture, creating synergies

Local food production

Suggested research topics under the cluster of local food production address health, environmental and accessibility issues. In Guildford, the public group focussed strongly on local food and proposed sub-topics.

In the analysis report of Series 1 the topic of local and regional production and consumption also came up very frequently. This strong preference is repeated in Series 2. Although statistics on how often topics according to their appearance should be used with caution (as this is no statistic analysis), it is rather impressive how frequently the idea of local production was brought forward in Series 2. Regional production and its possible advantages appear to be a rather robust topic. Delegates of different organizations and backgrounds came at different places very often to the conclusion that it is a worthwhile or even urgent topic to establish local food supply systems. It comes up in workshops in spite of differences in thematic framing. The topic seems to be even robust against different framings. Regional/local food production and consumption can appear in multiple contexts. It touches questions of sustainability, healthy food, decreased transportation, bio-diversity (preserving local species) and social desirability in the context of developing local economies. How local structures could be developed, optimized and maintained, their impact on the economy, employment, life style, environment and health, and how costs would have to be calculated, if the whole food chain would be taken into account, open up a bundle of research questions and give a lot room for structural innovation. The high appearance of this topic would allow for comparing between stakeholder groups, but no clear pattern appeared. Hence, the topic does not "belong" to a certain stakeholder according to the original categorization.

	Ankara (TK)	**Brussels (BE)**	**Guildford (UK)**	**Maastricht (NL)**	**Madrid (ES) "large"** (facilitated)	**Montpellier (FR)**	**Vienna (AT)**
BUS		2) Proximity – Accessibility (easiness) 3) Tools	Is there a health risk to the relocalisation of food production/ growing?	More local production.*			Mobility - location, infrastructure
		Ho2 p1 / 3 BUS1	*Ho3 p1 (fig. 13) / 3 BUS*	*Ho2 Sticky N. / 2 -3 BUS*			*Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS*
BUS2		5) Local consumption					
		Ho4 p1 / 3 BUS2					
NPO		· local food production					◊ Food sovereignty (Regional Seasonal Organic?)

							◊ Diversity
		Ho3 p1 / 2 NPO, 1 OTH					*Ho3 p1 / 6 NPO*
PUB	Local scaled research/study	Food planning: urban farming: local production	hidden costs local V wider Local produced food getting local people involved how do we get back to local food? Is local food – nutritional better for us? Messages – for public. Comparative quality of local food [....] is it · Environment – sustainability · Supermarkets employ lots of people · Economic impact · Local health economy · What is regional food? · Research on nutrition-3) do people who eat 'locally' (and have access) produced food eat a healthier more nutritional diet?		Promotion of regional/local food	Gardens//urbanization Better to eat local? (preconceived idea?)	
	Ho3 p1-7 / 5 PUB	*Ho1 p1 / 1 PUB, 2 OTH*	*Ho2 p2 (fig. 7) / 3 PUB, 1 BUS*		*Ho2 p1 / 3 PUB, facil*	*Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB*	

Table 18: Local food production

Health impact of certain diets

In several groups, research on more fundamental questions concerning the relationship between nutrition and health were brought forward. In detail, the questions brought forward vary strongly from the therapeutic (or toxic) potential of food on a general level (see "NPO" in Bratislava or "PUB" in Maastricht, large "BUS2" in Copenhagen) or in respect to certain nutrition styles, such as plant based diets (NPO, Maastricht) or the fat intake in Maastricht, the prevention of diseases (see large "PUB" in Copenhagen), impact on the quality of life as well as its interaction with medication (e.g. chemotherapy). On a meta-level, the French public group asked: Who is interested in questioning the health impact of food?

	Bratislava (SK) facilitated	**Copenhagen (DK) "large"**	**Guildford (UK)**	**Maastricht (NL)**	**Montpellier (FR)**
BUS		• Mental health/happiness			
		Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS			
BUS2		• Methods for studying effects of food on future diseases • Effect of combined meals (variety)			
		Ho3 p1 / 4 BUS			
NPO	Health – Impact of: o Quality o Way of processing and preserving o Specific needs of organism o Food as medicine/poison		Benefits of plant - based diets on health - cancer - concentration - diabetes etc.	- Prevention plus quality of life. - Interaction nutrition ↔ medication such as e.g. chemo.	
	Ho2 p1 (2,0) / 3 NPO, 2 OTH		*Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 6 NPO*	*Ho1 Sticky N. / 2 -3 NPO*	
PUB		• Prevention of diseases and sickness	Food nutrition- types of fats to eat Cholesterol – dietary food – education	Influence on health	Interest of questioning the health impact of food?
		Ho2 p1 / 5 PUB	*Ho2 p2 (fig. 7) / 3 PUB, 1 BUS*	*Ho4 Sticky N. / 2 -3 PUB*	*Ho1 p2 / 7 PUB*

Table 19: Health impact of certain diets

Food ingredients and food additives

Being mentioned mostly by civil society and public sector groups, most of the time these groups named it in conjunction with their potential impact on health.

	Bratislava (SK)	**Maastricht (NL)**	**Porto (PT)**	**Thessaloniki (GR)**	**Copenhagen (DK) "large"**
BUS		Determining ingredients in vegetables			Sugar/stevia/artificial sweeteners
		Ho2 Sticky N. / 2 -3 BUS1			*Ho3 p1 / 4 BUS*
NPO	- Composition (ingredients) - emulgators, hormones, GMO o Ingredients/additives	- Additives (effect on metabolism)	- Relationship between certain food additives and pathologies at a physiological and neurological level (e.g. milk, red meat, additives)		
	Ho2 p1 (2,0) / 3 NPO, 2 OTH	*Ho1 Sticky N / 2-3 NPO*	*Ho2 p1 / 3 NPO, 2 OTH*		
PUB			- Maximization of the nutritional value (incorporation of new food)	3. The consequences of chemical supplements on health	
			Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB	*Ho1 p1 / 6 PUB*	
BUS & NPO				6. Nutritional supplements and search of alternatives (pigment, nitrates…)	
				Ho2 p1 / 3 NPO, 3 BUS	

Table 20: Food ingredients and food additives

Specific nutrition needs

Research on how to nourish certain population groups is demanded by two large “business groups” (Copenhagen, Madrid) and in three “public groups” (Brussels, Thessaloniki, Vienna). Special nutrition needs concern the very young, the very old and persons with food allergies/intolerances. As in Series 1, the nutrition of children and young people caused most often concern among all above mentioned groups. Optimal nutrition for the elderly is reflected in the context of demographic change and healthy ageing. The demographic change (increase of life expectance and decrease of birth rates leads to a relative higher number of senior citizens in industrialized countries) and its multi-facetted dynamics with diets. The public sector group at the Vienna workshop put this on a poster.

	Brussels (BE)	**Copenhagen (DK) "large"**	**Madrid (ES) "large"** (facilitated)	**Thessaloniki (GR)**	**Vienna (AT)**
BUS		• Address target groups in danger zone • Schools: Create balance	iii Diets design according to population segments		
		Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS	*Ho1 p1 / 3 BUS, fac*		
PUB	• Malnutrition: undernutrition children (elderly, infants)			1. Research focused on food products for population groups with special needs (ex. People with specific allergies or food intolerances):	- diets + demographic change (dynamics at multiple levels)
	Ho1 p1 / 1 PUB, 2 OTH			*Ho1 p1 / 6 PUB*	*Ho2 p1 / 4 PUB*

Table 21: Specific nutrition needs

Food industry

This cluster comprises research demands on the roles of the food industry. There appears to be a certain scepticism among public sector and civil society representatives about the roles the food industry plays.

	Bratislava (SK) (facilitated)	**Copenhagen (DK) "large"**	**Maastricht (NL)**	**Madrid (ES) "large" (facilitated)**
BUS			Competing interests within the food industry	
			Ho2 Sticky N. / 2 -3 BUS	
NPO			- Role of pharmaceutical industry↔ food industry.	
			Ho1 Sticky N. / 2 -3 NPO	
PUB	Food industry Is it missing in the government structure?	• Profit and food • The role of carbohydrate industry in the use of carbohydrates in foods		HEALTH Current Approach and Industry
	Ho1 p2 (1,1) / 3 PUB	*Ho2 p1 / 5 PUB*		*Ho2 p1 / 3 PUB, facil*

Table 22: Food industry

Food Safety

Food safety is a topic repeatedly brought up. It was linked to quality issues, but mostly by private sector and civil society representatives.

	Bratislava (SK) facilitated	**Brussels (BE)**	**Madrid (ES) "large", facilitated**	**Montpellier (FR)**	**Porto (PT)**	**Thessaloniki (GR)**	**Vienna (AT)**
BUS		1) Food Safety	b. Food safety i. Increasing the useful life				Food safety
		Ho2 p1 / 3 BUS1	*Ho1 p1 / 3 BUS*				*Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS*
BUS & NPO						5. Security and quality standards for small scale agricultural production	
						Ho2 p1 / 3 NPO, 3 BUS	
NPO				Processing, preservation, transport, storage, food safety			
				Ho2 p1 / 4 NPO			
PUB	Quality and safety of food		FOOD QUALITY AND SAFETY		- Experimental design/ expiry date and robustness of the results in the prevention of morbidity and mortality		
	Ho1 p2 (1,1) / 3 PUB		*Ho2 p1 / 3 PUB*		*Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB*		
OTH		• Food security: immunology balance					
		Ho1 p1 / 1 PUB, 2 OTH					

Table 23: Food safety

Packaging

Almost all general topics mentioned more than three or four times have been brought up in all three stakeholder categories. Packaging is an exception; mostly private sector representatives showed an interest in this topic.

	Brussels (BE)	**Madrid (ES) "large" (facilitated)**	**Vienna (AT)**
BUS	3) Packaging - Sustainable materials + safe - Smart	ii. Active and smart packaging ii. Communicative packaging	Packaging
	Ho4 p1 / 3 BUS2	*Ho1 p1 / 3 BUS*	*Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS*
PUB		More packaging everyday: Awareness raising Sustainability Pollution smart packaging	
		Ho2 p1 / 3 PUB	

Table 24: Packaging

Genetically modified food

The topic was mentioned in five workshops as a topic of its own, but appears not to have been discussed at length. As is visible in the table below, it cannot be allocated to a specific stakeholder category.

	Ankara (TK)	**Bratislava (SK)** (facilitated)	**Brussels (BE)**	**Copenhagen (DK) "large"**	**Thessaloniki (GR)**
BUS	- Possibility in the entrance of GMO seeds			• GMO	
	Ho2 p1-3 / 9 BUS			*Ho1 p1 (sticky N.)/ 6 BUS*	
NPO		hormones, GMO			
		Ho2 p1 (2,0) fac / 3 NPO, 2 OTH			

PUB			• Genetically Modified Food: consequences, advantages, disadvantages		
			Ho1 p1 / 1 PUB, 2 OTH		
BUS& NPO					7. Genetically Modified Products
					Ho2 p1 / 3 NPO, 3 BUS

Table 25: Genetically modified food

Health conditions: obesity

In three different working group categories and in three different workshops, obesity is mentioned. Interestingly, three quite different causalities are reflected: innate, poverty-driven and communication-related perspectives. Obesity seems to have been more elaborated in the public group in Guildford, which in general tended to more educational approaches. Given the prominence of the topic in public discourses and health campaigns, obesity was mentioned in surprisingly few workshops.

	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	**Guildford (UK)**	**Porto (PT)**
BUS2	• Genetics of obesity		
	Ho3 p1 (notes) / 4 BUS		
NPO			- Relationship between the purchasing power and obesity
			Ho2 p2 / 3 NPO, 2 NtO
PUB		Obesity impact on Diseases – health – benefits Dementia – mixed messages obesity	
		Ho2 p2 (fig. 7) / 3 PUB, 1 BUS	

Table 26: Health conditions: obesity

Food quality

More than the half of the topics which relate to food quality were mentioned by civil society representatives. All groups related food quality to food production.

	Bratislava (SK) (facilitated)	**Copenhagen (DK) "large"**	**Guildford (UK)**	**Madrid (ES) "large" (facilitated)**	**Montpellier (FR)**	**Porto (PT)**
BUS		• Connections between food production (agricultural) systems and nutritional quality				
		Ho3 p1 / 4 BUS				
NPO	Food - quality (difference)			0.1. Monitoring and evaluation of products quality and health claims.	Quality issue What is it? Taste, health, organoleptic, visual, shelf-life, seasonality, organic labels, brands, information towards consumers (labels), preservatives, traceability Whom for? Doctors, consumers, producers, industrialists, retailers	- Nutritional quality of food products
	Ho2 p1 (2,0) fac / 3 NPO, 2 OTH			*Ho3 p1 / 1 NPO, 2 BUS*	*Ho2 p1 / 4 NPO*	*Ho2 p1 / 3 NPO, 2 NtO*
PUB	Quality of food, education		Procurement reduces choice for local, fresh, and quality staples – Food producers – holding back food in a chilled form to keep continuity of availability – leads to poor quality food -			
	Ho1 p2 (1,1) fac / 3 PUB		*Ho2 p1 (fig. 6) / 3 PUB, 1 BUS*			

Table 27: Food quality

Food production

Food production was a topic across all three stakeholder categories, with the private sector mentioning it most often. Most of the private representatives focused on the production processes themselves, while the public sector and civil society representatives seem to have focused mostly on the effects of food processing, in particular on food quality.

	Ankara (TK)	**Bratislava (SK), facilitated**	**Brussels (BE)**	**Copenhagen (DK) "large"**	**Guildford (UK)**	**Madrid (ES) "large", facilitated**	**Maastricht (NL)**	**Montpellier (FR)**	**Porto (PT)**	**Thessaloniki (GR)**	**Vienna (AT)**
BUS	- Lack of quality raw material Production	o Processing technology *Ho2 p1 (2,0) fac /*		• Food engineer *Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS*			- Resistance breeding vegetables and crops. - Optimising biological products, increasing resilience of plants.		2. Optimization of the value-chain by researching costs from production to consumption;	The focus must be on primary production (ex. use of specific cultivating methods and varieties) and not on intervening on the final product as it happens today	Cultivation, production, marketing seeds; applied research
		3 NPO, 2 OTH					*Ho2 Sticky N. / 2 -3 BUS*		*Ho3 p1 / 5 BUS*	*Ho1 p1 / 6 , PUB*	*Ho1 p1 / 6 BUS*
BUS2				• The effect of processing methods							
	Ho2 p1-3 / 9 BUS			*Ho3 p1 / 4 BUS*							
NPO						0.1. Monitoring and evaluation of products quality and health claims.		Quality issue			Seed nutrition Products .....
						Ho3 p1 / 1 NPO, 2 BUS, facil		*Ho2 p1 / 4 NPO*			*Ho3 p1 / 6 NPO*

	Ankara (TK)	Bratislava (SK), facilitated	Brussels (BE)	Copenhagen (DK) "large"	Guildford (UK)	Madrid (ES) "large", facilitated	Maastricht (NL)	Montpellier (FR)	Porto (PT)	Thessaloniki (GR)	Vienna (AT)
PUB			• Food engineering & production: meat manufacturing		Procurement reduces choice for local, fresh, and quality staples – Food producers – holding back food in a chilled form to keep continuity of availability – leads to poor quality food -			Production Raw//processed product			
								Searching for diversity of raw materials			
			Ho1 p1 / 1 PUB, 2 OTH		*Ho2 p1 (fig. 6) / 3 PUB, 1 BUS*			*Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB*			
BUS & NPO										1. How do production processes affect nutritional value of traditionally nutritious foods? 3. Standardization of bee products and inclusion to the Code of foods and drinks	
										Ho2 p1 / 3 NPO, 3 BUS	

Table 28: Food production

Meta level: How to arrive at research topics reflecting societal demands

In addition to listing research topics, some working groups proposed schemes for how to arrive at research topics reflecting societal demands (public and NPO sector representatives) or named criteria for desired research topics (public stakeholders).

	Bratislava (SK) (facilitated)	**Maastricht (NL)**	**Montpellier (FR)**	**Vienna (AT)**
NPO	Collaboration Clusters: (Ministry of regional development) - Slovak Environmental Agency (Ministry of environment) - National Rural Development Network (Ministry of agriculture) - Ministry of Education - Ministry of labour and social affairs - Tourism		! private sector (important funds) could have "perverse" impact on scientific research Involving everyone in research Dialogue structure national/local --> civil society --> institutions --> scientists --> professional organisations Upstream: choice of the subject Downstream: analysis and communication of the results	
	Ho2 p1 (2,0) / 3 NPO, 2 OTH		*Ho2 p2 / 4 NPO*	
PUB		- Triangle of government, industry and science.		* Integration [of] sustainability criteria (Ecology – social issues – economy) ---> Aspects of application ("decsion support tools") * Horizontal [cross-sectional] topics with high innovation potential (e.g. colon health,
		Ho4 Sticky N. / 2 -3 PUB		*Ho2 p1 / 4 PUB*

Table 29: Meta level: How to arrive at research topics reflecting societal demands

As seen above there are only a few common topics brought forward by more than one stakeholder group, but some of them appear to be relatively robust. Recommending certain topics for future investment of public research funds is a sensitive matter, and the question remains on how far stakeholder involvement alone is a method for doing so. As in Series 1, it shows that certain patterns cannot be shaped on the basis of one workshop series only. Topics do re-appear several times and across working groups, but the context may differ. If all 35 workshops are grouped and compared, which will be done in the third workshop report, certain patterns may show up. The variability of the workshop outcomes shows that it may be principally unwise to draw too many conclusions from not reproduced workshops, as is presently often done.

Common topics on research programming

The second task was to be identical in the homogeneous and heterogeneous working groups and referred to worst or best case scenarios concerning the research system. Homogeneous groups discussed worst cases, heterogeneous groups best cases.

> 2) Discussion of ways to organize research funding in this field:
>
> *Define the worst case in research funding in the scope of food and health by naming the main problematic criteria of a Worst Case, following the sections on the flip chart.*
>
> *How should funding NOT be organized? Think about your own experiences and remain as concrete as possible. Take notes on the pre-structured flip chart– and complement the given sections if something important is missing.*
>
> *Best case: How should research and innovation programmes on the development of high-quality, healthy, safe and sustainable food products be organized?*

In the common guidelines a few questions were formulated. For the worst case scenario in the morning a few examples of sub-questions were given to trigger deliberations.

> **a) Decision making on topics/areas/themes:** *e.g.: Who should not decide (alone) on topics of programmes or decide on relevance? How must decisions not be made? In which ways must (which) actors not be involved or must not be forgotten? etc.*
>
> **b) Decision making on project funding:** *e.g.: How should decisions on funding specific research projects not be made? How should reviewers not be selected?*
>
> **c) Quality criteria for funding:** *e.g.: Which scientific or sustainability criteria must not be forgotten? Which criteria would be problematic (at least if standing alone)?*
>
> **d) Exploitation of results:** *e.g.: How should results (not) be used? How should rights or patents not be defined? How would results be hardly accessible?*
>
> **e) Evaluation:** *e.g.: How should evaluation not be organized? Pitfalls of evaluation?*
>
> **f) Project design** *e.g.: What can create barriers for sound sustainable research projects? What can create barriers for sound & sustainable innovation projects (types of cooperation, distribution of roles, administration, budget-tasks-relations, ...)?*
>
> **g) And this is important, too** ...

For the best case scenarios the guiding themes were the same, but the questions were positive ones.

For the analysis of common topics, themes and issues two approaches have been used. The first approach presents common topics as they were mentioned under one of the guiding

discussion topics listed above (as far as discussions followed that scheme). This excludes input not fitting into this scheme. Besides this, participants did not stick closely to the discussion topics. Input on criteria, e.g., can be found in input on other topics, too. To include also all this input, a second approach was applied (analysis 2): looking for common topics across working groups and the guiding questions.

First approach: Analysis along discussion themes

In this section we present the outcomes according to the first approach (analysis 1). For better readability, the worst case items are written in red. The references – the participants' input - on which this analysis is based, are listed in tables under the summarising texts on each guiding discussion theme.

Decision making on topics/areas/themes

Input on this discussion topic partly overlaps with the input on the topic *decision-making on funding*. Stakeholders of all three categories suggested that decisions on topics are made by **involving stakeholders in a bottom-up process** (fourteen groups of all three categories in five workshops). This does not come as a surprise, because stakeholders making themselves heard by participating in such a scenario workshop obviously would like to have a say: for example, as a civil society representative with a social mission, by pursuing economic interest or as a policy maker trying to balance interests. An input contradicting this demand would have been a surprise, of course. Public, civil society and business representatives also strongly demanded **independency and objectivity in decisions on topics** (ten groups of all three categories) with a balance of stakeholder influence on decisions, but here and there participants had different ideas on who should not decide on topics: civil society organizations companies, researchers or single individuals (on each one group of representatives of the private sector) or not only researchers or companies (one group of representatives of the public sector), or not a stakeholder group alone: industry, academia, corporations or public entities (one public group, one from civil society, one of private sector representatives). According to three working groups (two heterogeneous groups and one public group) research topics should derive from societal demand or on a societal challenge. – The challenge stakeholders pointed out, is to organize a credible decision making process on topics, which involve stakeholders in a bottom-up process but do not disadvantage stakeholder groups in favour of others.

Worst case

Thessaloniki	*Worst Case: Decision on Topics*
5. Decisions taken on the research subjects exclusively by funders	Delegates: 6 PUB *Homog. group 1 „Public" / p3*
1. Decisions taken by individuals without relevance to the subject, to exclude consumers, producers, social institutions, and the participation of people or institutions motivated by economic or political reasons.	Delegates: 3 NPO, 3 BUS *Homog. group 2 / p1*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst Case: Decision on Topics*
When research is done just for the research – PR of schools Incompetent contractors	Delegates: 3 PUB *Homog. group 1 „Public" / p1 (1,0)*
" Monoinstitution" + "selforder" - Conflict of interest - it is not multidisciplinary - "About us, without us" - There is no "bottom-up" communication - SMEs do not have financial and professional capacities to formulate the assignment	Delegates: 3 participants *Homog. group 3 "Business" / p3 (3.3)*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst Case: Decision on Topics*
Incorrectly identified needs (KEGA, VEGA – specific grant schemes)	Delegates: 3 NPO, 2 OTH *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit" / p2 (2.1)*
About us – without us	Delegates: 3 participants *Homog. group 3 „Business" / p1 (3.1)*
Copenhagen („large")	*Worst Case: Decision on Topics*
• NGOs • Because of funding • Researchers • Politicians	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p2*
• Avoid researcher only consortia • Don't forget co creation • The universities alone • Avoid topics of no relevance	Delegates: 5 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
• Individuals alone • Private companies alone	Delegates: 4 BUS *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p2*
Guildford	*Worst Case: Decision on Topics*
Food industry – Public organizations – trans national corporations academia political people	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 BUS *Homog. group 2 „Public" / p5 (fig. 10)*
Madrid („large", facilitated group)	*Worst Case: Decision on Topics*
Better objectivity and independency (there is a lack of independency and objectivity) consultants / external assessors	Delegates: 3 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p3*
* Interested decisions (particulars) * Inappropriate training of decision makers * Short trade interest * Due to political reasons	Delegates: 3 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
- Some cases of milk derivatives with a Function not clearly related to health	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p2*
Porto	*Worst Case: Decision on Topics*

- Not grounded in scientific evidence - Independent (political, financial, industrial, economic lobbies) - Ignorance of the Portuguese context (real health threats) - Ignorance of the sustainability - No involvement of the actors	Delegates: 7 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
- Laboratories financed only by food companies and / or agro-chemistry - Food industry - Decisions taken by interests in the above mentioned industry	Delegates: 3 NPO, 2OTH *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p3*
1º Decisions taken by a group that doesn't represent all the interests 2º Healthy products inaccessible 3º Absence of mechanisms that avoid frauds in the food area at all levels.	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p2*
Vienna	*Worst Case: Decision on Topics*
Politics, institutions, solitary decision Leadership on topics	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p2*
- very narrow thematic areas - high self-interest of fundgivers ? ("commissioned research") - mere "confirmation research" (desired results) - high vulnerability for lobbying (monopolists!?) [added during presentation:] - no more open calls	Delegates: 4 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
Lobbying of large enterprises (multinational companies) One-sided, politics	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p2*
Brussels	*Worst Case*
- Create useless needs - GMOs (no consensus)	Delegates: 3 CSOs with business ties *Homog. group 4 " Business 2" / p2*

Table 30: Worst case on decision making on topics/areas/themes

Best case

Madrid („large", facilitated group)	*Best Case: Decision on Topics*
- Transparent public tender (utopia)? With minimum requirements and coherent scale - Selection criteria - Technical Specifications Sheet	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB *Mixed group 1 / p1*
* By relevant people on this area * Independent and impartial	Delegates: 1 BUS, 1 NPO, 1 PUB *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Porto	*Best Case: Decision on Topics*
Increased participation of all actors - Promotion of the competitiveness (tackle regional / national problems) - Impartiality / reliability.	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 1 / p1*
- Participatory, strategic and representative decisions - Specific line of financing (top-down) - Adequate diagnosis for a correct analysis of the needs and adaptation to reality	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 2 / p1*
- Representatives of the different sectors (industrial, agricultural producers, researchers, social groups, environmental organizations and health). National and international environmental institutions. - Development of a national action plan (guidelines): national food inquire + auscultation + WHO	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 3 / p1*

Copenhagen („large“)	*Best Case: Decision on Topics*
• Get relevant topics from potential applicants • Preventive activities instead of treatments • Call for open process about research topics when it focuses on strategic research, then we define the problems to be solved	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p1*
• The research should be based on a problem in the society (a better society) • An research topic should always be raised in problem in society • Should be applicable • Givers / takers	Delegates: 1 PUB, 3 BUS *Mixed group 2 / p1*
• Stakeholders	Delegates: 1 PUB, 4 BUS *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Best Case: Decision on Topics*
- access / information for all - to be able to decide by oneself - bottom up cooperations - professional, independent evaluators	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Participatory Division between calls & topics Strategically relevant / relevant in the long run	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 2 / p1*
- Free choice of topics - Appropriate financing - Open for all disciplinary relevant institutions (or single persons)	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Guildford	*Best Case: Decision on Topics*
- openness to new ideas - longer term planning (+20 years) - future proof approach	Delegates: 4 participants *Mixed group 3 / p2 (fig. 17)*
Montpellier	*Best Case: Decision on Topics*
(1) global understanding -> social science (2) scientific approach (ethical process) -> “hard” science ---> connexion social -“hard” science, systemic approach (3) “observatory” (for long -term follow -up) Prior to the programme definition Consultation and involvement of all stakeholders ---> address issues (stake, objectives, etc.) ??? *	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Thessaloniki	*Best Case: Decision on Topics*
1. Inprofood: The need for research derives from the needs of the civil society	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 1 / p1*
1. Decision making based on a real nutritional need, with the participation on all involved interest groups	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p2*
Thessaloniki	*Best Case: Decision on Topics*
1. The development of research subject derives from extensive dialogue and the participation of social institutions (e.x INKA, Consumers’ institute), organizations working with specific population groups, medical associations, the scientific community, ect.	Delegates: 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 3 / p3*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Best Case: Decision on Topics*

A. suggestions from bottom to top – consultations with ministry - differentiating between basic and applied research - first demand as a starting demand - communication via forum - umbrella organizations (associations, guilds) - they are looking for researchers - revitalization of food industry -> programme - Ministry of Food production (general directorates 12) FUNDING - We could catch up with Finland in 20 years - Link to WHO and EU - Increasing the employment through the involvement of small and medium enterprises - Actors: small and medium enterprises	Delegates: 3 participants *Mixed group 1 / p1 (4.1)*
Actors: small and medium enterprises - associations - Ministries - Transnational corporations - Academic sector Health and environment are at the first place It should be in the interest of state Moral fundamentals of the issue	Delegates: 3 participants *Mixed group 1 / p2 (4.2)*

Table 31: Best case on decision making on topics/areas/themes

Decision making on project funding

As expected, input on this topic focused mostly on review processes. None of the input can be ascribed to one stakeholder category only. Apparently, on a general level there was agreement across stakeholder categories that decision making on funding should be **independent and impartial, without conflicts of interest** (fifteen groups of representatives of all three categories in six workshops), some working groups mentioned **transparency** (seven groups (mixed, private and public sector) in four workshops), **knowledgeable reviewers** (three mixed groups and a group of private sector representatives in two workshops) and a **multidisciplinary setting** (one group of public representatives and three mixed groups in four workshops) or a committee (one mixed group). They demanded an **inclusion of stakeholders** other than researchers, scientists and funders (six mixed groups, one group from civil society, two of the public sector in five workshops), but it was also mentioned that the review process should **not** be **influenced by a dominating stakeholder**, whether it be industry, especially large industry (three NPO, two mixed groups, one public, one private sector group in four workshops) or politics (one NPO, one public sector group in two workshops). Public, civil society and business representatives stressed the importance of having a **perspective on publicly funded research and innovation that is broader than expected economic benefit** (two public sector, two mixed groups, one private sector, one

NPO group in four workshops). Obviously there is some overlapping with the discussion topic *decisions on topics*. Two working groups would like to have a two-round application process; one of the groups proposed that in the first round applications should be made anonymously.

Worst case

Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst Case: Decision on funding*
- Non-existence of continuous research - Only a project – based research - Top – down decision making - Internet portal doesn´t work	Delegates: 3 NPO, 2 OTH *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit" / p2 (2.1) fac*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst Case: Decision on Funding*
B. Wrong distribution of funding Projects selected in advance	Delegates: 3 PUB *Homog. group 3 „Public" / p1 (1,0)*
State: 1 institution – has to be multidisciplinary Private firm Conflict of interests: - nobody is responsible - Monoisntistution + "self –order" - Missing societal request - Transparency - Reality in practice	Delegates: 1 Bus, 2 OTH *Homog. group 3 "Business"/ p1 (3.1)*
B. State order - Academy vs. Reality (business)	Delegates: 1 Bus, 2 OTH *Homog. group 3 „Business" / p3 (3.3)*
Brussels	*Worst Case: Decision on Funding*
- not to agro -food industry - not to organizations with specific interest (e.g. Greenpeace --> only environment)	Delegates: 2 NPO, 1 OTH *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p2*
- Fame >< Real competency - Networking Cryonism	Delegates: 3 CSO with business ties *Homog. group 4 „Business 2" / p2*
Copenhagen („large")	*Worst Case: Decision on Funding*
• Pressure from interest groups • Personal scientific hang up • Researchers	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p2*
• Lack of transparency • Do not put medical society in charge • Avoid political agendas	Delegates: 5 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
• No corruption or friends • Research topics not raised by funder alone	Delegates: 4 BUS *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p2*
Guildford	*Worst Case: Decision on Funding*

- Research funded by Coca-Cola et al - Profit before public health - Driven by shareholders - academic research less and less action based - only quantitative research ignoring qualitative research - no money for research - no champions / advocates - research which favours small scale farming etc. is BURIED by economic interests	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group 1 / p4 (fig. 4)*
Only snapshot – short termism	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit" / p5 (fig. 5)*
Multidisciplinary. (Case studies) public representatives. Dieticians, experts, grass roots, sustainable / slow food movement nutritionists, nurse practitioners – catering department Backing from commercial interests Reviewers Work practise – knowledge in the area Already have proved working elsewhere Anecdotal – think outside the box. Not to fund – pharmaceutical industry people with a commercial interest in food and control a lot of what is produced.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 BUS *Homog. group 2 p5 (fig. 10)*
Knee jerk reactions - Anything without a consultation process.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 BUS *Homog. group 2 p6 (fig. 11)*
a) Corporate food interests and governments alone. b) Collapse of healthy food culture. c) Disenfranchisement of small farmers, peasants – food sovereignty versus food security	Delegates: 3 BUS, *Homog. group 3 p1 (fig. 13)*
Madrid („large", facilitated)	*Worst Case: Decision on Funding*
Few knowledge about evaluated subjects	Delegates: 3 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p3*
* Due to political reasons * Limitations to manage funds in an autonomous way / temporal limitations (public) * Just to fund a single project (With EU – Consortium)	Delegates: 3 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
JUST BASED ON ACCOUNTABILITY AND PROFIT. TOO INFLUENCED BY SPECULATIVE INTERESTS. VIEWERS ARE NOT INDEPENDENT AND TOO LINKED TO SPECIFIC SECTORS	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p2*
Porto	*Worst Case: Decision on Funding*
- Speculation (future) - Control by lobbies - "Fashion" - Lack of critical mass between researchers (competitiveness	Delegates: 7 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
- Only industry (food, agro-chemical, health) - The evaluators having conflict of interests	Delegates: 3 NPO, 2 OTH *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p3*
1. Absence of equity and impartiality in the distribution of funding 2. Commissions of evaluation not impartial / reliable.	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p2*
Vienna	*Worst Case: Decision on Funding*
Restriction of free [independent] research Only entrepreneurial [economic] benefit Restrictions to access, non-transparency	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p2*

- see above *[- very narrow thematic areas **?** - high self-interest of fundgivers - ("commissioned research") **?**- mere "confirmation research" (desired results) **?** - high vulnerability for lobbying (monopolists!?)]* - scattershot - non-transparency - time for decision (> 6 months!)	Delegates: 4 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
Corporations Politics By personal connections Desired results	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p2*
Thessaloniki	*Worst Case: Decision on Funding*
7. Disregarding the potential of each country (e.x the availability of plant varieties), decisions influenced by private interests	Delegates: 6 PUB *Homog. group 3 „Public" / p3*
2. Lack of transparency, concerning funding processes	Delegates: 3 NPO, 3 BUS *Homog. group 2 / p1*

Table 32: Worst case on decision making on funding

Best case

Copenhagen („large")	*Best Case: Decision on Funding*
• To be selected by the takers • Researchers • Companies • Retailers • Stakeholders • Include the European consumers in the decision making on research	Delegates: 1 PUB, 3 BUS *Mixed group 2 / p1*
• Stakeholders	Delegates: 1 PUB, 4 BUS *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Guildford	*Best Case: Decision on Funding*
Democratic selections of who gets **nde* - experts - interest groups - operational experts	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 2 / p2 (fig. 15)*
- universal definitions, simple semantics. - Infographics and dissemination to stakeholders Current: - focus on large scale / - focus on production /- limited stakeholder engagement / - govt and expert led / - Inaccessible / biased studies Best case - all stakeholder have a voice / – national debate --> roles: corporate, civil society, government / - 'crowd sourced' data – (novel ideas) / - holistic view of food growing benefits / grass roots initiated action networking groups / - localised agendas / - tiered focus according to stakeholder	Delegates: 4 participants *Mixed group 3 / p2 (fig. 17)*
1) Independent commissioning involving all major stakeholders – not special / self interest groups. 2) Multidisciplinary 3) Applied – tied in + real life geared to supporting 'food prescriptions' 4) Longitudinal – years not months	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 1 / p1 (fig.18)*
Madrid („large", facilitated)	*Best Case: Decision on Funding*

- Give priority to the most needy - MARKET NEEDS (DEMAND) - NATIONAL INTEREST VS EU INTEREST	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB *Mixed group 1 / p1*
* Experts and competent people * Independent peer review	Delegates: 1 BUS, 1 NPO, 1 PUB *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Montpellier	*Best Case: Decision on Funding*
Random drawing ? selection by the final beneficiaries Transparency Independence of scientists / no interest for 1 specific result	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Involvement of target publics in selection Requirements for industrialists	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 1 / p2*
Porto	*Best Case: Decision on Funding*
- Exempt - Give priority to better methods / procedures - Establish priorities (agenda)	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 1 / p1*
- Evaluators that are independent and of representative sectors - Evaluators with different previous experience / multidisciplinary - Evaluators with experience (seniors)	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 2 / p1*
- Project in accordance to the national action plan - Possibility for evaluators to suggest collaborative fusions of: teams, projects and / or resources - 1st selection according to project without identification of the promoters - Evaluators that are representatives of the different national and international sectors (annual turnover)	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Best Case: Decision on Funding*
- clear criteria	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Predefined criteria HOLISTIC Transparent early (< 6 month) Multi-disciplinary & competent Ethical component Independent evaluation (careful)	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Transparent & comprehensible (Project presentation) Responsible [attitude]	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Thessaloniki	*Best Case: Decision on Funding*
2. Funding with objective terms (scientific knowledge, adequate infrastructure, experience, cost-benefit relationship, innovation)	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 1 / p1*
2. Assessment by a committee based on: • Objective and scientific criteria and the research goals of the country • The quality of the final product, which must correspond to the money invested for its production	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p2*
2. State funding of research programs of Universities or scientific foundations – laboratories	Delegates: 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 3 / p3*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Best Case: Decision on Funding*
B. More sources of funding C. Possibility to patent natural substances / remedies	Delegates: 3 participants *Mixed group 1 / p2 (4.2)*

Health & Food & Public interest 1. Societal request for outcomes 2. Actors: Public institutions (inspection / regulation bodies) Private / commercial sector NPO Associations (producers, distributors, consumers, consultants) Citizen 4. Principles: bottom-up / top-down Multisector Partnerships Communication, publicity, transparency The role of actors 6. Social, economic and environmental aspects – 3x pillars	Delegates: 3 participants *Mixed group 2 / p1 (5.1)*
Research outline A. two-rounds process a. outline + expected outcomes b. elaborating the project B. Market demand Responsibility to return funds SOLIDARITY, EFFECTIVNESS, IMPARTIELANESS	Delegates: 3 participants, *Mixed group 3 / p1 (6.1)*

Table 33: Best case on decision making on funding

Quality criteria for funding

With most topics having been named only once, input on this was quite diverse. None of the input can be ascribed to one of stakeholder category only. Apparently there was agreement across stakeholder categories on a general level. There is some overlapping with other guiding discussion topics such as decisions on funding. Participants mentioned several **general conditions to be fulfilled by funders and/or applicants**. Funding criteria should be clear and credible; applicants should be capable of conducting the research they apply for, but scientific criteria alone are not sufficient. Business and public representatives demanded here and there interdisciplinary research. Generally **a broader focus than on research alone** was considered as reasonable (four mixed, two private sector, two public sector groups in five workshops): either by including economic aspects (mostly mentioned by business and public representatives), social and environmental ones (mentioned by representatives of all stakeholder categories) or a holistic perspective (mentioned by public representatives). Business representatives demanded applicable results.

Worst case

Guildford	*Worst Case: Criteria*
Environmental. Not broader perspective. Clear credibility -	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 BUS *Homog. group 2 / p6 (fig. 11)*
Madrid („large", facilitated group)	*Worst Case: Criteria*
Short adjustment to Market need	Delegates: 3 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p3*

* Trade interest of public use * Subject to proportionality, Member States * Conditioning according to results, research	Delegates: 3 PUB *Homog. group „Public“ / p2*
DECISION CRITERIA ARE NOT CLEAR. LACK OF TRANSPARENCY, PRIORITIES ARE NOT DEFINED. QUALITY CRITERIA WITH NO SCIENTIFIC BASE, UNACHIEVABLE. NOT VIABLE PROJECTS.	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS *Homog. group “Nonprofit" / p2*
Brussels	*Worst Case: Criteria*
- Size of the group Important - Geographical	Delegates: 3 NPO with business ties *Homog. group 4 “Business 2” / p2*
Brussels	*Worst Case*
- Do not share distributed funds only because available - Not only innovative character necessary	Delegates: 3 NPO with business ties *Homog. group 4 “ Business 2” / p2*
Porto	*Worst Case: Criteria*
- Forget: sustainability - environmental; economic; social - Scientific relevance and capacity - Impact in food and health	Delegates: 7 PUB *Homog. group „Public“ / p2*
- Absence of scientific exemption - No respect for ecosystems and environment - Only economic criteria	Delegates: 3 NPO, 2OTH *Homog. group „Nonprofit“ / p3*
1. Funding of research projects with no practical applicability.	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group „Business“ / p2*
Copenhagen („large“)	*Worst Case: Criteria*
• Peer review • Consumer relevance • Commercial interests (problematic)	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business“ / p2*
• Consumer insight • Psychology	Delegates: 5 PUB *Homog. group „Public“ / p2*
• High standard of scientific work • The right scientific approach	Delegates: 4 BUS *Homog. group „Nonprofit“ / p2*
Vienna	*Worst Case: Criteria*
Only measuring and weighting Single criteria	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business“ / p2*
- focus on “excellence principle” - monodisciplinary consortia - no careful evaluation of proposals	Delegates: 4 PUB *Homog. group „Public“ / p2*
Size of fund-receiver Personal connections Administration Fitting into the mainstream Size of the projects	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group „Nonprofit“ / p2*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst Case: Criteria*
C. Availability of information about projects (funding)	Delegates: 3 PUB *Homog. group 1 „Public“ / p1 (1,0)*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst case: Criteria*

B: absence of multi-stakeholder community and focus groups - description of problems - several research methods – absence of triangulation -improper use of research methods -research design E. State as a contractor -> investigator without experience Not the topic required by society – inproper methods, samples, target groups - > outcomes without any use or not available -> without critical feedback	Delegates: 3 participants *Homog. group 3 „Business" / p2 (3.2)*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst case: Criteria*
State / commercial sector / REVOLVING SYSTEM Non-profit sector	Delegates: 3 participants *Mixed group 3 / p1 (6.1)*
Thessaloniki	*Worst case: Criteria*
6. Subjective criteria that only benefit specific groups of people	Delegates: 6 PUB *Homog. group 1 „Public" / p3*
3. Lack of quality criteria (disregarding scientific relevance, technological infrastructure, applicability, ect)	Delegates: 3 NPO, 3 BUS *Homog. group 2 / p1*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst case: Criteria*
- Unfulfilled conditions (experience, financial capacities, international contacts, support) - Sustainability - Start-up´s – (funding for innovations of all types)	Delegates: 3 NPO, 2 OTH *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit" / p2 (2.1)*

Table 34: Worst case on quality criteria for funding

Best case

Guildford	*Best Case: Criteria*
- research should lead to several testable hypothesis - standard research methodology. diagramm	Delegates: 4 participants *Mixed group 3 / p2 (fig. 17)*
Uses media in public engagement ** links between eating well and feeling better ** Bring home urgency of issues Think big – be at scale – e.g. impact	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 1 / p1 (fig.18)*
Madrid („large", facilitated group)	*Best Case: Criteria*
- Industry needs ("business plan") + Final consumer "coherence"	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB Mixed group 1 / p2
* Clear and transparent * Matching Market needs * Not very restrictive / limited programmes * Project availability and transparency	Delegates: 1 BUS, 1 NPO, 1 PUB, Mixed group 3 / p1&2
Montpellier	*Best Case: Criteria*

1) research must offer at least tracks, subjects for improvement Sustainability: - arbitration - time limits - continuum of -- actors - continuous improvement (in parallel with evaluation) - minimum (lower limit) financing - relevance of target - morbidity / mortality indicators project methodology Clearly identified objectives ((2) Interest of professionals, civil society, population Versatility of expertise Multiplicity of actors From research to application Research <-> field	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 1 / p1&2*
Criteria that can ensure Sustainability - financial - taking into account social stakeholders and demands & needs of populations - upstream vs. downstream system: regional experimentation Equity - break down dominant ideas - consider ALL opinions (feeling: lack of listening) Transparency - available publication - popularised public communication -> equity / - scientific evaluation (AERES) including articles and others / - individual / economical interest <--> collective interest Priority criteria (1) sustainable - financing under evaluation conditions - implementing procedures -> harmonisation / / comparison - protecting from change - defining decision taking system - controlling lobbies (2) EU compatible / EU / region - repeatable actions -> themes + methodology process / implementation of actions (3) Smart - National (vs. European) directory of local initiatives (easy to fulfil!!) => validation by this directory / eligibility criteria	Delegates: 3 PUB, 2 NPO *Mixed group 2 / p1&2*
Porto	*Best Case: Criteria*
- Criteria representative of the actors (increased)	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 1 / p1*
- Adequate duration of the projects - Environmental sustainability	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 2 / p1*
- Promoting knowledge - Make use of existent resources - Synergies among researchers / institutions - Team capable of executing the project	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Copenhagen („large“)	*Best Case: Criteria*
• High research quality, novelty value and relevance in the relation to the stated objectives • Efficiency, quality	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p1*
• Interdisciplinarity • Interdisciplinary organization • Cooperation (Theory versus Practice)	Delegates: 1 PUB, 3 BUS *Mixed group 2 / p1*

• Relevance • Originality • Interdisciplinary in some cases • Private enterprise • No patent on natural resources / life	Delegates: 1 PUB, 4 BUS *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Best Case: Criteria*
- applicability - practice ---> relevant	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Holistic perspective Methodically correct (also allowing innovation) Applicability Health / social issues ?	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 2 / p1*
- Objectivity - Rapid decisions - Accessibility of results	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Thessaloniki	*Best Case: Criteria*
3. Excellence of the methodology group	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p2*
3. Experience, relevance, appropriate knowledge, infrastructure, technological know-how	Delegates: 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 3 / p3*

Table 35: Best case on quality criteria for funding

Exploitation of results

Discussions on this topic focused on disseminating research results and on intellectual property rights. Representatives of all three stakeholder categories proposed that **all results should be published** (9 mixed, 4 public sector, 2 private sector groups, 1 NPO group in nine workshops); some of them straightforwardly stated that data should not be hidden, and that there should be non-biased dissemination of results (5 mixed, 2 public sector, 2 private sector groups, 1 NPO group in six workshops). The poster documentation allows the assumption that according to all stakeholder categories dissemination should not be restricted to publishing results in scientific journals, but target a wider public, too. Participants of all stakeholder categories voiced concerns about what they considered as too far-reaching intellectual property rights: **patents on raw materials and genes** were considered as **unacceptable** (two mixed groups, one private sector, one public sector group in two workshops). Stakeholders of all three categories (three mixed, two public sector groups in four workshops) requested targeted dissemination activities.

Worst case

Thessaloniki	*Worst Case - Exploitation of results*
8. To not publish the results and receive feedback	Delegates: 6 PUB *Homog. group 1 „Public" / p3*
4. Use of results: lack of accessibility, 'selective' hiding of data	Delegates: 3 NPO, 3 BUS

	Homog. group 2 / p1
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst Case - Exploitation of results*
- For whom is it important (nobody is interested, public is not interested) - inadequate protection of results	Delegates: 3 NPO, 2 OTH *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit" / p2 (2.1)*
Funding is public but know-how stays in private hands Costs are socialised and profits / benefits are capitalised. If we fund the education from the public sources, we expect it to be public and free	Delegates: 1 BUS, 2 OTH *Homog. group 3 "Business" / p1 (3.1)*
D. Intellectual property plagiarism (theses)	Delegates: 3 PUB, + 1REC *Homog. group 1 „Public" / p1 (1,0)*
Brussels	*Worst Case - Exploitation of results*
- lack of objectivity	Delegates: 2 NPO, 1OTH *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p2*
Brussels	*Worst Case*
- Confidentiality >< Transparency - Publication only if useful - Patent if profit - Prioritize concrete output (ex: pilot) - Do not limit to results +	Delegates: 3 NPO with business ties *Homog. group 4 " Business 2" / p2*
Copenhagen („large")	*Worst Case - Exploitation of results*
• Patents on "life" • State • Talking down to ordinary people • Journals	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p2*
• Include exploitation into research action • Use open domain publication • Communication starts in "wanted effects"	Delegates: 5 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
• Not end up in the researcher's computer • Not in black and white • Not closed communication within the researcher's "world"	Delegates: 4 BUS *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p2*
Guildford	*Worst Case - Exploitation of results*
- not publishing potentially beneficial research – CHERRY PICKING - data incomprehensible to stakeholders research not available to practitioners stays inaccessible only to academic community and not general public Industry makes / steers PUBLIC POLICY no press / marketing of research – keep public in dark Govt (government) takes no action despite research agenda saying other things Stakeholders rebel IGNORE GOOD DATA	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit" / p4 &5 (fig. 4&5)*
How are the reviews not to be used exploitation of research the way the media reports the results not reporting on the failings not giving the full picture not getting the info out to the right people to make changes.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 BUS *Homog. group 2 „Public" / p6 (fig. 11)*

One size fits all.	
Maastricht	*Worst Case: Exploitation of Results*
- Accessible for limited group of people. - Accessible for researchers; abuse of research data. - Abuse of data.	*Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit" / p1*
- Not only the person who found the result, is allowed to use it. - No patent. - Communication should not be done by researchers, people from practice speak the right language. - Not too much theory, too much information is suitable.	*Homog. group 2 „Business A" / p1*
- Approve research of similar projects. - They study local products from Limburg.	*Homog. group 3 „Business B" / p1*
- Societal relevance and applicability via marketing methodology. - „Product"=tangible, but can also be not tangible (e.g. cooperation).	*Homog. group 4 „Public" / p1*
Madrid („large", facilitated group)	*Worst Case - Exploitation of results*
Short transparency in spreading results	Delegates: 3 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p3*
* Lack of links among research and business * Lack of links among research and consumer * Not using of patents as a result from research of public body	Delegates: 3 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
NOT CLEAR RESULTS EXPLOITATION, AND WITH SPECULATIVE INTERESTS. NON ACCESSIBLE (PATENTS EXPIRATION DATE TOO SHORT OR TOO LONG) LACK OF COMMUNICATION OF RESULTS TO THE POPULATION	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p3*
Porto	*Worst Case - Exploitation of results*
- Patenting genes - Not publish results (positive or negative) (scientific community and population in general) - Inaccessibility of the data - Inexistence of policies for data usage - Inefficiency / delay - Communication / adaptation; "de-codification" of competences (for education for health); knowledge ? behaviour.	Delegates: 7 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p3*
- Results used only for the benefit of companies - Patents about raw materials and goods essential for life - Absence of circulation of information - Deficient information, biased and not trustworthy	Delegates: 3 NPO, 2OTH *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p4*
1. Absence of sharing of results (bad management of information) 2. Manipulation of results according to vested interests.	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p3*
Vienna	*Worst Case - Exploitation of results*
Unpublished, (transparency)	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p2*
Exclusive exploitation rights	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business" / p3*
- de-linking from potential users (language, media, ...) - see: topics *[See input on decision on topics]* - drawer	Delegates: 4 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p3*
No exploitation / making public	Delegates: 6 NPO

Only useful for / accessible to special enterprises Undesired results disappear	*Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p3*

Table 36: Worst case on the exploitation of results

Best case

Copenhagen („large")	*Best Case - Exploitation of results*
• Peer reviewed scientific journals • Popular articles in relevant media • Internet pages	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p1*
• Choose the strongest communicator to leader • Compete for implementation money	Delegates: 1 PUB, 3 BUS *Mixed group 2 / p1*
• Direct to "S H" (stakeholder)	Delegates: 1 PUB, 4 BUS *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Guildford	*Best Case - Exploitation of results*
[diagramm] - terminology - definitions - infographics and dissemination – research methodology Policy and action - recommendations - policy - social value act	Delegates: 4 participants *Mixed group 3 / p1 (fig. 16)*
Maastricht	*Best Case: Exploitation of Results*
- Regardless of outcome. - Effects on long term. - Communication (who). - By all means the financer.	*Mixed group 1 / p1*
- The common devisor ? people/athletes/patients.	*Mixed group 2 / p1*
Madrid („large", facilitated group)	*Best Case - Exploitation of results*
- Evaluate "innovation return within SMES"	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB *Mixed group 1 / p2*
Publication Social impact	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p1*
* Availability according to social contribution. * In the previous agreement results spreading policy should be established.	Delegates: 1 BUS, 1 NPO, 1 PUB *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Montpellier	*Best Case - Exploitation of results*
--> sharing results / methods as much as possible	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 3 / p4*
Porto	*Best Case - Exploitation of results*
- Disseminate knowledge - Re-financing research that have brought / generated an added-value	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 1 / p2*
- An 'agency' of communication of results - Do not patent natural resources	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 2 / p2*
- In all phases of research, all stakeholders should be present (meetings, workshops)	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Thessaloniki	*Best Case - Exploitation of results*
3. Appropriate application of research results (e.x by applying consumer and market based research)	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 1*
4. Publishing of results. Production of innovative products that benefit the end user	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 2*
4. Dissemination, transparency, accessibility, informing / educating at least those concerned with the subject and develop the research	Delegates: 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 3*

– controlling commercials / marketing 7. Dissemination of information and education of the civil society on nutritional best practices.	
Vienna	*Best Case - Exploitation of results*
- user oriented preparation - follow-up projects - accessible	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p2*
Making public in different media (easily accessible, dissemination) Compatible (application & scientifical)	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 2 / p2*
-> Public availability of all results -> (Popular scientific exploitation)	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 3 / p2*

Table 37: Best case on the exploitation of results

Evaluation

This topic was understood as evaluation of research proposals and research programmes. **Independence of evaluators/reviewers** – no conflict of interest, etc. – was a point raised several times (2 public sector, 3 mixed groups, 1 business group in four workshops). Most demands were made only twice or once, covering a spectra from taking into account ethical issues, capability of reviewers, criticism of focusing on excellence alone, making evaluation reports public, and comprehensible proposals to administrative issues. Evaluation and review were also discussed under other guiding discussion themes. The analysis across these themes allowed for a more detailed assessment of stakeholder views on evaluation.

Worst case

Guildford	*Worst Case: Evaluation*
All the same people – biased to the same approach - but nothing can get decided - only looking at one side	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 BUS *Homog. group 2 „Public“ / p7 (fig. 12)*
Madrid („large“, facilitated)	*Worst Case: Evaluation*
Short involvement in real evaluation Contradictory and irrelevant criteria.	Delegates: 3 BUS *Homog. group “Business” / p3*
Interest / conflict Lack of monitoring medium / long term Lack of importance (promotion)	Delegates: 3 PUB *Homog. group „Public“ / p2*
WITH SPECULATIVE INTERESTS	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS *Homog. group „Nonprofit“ / p3*
Porto	*Worst Case: Evaluation*
- Not taking into account the relation between the cost-and the scientific or sustainability benefit - Not taking into account previous results	Delegates: 7 PUB *Homog. group „Public“ / p3*
- Without the participation of the stakeholders - Merely for economic interests	Delegates: 3 NPO, 2 OTH *Homog. group „Nonprofit“ / p4*
1. Lack of representatively and competence of the evaluation commission. 2. Lack of verification of the research outputs.	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group “Business” / p3*
Copenhagen („large“)	*Worst Case: Evaluation*

• Internal or narrow-spectra interests • Not by the researchers	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group "Business" / p2*
• Citizen's participation	Delegates: 5 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p2*
• Not too detailed • Not by unprofessionals	Delegates: 4 BUS *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p2*
Vienna	*Worst Case: Evaluation*
No evaluation, the same funding department Not published [Valuing] judgements ("good" – "bad")	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group "Business" / p3*
- criteria are determined retrospectively - exclusive focussing on "scientific excellence", not regarding societal benefit - only "benchmarking"	Delegates: 4 PUB *Homog. group „Public" / p3*
Administratively elaborated? Evaluation by competitors, corporations	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group „Nonprofit" / p3*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst Case: Evaluation*
Bureaucracy Missing bottom – up communication - research needs - SMEs don't have a capacities – neither financial nor personal	Delegates: 3 participants, 1 *Homog. group 3 „Business" / p2 (3.2)*
Thessaloniki	*Worst Case: Evaluation*
9. Do not "calculate" the cost-benefit factor and the needs of the end consumer	Delegates: 6 PUB *Homog. group 1 „Public" / p3*
5. Evaluation by non-independent international and national institutions	Delegates: 3 NPO, 3 BUS *Homog. group 2 / p1*
Montpellier	*Worst Case: Evaluation*
Support --->Evaluation and evaluators*	Delegates: 2 BUS *Homog. group "Business" / p3*

Table 38: Worst case on evaluation

Best case

Madrid („large", facilitated)	*Best Case: Evaluation*
- Coherent criteria to select "OFFICER" - Ethics, prepared, with full knowledge	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB *Mixed group 1 / p2*
* To simplify scientific evaluation process * Project monitoring (2-3 years) medium term	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p1*
* Clear, relevant, consistent and contradictions free criteria. * Compulsory Ethic code * Evaluation feedback and communication channel	Delegates: 1 BUS, 1 NPO, 1 PUB *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Montpellier	*Best Case: Evaluation*
Institutional mechanisms: - internal => ethics, quality, audit, control, evaluation, "human" management	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 3 / p3*
- downstream evaluation / consultation by / of all partners	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 3 / p4*
Porto	*Best Case: Evaluation*
- Adequate the results obtained with the end-goals - External	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 1 / p2*
- Fulfilling the goals - Financial execution - Fulfilling the plan - Sustainability of the project (always that it is possible)	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 2 / p2*

1. evaluation in each phase of the project 2. final evaluation both 1. and 2. having a final weight on the evaluation of a possible follow-up project	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Copenhagen („large“)	*Best Case: Evaluation*
• Expert group and a broad group (government, university, private sector)	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p1*
• Include the consumers in the evaluation • In principle everybody should be able to understand	Delegates: 1 PUB, 3 BUS *Mixed group 2 / p1*
• Stakeholders	Delegates: 1 PUB, 4 BUS *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Best Case: Evaluation*
- see quality criteria - at the beginning accorded agreements are valid during the whole project (no changing at the end)	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p2*
MUST Pre-defined criteria ---------- use of results Transparent Independent / published	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 2 / p2*
-> Must take place	2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Thessaloniki	*Best Case: Evaluation*
4. Objective assessment of results (with the participation of many evaluators, transnational assessment, interdisciplinary assessment, point system, qualitative & quantitative criteria)	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 1 / p1*
5. Publishing in scientific journals. Cost-benefit (to make up for the investment money)	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p2*
5. Assessment of the produced product by certified organizations 6. Assessment of academic research based on methodology & internationally recognized scientific criteria MX3 *p2*	Delegates: 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 3 / p3*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Best Case: Evaluation*
- Set of evaluation criteria ?	Delegates: 3 participants *Mixed group 3 / p1 (6.1)*

Table 39: Best case on evaluation

Project design

This topic was not a dominating one in the discussions, and common topics are hard to find. Several times a suggestion was made to reduce administrative tasks by reducing the number of reports, making or demanding less detailed specifications; in short: in two workshops 6 working groups including all stakeholder categories demanded **less bureaucratic project monitoring**. From the input it cannot be said if this demand applies to national projects and/or projects funded under a European programme. Participants also demanded broader call topics (1 NPO, 1 mixed group in 2 workshops). A human resources issue was mentioned twice (by business and public representatives): All partners should be involved as active ones. The following issues fitting better to another guiding topic were mentioned (almost always only once): results should not be privately owned only (by business representatives), applicants should have sufficient knowledge and means for conducting the proposed research project (by public representative), grant sufficient funds (by public and business representatives), and grant long-term funding, not only on a project (a mixed group).

Best case

Guildford	*Best Case: Research Design*
Inclusive ---> roles in dissemination and action - civil society - all-scale farmers - corporate - government local and central Research steering board	Delegates: 4 participants *Mixed group 3 / p1 (fig. 16)*
Madrid („large", facilitated group)	*Best Case: Research Design*
- Mixed groups willing to work together and create synergy - With no particular interests	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB *Mixed group 1 / p3*
Wider calls * Less ambitious * Calls simplification (specialized companies to ask for projects)	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p1*
* All partners should take part in design (right and duty) * To create opportunities to look for a most suitable partner * Quality and design, relevant proposal * According to programme criteria * Tight and viable budget.	Delegates: 1 BUS, 1 NPO, 1 PUB *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Copenhagen („large")	*Best Case: Research Design*
• Balance between the absence of bureaucracy and the relevance of the research • Too detailed e.g. from funders • Too many reports	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p1*
• Knowledge is not missing – intervention to influence via nudging • Structures leading to unhealthy food choices • Nature or nurture? • Adolescents' availability to healthy food • How are children' food habits created • Politic • Make the politicians to ???	Delegates: 1 PUB, 3 BUS *Mixed group 2 / p1*

• A happy few	Delegates: 1 PUB, 4 BUS *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Maastricht	*Best Case: Research Design*
- SMART - Applied (applicable) science based on goal/ end product - go/no-go decisions	*Mixed group 1 / p1*
Vienna	*Best Case: Research Design*
- no own resources - lump sum accounting - continuity of expertise	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p2*
Project manager provided for SMEs Participatory proportionality Consortia not too big	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 2 / p2*
- Inter- and trans-disciplinary teams - Flat rate [funding of] costs	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Thessaloniki	*Best Case: Research Design*
6. Recruitment of an appropriate scientific committee with all required specialties and tools.	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 BUS, 2 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p2*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Best Case: Research Design*
5. Funding – long-term sustainability Who will be the coordinator of the project	Delegates: 3 participants *Mixed group 2 / p1 (5.1)*
Grant scheme Tripartity	Delegates: 3 participants *Mixed group 3 / p1 (6.1)*

Table 40: Best case on project design

Worst case

Madrid („large“, facilitated group)	*Worst Case: Research Design*
- Lack of active participation of all the partners - Lack of involvement in main objective	Delegates: 3 BUS *Homog. group „Business“ / p4*
- Lack of FUNDS - LOW QUALITY DESIGN - UNBALANCED QUOTATION - NON VIABLE OR NON PROFITABLE PRODUCT	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS *Homog. group „Nonprofit“ / p3*
Copenhagen („large“)	*Worst Case: Research Design*
• Ideology agriculture business • “Up in time” • Many partners	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business“ / p2*
• No single discipline in charge • Include practitioners with the hard core scientists	Delegates: 5 PUB *Homog. group „Public“ / p2*
• Privately owned results	Delegates: 4 BUS *Homog. group „Nonprofit“ / p2*
Maastricht	*Worst Case: Research Design*
- Exclusion of users. - Necessary use of specific nutrition. - Impossible for certain groups (financially).	*Homog. group „Nonprofit“, Ho1 p1*
- Not only by scientists: also involve people from business in set-up and execution.	*Homog. group 2 „Business A“ / p1*
- Complex bureaucracy for starting projects.	*Homog. group 3 „Business B“ / p1*
- Lack of cohesion. - „Together“is about money, not about end product or goal. - „The bigger the better“is not matching with creating synergy. - No space for „organically“ arising projects or networks.	*Homog. group „Public“ Ho4 p1*
Vienna	*Worst Case: Research Design*

As it is now (bureaucracy, organization) Only national or regional	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business“ / p3*
- consortium: In conformity with the call, disinterested - uncoordinated procedures at different fund givers - high proportion of self-funding necessary	Delegates: 4 PUB *Homog. group „Public“ / p3*
Frame too narrow Thematic presetting (methodical presetting) Exertion of influence? Large administrative expenditure?	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group „Nonprofit“ / p3*
Thessaloniki	*Worst Case: Research Design*
10. Design: insufficient infrastructures and knowledge	Delegates: 6 PUB ***Homog. group 3 „Public“ /** p3*
6. Design: Intervention of funding agency on the scientific processes.	Delegates: 3 NPO, 3 BUS *Group 2 p1*

Table 41: Worst case on project design

And this is important, too

Also input on the last guiding topic for discussion saw a large diversity. Almost all input on this has been mentioned only once. Altogether, as expected, there was not very much input on this topic, from some groups even none. Some of it mirrors input on other discussion topics, especially the discussions on project design. Across the stakeholder categories, participants listed under this topic what they consider as **very basic conditions** – money and time -, **frustrating experiences** – dissatisfying application and evaluation processes, too little time for conducting research, career issues of young researchers - or important **“soft factors” making research worthwhile** – fun and recognition. Maybe some stakeholders witness a too strong focus on large scale projects: some participants demanded funding of small scale projects, too.

Worst case

Madrid („large“, facilitated)	*Worst Case – And this is important, too*
- Well defined topics	Delegates: 3 BUS *Homog. group „Business“ / p4*
Bratislava (facilitated)	*Worst Case – And this is important, too*
- All follow their own interests without thinking about the impacts of their activities	Delegates: 3 participants *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p1 (3.1)*
Madrid („large“, facilitated group)	*Worst Case – And this is important, too*
- Lack of interlocutor in case of doubts, suggestions and claims	Delegates: 3 BUS *Homog. group „Business“ / p4*

Vienna	*Worst Case – And this is important, too*
Remaining unheard (Society); Research without consequences	Delegates: 6 BUS *Homog. group „Business“ / p3*
- too narrow time frame (especially no forerun and follow-up phase) - unrealistic work and budget plan	Delegates: 4 PUB *Homog. group „Public“ / p3*
Redundancies Access to funding only for big players	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group „Nonprofit“ / p3*
Porto	*Worst Case- Other*
- Lack of money - Natural / artificial catastrophes - Absence of strategies that are independent of the political actors - Lack of cooperation / mobility of human resources	Delegates: 7 PUB *Homog. group „Public“ / p3*
- Selective funding - Doubt regarding innovation - Bureaucracy - Absence of the definition of a goal regarding the population	Delegates: 3 NPO, 2OTH *Homog. group „Nonprofit“ / p4*
1. Excess of bureaucracy 2. Absence of a rigorous map of needs regarding new knowledge / research	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group „Business“ / p3*

Table 42: Worst case on other important issues

Best case

Madrid („large“, facilitated)	*Best Case – And this is important, too*
- Open funding lines - Claim process / application reviews denied - With well based justification	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB *Mixed group 1 / p3*
Vienna	*Best Case – And this is important, too*
- financing / preparation of results	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS *Mixed group 1 / p2*
MONEY TIME Small project schemes for all (NGOs, ...) *)	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 2 / p2*
- Appreciation - Fun - Funding of phasing out and new funding?	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 BUS, 2 NPO *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Madrid („large“, facilitated group)	*Best Case – Other*
* More relationship among similar projects (BBOO Access)	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Porto	*Best Case – Other*
- Generate critical mass - Manage knowledge	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 1 / p2*
- Environmental, social and economic sustainability - New areas (association of the consumption of autochthonous products to health)	Delegates: 6 participants *Mixed group 2 / p2*

- Development of new production techniques (environmental economic sustainability) - Development of new products (bioactive) - Identification of bioactive compounds and its metabolic relevance and safety. - New methodologies for evaluation of ingestion	Delegates: 5 participants *Mixed group 3 / p2*

Table 43: Best case on other important issues

Second approach: Analysis across discussion themes

In this section we present the outcomes according to the second approach (analysis 2). The references on which this analysis is based on are listed in footnotes.

Broad involvement of stakeholders, citizens, policy makers and experts instead of power accumulation

Many different working groups expressed that society at large can benefit from research agendas building on a *broad range of interests.*

Still, a "broad range" is *often not further specified.* When working groups actually do specify, which types of organizations/actors/stakeholders would constitute this broad involvement, and if they are compared, then different understandings of what should ideally consist of a broad range of organizations become visible. In the context of this broad range/broad involvement of interests/stakeholders is becoming a mantra in modern policy making, and in the context of the consequences on science and research at large, diverging interpretations give some reason for concern. Also the question of who actually is meant to be involved in policy making , but depicted as an ideal, not only in the workshops, but seemingly has become a part of modern policy making. A closer look at the different working group results reveals that it can mean something completely different to different people.

What comes up very clearly is that *power accumulation* is perceived as most harmful by different actors. Across several working groups in different regions this topic is given high importance.

As in the first series of workshops, in general terms, quite different groups deem involving a broad range of interest groups or stakeholders as principally desirable, but how this “broad range” could be defined is seldom specified or only rough target groups are given. The same holds true for the often desired trans-, multi- and interdisciplinarity.

What could be an acceptable broad range of stakeholders, areas, actors, disciplines, experts, professionals, players, interests or other characteristics is an unsolved question that could provide a basis for several research projects and public policy discussions. On the one hand, diversity seems to have become a common vision, but a vision that seems widely open to an equally broad range of interpretations.

Broadening the range of actors in decision-making on funding was considered to be an option for getting a broader perspective, sometimes even a more practical one: by involving reviewers from several scientific disciplines (multi-disciplinarity)[24], policy makers[25], civil society[26], citizens and consumers[27], people with practical expertise in the field[28], and a diversity of private sector representatives[29].

In the 2nd workshops in France, Greece and the United Kingdom, for example, participants asked for a systematised, more inclusive approach in research programming. The British participants asked for "independent commissioning involving all major stakeholders", without "special/self interest groups" by a representative steering board.[30] In Greece participants suggested the engagement of "all interest groups" in a dialogue on research programming on food and health.[31] Going beyond a stakeholder approach, in France participants asked that *all* opinions should be considered and that the population's needs should be analysed before commissioning research.[32]

[24] VIENNA: W2/**Multi-disciplinary & competent /**MIX2 Poster 1/Best Case/2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
Guildford: W2/**Multidisciplinary. (Case studies) public representatives./**figure10/Worst Case/3PUB 1BUS
FR_EASW2/**---> multidisciplinary teams /**MIX3 poster 2/Best Case/2PUB 1NPO 1BUS
Guildford: W2/ **Multidisciplinary/**MIX1 figure18/Best Case/1PUB 1BUS 2NPO 1BoP
[25] Guildford: W2/**government local and central/**/MIX3 figure16/Best Case**/**1PUB 1BUS 2NPO 1BoP
[26] Guildford: W2/ **civil society/**MIX3 figure16/Best Case**/**1PUB 1BUS 2NPO 1BoP
[27] Copenhagen: W2/ **Citizen's participation/**Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case**/**5PUB
Copenhagen: W2/ **Include the consumers in the evaluation/**MIX2 poster 1/Best Case/1PUB 3BUS
[28] Guildford: W2/**Work practise – knowledge in the area**/HOM2 figure10/3PUB 1BUS
Guildford: W2/Who should organise funding on research?/**Dieticians, experts, grass roots, sustainable/ slow food movement/ / nutritionists, nurse practitioners – catering department**/Hom2 figure10/3PUB 1BUS
[29] Copenhagen: W2/ **Companies / Retailers/**/MIX2 poster 1/Best Case**/**1PUB 3BUS
Guildford: W2/ **all-scale farmers / corporate**/MIX3 figure16/Best Case/1PUB 1BUS 2NPO 1BoP
[30] Guildford: W2/**Independent commissioning involving all major stakeholders – not special/ self interest groups**./MIX1 figure18/Best Case/1PUB 1BUS 2NPO 1BoP
Guildford: W2/ - **limited stakeholder engagement**/MIX3 figure17/Best Case/1BUS 2 NPO 1BoP
Guildford: W2/ - **all stakeholder have a voice – national debate roles: corporate, civil society,** /MIX3 figure17/Best Case/1BUS 2 NPO 1BoP
Guildford: W2/ - **representative steering board**/MIX3/ figure17/Best Case/1BUS 2 NPO 1BoP
[31] GR_EASW2/ **1. Decision making based on a real nutritional need, with the participation on all involved interest groups**/MIX1 poster 2
GR_EASW2/ **1. The development of research subject derives from extensive dialogue and the participation of social institutions (e.g INKA, Consumers' institute), organizations working with specific population groups, medical associations, the scientific community, ect./**MIX1 poster 3
[32] FR_EASW2/ **- consider ALL opinions (feeling: lack of listening)** /MIX2 poster 1/Best Case/3PUB 2NPO

Thinking out of the box and a more systemic view

As in the 1st workshop series, also in the second one, participants identified the preference for fashionable topics and approaches as innovation barriers.[33] A more diverse decision-making is considered as a kind of insurance against one-sidedness, in terms of scientific approaches[34], "ideology" (read: "environmental sustainability"),[35] political agendas[36] or private interests[37]. And it may contribute to a more systemic view on food and health. In several workshops participants demanded a more systemic or holistic view on food and health by putting this research area into a broader context of social and environmental issues.[38]

FR_EASW2/**Consultation and involvement of all stakeholders /**MIX3 poster 1/Best Case**/**2PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW2/ **---> address issues (stake, objectives, etc.) ??? * /**MIX3 poster 1/Best Case**/**2PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW2/ **- taking into account social stakeholders and demands & needs of populations /**MIX2 poster 1/Best Case**/**3PUB 2NPO
FR_EASW2/**2- Perception by target populations or consumers -> preliminary analysis of needs and stakeholders /**Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case**/**2BUS

[33] Porto: W2//**- "Fashion"/**Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case**/**7PUB
VIENNA: W2/1949/**Fitting into the mainstream /**Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case/6NPO

[34] Guildford: W2/**All the same people – biased to the same approach** -/figure12/Worst Case/3PUB 1BUS

[35] BE_EASW2/ **Overly ideological thinking lacks: pragmatism, practicality, people aspect / experts and researchers one ideology** /Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case

[36] Copenhagen: W2/• **Avoid political agendas/**Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case/5PUB

[37] Porto: W2/- **Control by lobbies**/Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/7PUB
BE_EASW2/*Worst Case/***Solely beneficial to one stakeholder (independent vs. interdependent) (parasitical) /**Hom1 poster 2

[38] Guildford: W2/ **Food production VS wider 'therapeutic' agenda./** MIX3 figure17/Best Case**/**1BUS 2 NPO 1(BUS or PUB)
Guildford: W2/ **Link – enviro, health etc. / holistic approach / provide joined up thinking./** MIX2 figure14/Best Case**/**1PUB 1BUS 2NPO 1BoP
Guildford: W2/ **holistic view of food growing benefits/**MIX3/figure17/Best Case**/**1BUS 2 NPO 1BoP
Porto: W2/ **- Environmental sustainability/**MIX2 poster 1/Best Case/2PUB 2NoO 2BUS
VIENNA: W2/ **Holistic perspective /**MIX2 Poster 1/Best Case/2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
VIENNA: W2/ **Health/ social issues ← /**MIX2 Poster 1/Best Case**/**2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
Guildford: W2/ **Environmental. Not broader perspective./**figure11/Worst Case/3PUB 1PtB
Porto: W2/**-Forget: sustainability - environmental; economic; social/**Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/7PUB
Porto: W2/ **No respect for ecosystems and environment/**Hom2 poster 3/Worst Case/3NPO 2OTH
VIENNA: W2/ **Holistic perspective /**MIX2 Poster 1/Best Case/2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
BE_EASW2/ **sectional divisions in research: not holistic, comprehensive, not considering entire chain** / Worst Case /Hom1 poster 2 / 1PUB 2OTH

Mostly, the influence of large industry or single private interests is deplored

Dominance of large industry is named most often as a huge problem in different workshops and even if the participant characteristics do not match. This problem comes up in all stakeholder categories. Partly this unanimous objection against appropriation of science and research policy by big industry is even shared in workshops with strong business dominance. Exceptions we found were in workshops where participants came from organizations in which large industries were strongly involved.

Societal relevance of research and innovation was a big issue in the workshops. Apart from representatives of corporations, also in workshops seeing a strong representation of the private sector, private interests were considered as going against this goal and requiring some societal balancing.[39] As the report of the 2nd workshop in Belgium says, one participant put it this way: "Innovation is important, but not all innovative products are a need:

[39] Guildford: W2/**Backing from commercial interests**/figure10/Worst Case/3PUB 1PtB
Guildford: W2/**Not to fund – pharmaceutical industry / people with a commercial interest in food and control a lot of what is produced**/HOM2 figure 11/Worst Case/3PUB 1PtB
Guildford: W2/**Research funded by Coca-Cola et al/**figure4/Worst Case/6NPO
Guildford: W2/**Profit before public health/**figure4/Worst Case/6NPO
Guildford: W2/**Driven by shareholders/**figure4/Worst Case/6NPO
Guildford: W2/**Corporate food interests and governments alone./**figure13/Worst Case**/**3BUS
BE_EASW2/**Funding Criteria - Predominantly economic (impact: GMO's)** /Worst Case/Hom1 poster 2/1PUB 2OTH
VIENNA: W2/**Only entrepreneurial [economic] benefit /**Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/6BUS
VIENNA: W2/**Corporations /**Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case**/**6NPO
Guildford: W2/**exploitation of research/**figure11/Worst Case/3PUB 1PtB
Porto: W2/**Results used only for the benefit of companies/**Hom2 poster 4/Worst Case**/**3NPO 2OTH
VIENNA: W2/**Only useful for/accessible to special enterprises /**Hom3 poster 3/Worst Case**/**6NPO
FR_EASW2/ **individual/economical interest <--> collective interest /**MIX2 poster 1/Best Case**/**3PUB 2NPO
FR_EASW2/ **!! Do not let money drive the project /**MIX3 poster 3/Best Case**/**2PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW2/**Selection criteria: Collective impact <--> individual impact /**Hom3 poster 5/Worst Case**/**2BUS
Copenhagen: W2/ **Commercial interests (problematic)/**Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case**/**6BUS
Copenhagen: W2/*explanation to poster 2, Hom3/***Being useful for the whole society, the companies and people out there (Not just the research world)/**Worst Case/4BUS
Porto: W2/ **- Merely for economic interests** /Hom2 poster 4/Worst Case/3NPO 2OTH
Copenhagen: W2/**Pressure from interest groups**/Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/6BUS
NL_EASW2/Decision on Topics / **The social interest should be most important, the power of money should not overrule this: the themes researched should be based on societal demands**./MX1
TK_EASW2/Best Case/**Producing food alternatives prioritizing health rather than economical expectations**/MIX2 poster 1-4/PUB
TK_EASW2/Best Case/**Lessen Bureaucratic workload for especially private sector**/MIX3 poster 1-5/PUB

innovation should not prevail over real necessity."[40]

Politics as interference in the independence of research

Independence of research is held high. So it is not surprising that mere political decision making is rejected by many participants on the basis of the notion that politics should not be allowed to interfere in decisions on research nor must research be used for political gain.[41]

Independent committees, boards and panels

Many working groups note that they would rather have decisions made by intelligently assembled advisory boards, commissions or committees and decidedly not by small groups of (powerful) individuals or even single persons.

Working groups – as far they were dealing with the given research policy questions – consented that such boards, commissions or panels need to be *independent*[42] and it is emphasized that members must have *no conflicts of interests*[43]. Several working groups want to see *mixed expertise and backgrounds* in these consulting or decision making groups.

[40] BE_EASW2/explanation to Homogeneous group 4, poster 2, 3BUS

[41] ES_MERGE/ * Due to political reasons/Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case/3PUB+1FAC
DK_EASW2/• Avoid political agendas/Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case/5PUB
AT_EASW2/• Decision on funding/Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case/6NPO
PT_EASW2/- Independent (political, financial, industrial, economic lobbies)/Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/7PUB
AT_EASW2/Politics, institutions, solitary decision /Worst Case/Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/6BUS
AT_EASW2/One-sided, politics/Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case/6NPO
DK_EASW2/• Make the politicians to ???/MIX2 poster 1/Best Case/1PUB 3BUS
PT_EASW2/- Absence of strategies that are independent of the political actors/Hom1 poster 3/Worst Case/7PUB

[42] ES_EASW2/* **Independent peer review** /MIX3 poster 1/Best Case/1BUS 1NPO 1PUB facil
VIENNA: W2/**Independent evaluation (careful) /**MIX2 Poster 1/Best Case/2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
FR_EASW2/*Best Case/***Independence of scientists/ no interest for 1 specific result** /MIX1 poster 1/Best Case**/**2PUB 1NPO 1BUS
ES_EASW2/ *** Independent and impartial /**MIX3 poster 1/Best Case**/1BUS 1NPO 1PUB + 1FAC**
Copenhagen: W2/*explanation to poster 1MIX3 posters/* **Independent reviewers/**Best Case/1PUB 4BUS
GR_EASW2/ **5. Evaluation by non-independent international and national institutions** /Worst Case**/**GRU2 poster 1
ES_EASW2/**VIEWERS ARE NOT INDEPENDENT AND TOO LINKED TO SPECIFIC SECTORS. /**Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case**/**1NPO 2BUS facilitated
Porto: W2/ **Evaluators that are independent and of representative sectors**/MIX2 poster 1/Best Case/2PUB 2NoO 2BUS

[43] Porto: W2/ **The evaluators having conflict of interests**/Hom2 poster 3/Worst Case/3NPO 2OTH
ES_EASW2/**Interest/conflict /**Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case/3PUB + 1FAC
Porto: W2/**2º Commissions of evaluation not impartial/reliable./**Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case**/**5BUS

Coming to the *details*, the *consensus ends*. Where working groups indicate which expertise or interests they have in mind and how they would want to reach a satisfying balance and diversification in such boards/panels/ committees, it becomes visible that using the same words does not necessarily prove identical concepts. Some working groups stressed the importance of having competent evaluators.[44]

Independence and impartiality

Frequently, and again without being able to pinpoint this to certain stakeholder categories (yet), there is a strong wish for clear, transparent and stable rules from the start of a project. Clear evaluation criteria must be transparent and known in advance.

To avoid research being funded because of personal relations to or successful lobbying at funding agencies[45], some working groups named transparency as an indispensable condition of the funding process and requested clear, well-thought out funding criteria.[46] – In general, what is demanded, are funding decisions by impartial decision-makers, based on clear rules – a funding process not dominated by private or specific interests.[47] Views differ on who

[44] Copenhagen: W2/ • **Not by the researchers/**Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case**/**6BUS
Copenhagen: W2/ • **Not by unprofessionals/**Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case**/**4BUS
Porto: W2/**1º Lack of representatively and competence of the evaluation commission./**Hom3 poster 3/Worst Case**/**5BUS
ES_EASW2// *** Experts and competent people /**MIX3 poster 1/Best Case**/**1BUS 1NPO 1PUB + 1FAC

[45] FR_EASW2 / **- unclear influences (economical or other nature) -> e.g. GMOs, pesticides, tobacco** /poster3/Worst Case/7PUB 4NPO 2BUS + 1FAC
Copenhagen: W2 /**No corruption or friends/**Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case/4BUS
VIENNA: W2/**By personal connections /**Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case**/**6NPO
VIENNA: W2/**Personal connections /**Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case**/**6NPO
Copenhagen: W2/**Personal scientific hang up/**Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/6BUS

[46] ES_EASW2/ **Clear, relevant, consistent and contradictions free criteria.** /MIX3 poster 2/Best Case/1BUS 1NPO 1PUB facil
ES_EASW2/**Clear, relevant, consistent and contradictions free criteria.** / /**Contradictory and irrelevant criteria./**Hom1 poster 3/Worst Case**/**3BUS + 1 FAC
VIENNA: W2/**---> clear criteria /**MIX1 Poster 1/Best Case**/**2PUB 2BUS
VIENNA: W2/**Predefined criteria HOLISTIC /**MIX2 Poster 1/Best Case**/**2PUB 2BUS 2NPO
GR_EASW2/ **Subjective criteria that only benefit specific groups of people/**/HOM1 poster 3
GR_EASW2/ **Lack of quality criteria (disregarding scientific relevance, technological infrastructure, applicability, etc.)/**GR2 poster 1
GR_EASW2/ **Funding with objective terms (scientific knowledge, adequate infrastructure, experience, cost-benefit relationship, innovation)/**MIX1 poster 1
GR_EASW2/ **Objective and scientific criteria and the research goals of the country/**MIX1 poster 2
ES_EASW2/**DECISION CRITERIA ARE NOT CLEAR. LACK OF TRANSPARENCY, PRIORITIES ARE NOT DEFINED / QUALITY CRITERIA WITH NO SCIENTIFIC BASE, UNACHIEVABLE. NOT VIABLE PROJECTS /** Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case/1NPO 2BUS + 1FAC

[47] VIENNA: W2/ **→ Transparent & comprehensible /**MIX3 Poster 1/Best Case**/**2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
VIENNA: W2/ **– non-transparency /**Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case**/**4PUB

should decide and on the organization of the funding process. For instance, in the 2nd workshop in Austria, assessing scientific "excellence" by measuring publication output alone was rejected.[48]

A socially responsible exploitation of results

Researchers and scientists are not only expected to have the expertise needed for conducting the research projects they apply for[49]. In some working groups it was stipulated that they should produce applicable results[50], but also to contribute to societal goals, such as environmental sustainability[51] and to adhere to ethical standards in the conduct of research, as well as to develop an ethical attitude regarding the possible impact of their research[52].

Copenhagen: W2/ **Lack of transparency /**Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case/5PUB
FR_EASW2/**Transparency /**MIX1 poster 1/Best Case**/**2PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW2/**Transparency /**MIX2 poster 1/Best Case**/**3PUB 2NPO
GR_EASW2/Worst Case/**2. Lack of transparency, concerning funding processes /**GR2 poster 1/
[48] VIENNA: W2/**– focus on "excellence principle"** /Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case**/**4PUB
VIENNA: W2/**– exclusive focussing on "scientific excellence", not regarding societal benefit** /Hom2 poster3/Worst Case**/**4PUB
VIENNA: W2/**– only "benchmarking"** /Hom2 poster 3/Worst Case**/**4PUB
[49] Porto: W2/ **- Team capable of executing the project/**MIX3 poster 1/Best Case**/**2PUB 1NoO 2BUS
VIENNA: W2/**Methodically correct (also allowing innovation)** /MIX2 Poster 1/Best Case/2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
Porto: W2/**- Scientific relevance and capacity**/Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/7PUB
Copenhagen: W2/**• High standard of scientific work; • The right scientific approach**/Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case/4BUS
Copenhagen: W2/**• High research quality, novelty value and relevance in the relation to the stated objectives**/MIX1 poster 1/Best Case/2PUB 2BUS
Porto: W2/ **- Team capable of executing the project**/MIX3 poster 1/Best Case/2PUB 1NoO 2BUS/
[50] VIENNA: W2/ **- applicability** /MIX1 Poster 1/Best Case/2PUB 2BUS
VIENNA: W2/ **- practice ---> relevant** /MIX1 Poster 1/Best Case/2PUB 2BUS
VIENNA: W2/**Applicability** /MIX2 Poster 1/Best Case/2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
Porto: W2/**1º Funding of research projects with no practical applicability**./Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case/5BUS
Porto: W2/**–- Only economic criteria**/Hom2 poster 3/Worst Case/3NPO 2OTH
GR_EASW2/**Publishing of results. Production of innovative products that benefit the end user**/MIX1 poster 2
NL_EASW2/ **Research should focus on the applicability of results, the applicability of the end product, closely in line with the demands of the target group. Fundamental research is also important, but this research should not lead to practical advices**/
[51] Guildford: W2/**make food production sustainable/**MIX3 figure17/Best Case**/**1BUS 2 NPO 1BoP
See also the references on holistic perspective mentioned above.
[52] VIENNA: W2/**Ethical component /**MIX2 Poster 1/Best Case/2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
VIENNA: W2/ **→ Responsible [attitude] /**MIX3 Poster 1/Best Case**/**2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
FR_EASW2/**Institutional mechanisms: /**MIX3 poster 3/Best Case/2PUB 1NPO 1BUS

This ethical imperative on research and innovation was clearly reflected in discussions on the exploitation of research outcomes.

Availability and use of results

Participants in several workshops deemed the availability of research outcomes to be very important.[53] Beyond this general agreement, there was a unanimous understanding that research outcomes should be published.[54] As in the 1st workshop series, those who deliberated on the topic of "result use" most often state that publicly funded research needs to make its results available to the public, in a way that is easily accessible and does not create unnecessary barriers to eligibility. If public money is spent, then the outcomes must neither collect dust in drawers, nor is it sufficient to publish them only in scientific journals.

In several working groups participants considered it to be important to make research findings public beyond closed (academic) circles[55], and there were several opinions on to whom and in which form they should be disseminated. Public availability of research findings and open access to them were endorsed at several workshops.[56]

FR_EASW2/**ethics /**mx3 poster 3/Best Case/2PUB 1NPO 1BUS
ES_EASW2/ **- Ethics, prepared, with full knowledge /**MIX1 poster 2/Best Case**/3BUS 1PUB +1FAC**
ES_EASW2/ **Compulsory Ethic code /**MIX3 poster 2/Best Case**/1BUS 1NPO 1PUB +1FAC**

[53] Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom

[54] Porto: W2/**full disclosure/ /- Not publish results (positive or negative) (scientific community and population in general)**/Worst Case**/**7PUB
VIENNA: W2/**full disclosure/ /Unpublished, (transparency)** /Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/6BUS
Copenhagen: W2/• Not end up in the researcher's computer/Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case/4BUS
FR_EASW2/**No communication of the results** /Hom2 poster 4/Worst Case/4NPO
Guildford: W2/ **research not available to practitioners stays inaccessible only to academic community and not general public**/NPO figure5/Worst Case/6NPO
GR_EASW2/PUB/General WC/**8. To not publish the results and receive feedback**/HOM1 poster 3
Porto: W2/ **- Absence of circulation of information** /Hom2 poster 4/Worst Case/3NPO 2OTH
VIENNA: W2/**– drawer** /Hom2 poster 3/Worst Case/4PUB
VIENNA: W2/**No exploitation / making public** /Hom3 poster 3/Worst Case**/**6NPO
NL_EASW2/**Regardless of the outcomes, the results should be published so as to make those outcomes more transparent and accessible to everyone. This applies in particular if the research is funded on the basis of public money**./MX1
TK_EASW2/basic themes/**scientific publications cannot be accessed easily**/Hom 3 poster 1-7/PUB

[55] Copenhagen: W2/• **Not closed communication within the researcher's "world"**/Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case/4BUS

[56] VIENNA: W2/→ **Public availability of all results** /MIX3 Poster 2/Best Case/2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO

Communication within and between scientific communities is different from communication with a wider public. A one-size-fits-all approach is not expected to work here.[57] As far as this has been discussed in workshops, participants agreed that special efforts are needed to make outcomes public in an intelligible way.

Intellectual property rights

In the discussions on how to exploit research findings, more than putting them to economic use, [58] intellectual property rights were an issue, mostly in regard either to too exclusive or too broader exploitation rights.[59] In this case, participants were of the opinion that IPR should not conflict with the societal benefit of public research funding.

No misleading of citizens and consumers

As in the 1st workshop series, some participants deplored a distortion of research findings in the media.[60] In one workshop of the 2nd series a working group even recommended to

VIENNA: W2/**Accessible for everybody, public** /PLEN Post 3&4/Final discussion/6NPO 6BUS 4PUB
Copenhagen: W2/ • **Use open domain publication**/Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case/5PUB
FR_EASW2/ **--> sharing results/methods as much as possible /**MIX3 poster 4/Best Case**/**2PUB 1NPO 1BUS
BE_EASW2/ - **Open -source results** /Best Case/MIX1 poster 1
VIENNA: W2/**Restrictions to access, non-transparency** /Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/6BUS
[57] VIENNA: W2/ **- user oriented preparation /**MIX1 Poster 2/Best Case/2PUB 2BUS
Guildford: W2/**not getting the info out to the right people to make changes**./figure11/Worst Case/3PUB 1PtB
Guildford: W2/**One size fits all**./PUB figure11/Worst Case/3PUB 1PtB
[58] ES_EASW2/* **Lack of links among research and business** /Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case/3PUB 1FAC
[59] Copenhagen: W2/**No patent on natural resources/life/**MIX3 poster 1/Best Case
Porto: W2/ - **Do not patent natural resources**/MIX2 poster 2/Best Case/2PUB 2NoO 2BUS
VIENNA: W2/**Problem: Single [persons, organisations] prohibit innovations /**Final discussion/6NPO 6BUS 4PUB
Porto: W2/**-Patenting genes/**Hom1 poster 3/Worst Case/7PUB
Porto: W2/ **Patents about raw materials and goods essential for life/**Hom2 poster 4/Worst Case/3NPO 2OTH
VIENNA: W2/**Exclusive exploitation rights /**Hom1 poster 3/Worst Case/6BUS
ES_EASW2/ **Not using of patents as a result from research of public body /**Worst Case/3PUB + 1FAC
ES_EASW2/**NON ACCESSIBLE (PATENTS EXPIRATION DATE TOO SHORT OR TOO LONG) /**Worst Case**/**1NPO 2BUS +1FAC
[60] Guildford: W2/PUB/**the way the media reports the results/**figure11/Worst Case**/**3PUB 1PtB

control marketing efforts, presumably to avoid misleading information to consumers.[61] In two other workshops misleading information to consumers was discussed as an issue research programming should deal with, too.[62] Generally a demand for a high quality and independent presentation of research outcomes to the public is strongly visible.

Acceptance of results irrespective of whether they are positive, negative, desired or not

A recurring topic on this was an integrity issue, the selective publication of data and results. The full picture of the scientific state of the art is heavily distorted, if mostly positive results are published as presently often happens. Several working groups see it as a problem that negative, neutral, unpopular or otherwise not desired results are seldom published. If they remain unavailable they can bias the whole spectre of scientific evidence. Participants demanded non-selective, full publication of results.[63]

Lessening of administrative requirements

In the 1st and the 2nd workshop series many participants pointed out a sometimes enormously increased administrative burden imposed on them by research funders. In the

Copenhagen: W2/*explanation posters/* • ***By unprofessional journalists****/Notes to poster/*Worst Case**/**4BUS

[61] GR_EASW2/**Dissemination, transparency, accessibility, informing/educating at least those concerned with the subject and develop the research – controlling commercials**/marketing/MIX3 poster 3

[62] BE_EASW2/BUS1/ **Authorize messages that mislead the consumer in regards of his/her well-being and health** /*Worst Case* /Hom2 poster 2

BE_EASW2/**/ food labelling more transparent for consumer**/Hom3 poster 1/2NPO 1OTH

GR_EASW2/**Worst Case/Food labelling based on what the consumer wants to know about the product (ex. country of origin, processing method, ingredients, variety, energy waste, ect.) & reduce 'advertising lies' or exaggerations with no evidence.**/HOM1 poster 2

[63] VIENNA: W2/**All results *) /**PLEN Post 3&4/Final discussion/6NPO 6BUS 4PUB

Guildford: W2/**not reporting on the failings/**figure11/Worst Case**/**3PUB 1PtB

Guildford: W2/**not giving the full picture/**figure11/Worst Case/3PUB 1PtB

Porto: W2/- **Inaccessibility of the data/**Hom1 poster 3/Worst Case/7PUB

Porto: W2/ **- Deficient information, biased and not trustworthy/**Hom2 poster 4/Worst Case/3NPO 2OTH

Porto: W2/ **Manipulation of results according to vested interests./**Hom3 poster 3/Worst Case**/**5BUS

VIENNA: W2/**Undesired results disappear /**Hom3 poster 3/Worst Case/6NPO

VIENNA: W2/**Desired results /**Hom3 poster 2/Worst Case/6NPO

Guildford: W2/**not reporting on the failings / not giving the full picture**/HOM2 figure11/Worst Case/3PUB 1BUS

GR_EASW2/4. **Use of results: lack of accessibility, 'selective' hiding of data**/Worst Case/GR2 poster 1

2nd series proposed solutions were, among others, paying lump sums or flat rates,[64] better coordination among research funders,[65] and fewer reports or generally fewer demands.[66] For some working groups, project administration as it is, may require external support, especially for SMEs and universities.[67]

Duration and time scale of research projects

The duration of research projects was often seen as too short. Continuity and long term studies were demanded (see also Analysis Report 1).[68]

Better access of small organizations and smaller consortia to research

In some workshops of the 2nd series access of small organizations, SMEs and smaller consortia to research and research funding was discussed. It was mentioned that different funding schemes are needed.[69]

Open calls versus specific topics

Research funding increasingly launches calls on specific topics instead of funding proposals on topics suggested by researchers and/or companies alone. This new governance of research was a topic in some working groups. In some working groups participants

[64] VIENNA: W2/ **- lump sum accounting /**MIX1 Poster 2/Best Case**/**2PUB 2BUS
VIENNA: W2/**→ Flat rate [funding of] costs /**MIX3 Poster 2/Best Case**/**2PUB 2BUS 2NPO
VIENNA: W2/**Lump sums /**PLEN Post 3&4/Final discussion**/**6NPO 6BUS 4PUB
[65] VIENNA: W2/– **uncoordinated procedures at different fund givers** /Hom2 poster 3/Worst Case/4PUB
[66] Copenhagen: W2/• **Too many reports/**MIX1 poster 1/Best Case**/**2PUB 2BUS
Copenhagen: W2/*explanation poster 1, MIX1/* **Too many demands on the scientific area from the funding side – too much bureaucracy, too much regulations** / Best Case/2PUB 2BUS
TK_EASW2/Best Case/**Lessening Bureaucratic workload**/MIX2 poster 1-4/PUB
[67] VIENNA: W2/**Project manager provided for SMEs /**MIX2 Poster 2/Best Case**/**2PUB 2BUS 2NPO
Copenhagen: W2/*explanation poster 1, MIX1/* **Universities should support researchers in coping with administrative tasks/demands/bureaucracy in order to make researchers focus on research**./reported/Best Case**/**2PUB 2BUS
[68] Guildford: W2/**Longitudinal – years not months/**figure18/Best Case**/**1PUB 1BUS 2NPO 1BoP
Guildford: W2/ **research not followed up/ longitudinal research/**HOM1 figure5/Worst Case**/**6NPO
Guildford: W2/**Only snapshot – short termism/**figure5/Worst Case**/**6NPO
VIENNA: W2/*And this is important, too /***TIME /**MIX2 Poster 2/Best Case/2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
VIENNA: W2/*And this is important, too /–* **too narrow time frame (especially no forerun and follow-up phase)** /Hom2 poster 3/Worst Case**/**4PUB
FR_EASW2/ **long duration (time) /**MIX3 poster 1/Best Case**/**2PUB 1NPO 1BUS
[69] VIENNA: W2/**Consortia not too big** /MIX2 Poster 2/Best Case/2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO/
Copenhagen: W2/• **Many partners**/Hom1 poster 2/Worst Case/6BUS
VIENNA: W2/• *And this is important, too /* **Small project schemes for all (NGOs, ...)** *) /MIX2 Poster 2/Best Case**/**2PUB 2BUS 2NPO

demanded wider call topics or no call topics at all, but a free choice of topics instead,[70] other preferred calls based on national action plans,[71] while others stressed the importance of local research agendas on food and health and research on local issues.[72]

[70] VIENNA: W2/*Decision on topics /* **– very narrow thematic areas** /Hom2 poster 2/Worst Case**/**4PUB
ES_EASW2/ **Wider calls** /MIX2 poster 1/Best Case**/**2BUS 1PUB + 1FAC
VIENNA: W2/ **Frame too narrow** /Hom3 poster 3/Worst Case**/**6NPO
VIENNA: W2/ → **Free choice of topics** /MIX3 Poster 1/Best Case**/**2 PUB 2 BUS 2 NPO
[71] Porto: W2/ **- Establish priorities (agenda)/**MIX1 poster 1/Best Case/3PUB 2NoO 1BUS
Porto: W2/ **- Project in accordance to the national action plan/**MIX3 poster 1/Best Case/2PUB 1(NPO or OTH) 2BUS
[72] Guildford: W2/ **- localism agenda/**/MIX3 figure16/Best Case**/**1BUS 2 NPO 1(BUS or PUB)
Guildford: W2/ **- localised agendas/**/MIX3 figure17/Best Case**/**1BUS 2 NPO 1(BUS or PUB)
Guildford: W2/ **- DIY – localised solutions and case studies/**MIX2 figure14/Best Case**/**1PUB 1BUS 2(BUS or PUB)
Guildford: W2/ **- Obstacles to engagement in local healthy food culture/**MIX2 figure14/Best Case**/**1PUB 1BUS 2NPO 1(BUS or PUB)
TK_EASW2/Best Case/**Local scaled research**/Hom 3 poster 1-7/PU

Lists of common topics

Although the workshop structures, procedures and participant profiles are less homogeneous than originally planned, several common topics appear across this broad variety of workshops. Altogether, stakeholders who participated in the workshops named several research topics and areas. The areas and topics were clustered into 20 more general areas and topics, which address agricultural, economic, medical, natural, social and technical sciences and the humanities. This decision was made for pragmatic reasons in order to provide a better overview of the breadth of the themes under discussion. We are aware that different clusters – more or even less – could have been made. Areas and topics have not been ranked because of methodological concerns. Should clusters be ranked according to the number of workshops, of working groups or the number of participants in the working groups? And how should the number of topics in a cluster be accounted for? And how many "votes" should organizations receive if two or more delegates participated? For fairness, such organizations should not get more than one vote, but because it is not known for all working groups who participated in them, this is not feasible. The issue is further complicated by the fact that necessary re-categorizations of stakeholders made several homogeneous groups become heterogeneous ones. For these reasons, we only mention in how many working groups and workshops, areas topics were suggested.

List of common topics: Research areas/topics*
Availability of food / nutrition and income *(2 private sector, 3 public sector, 3 NPO groups; 7 workshops)*
Health effects *(3 public sector, 4 NPO groups; 5 workshops)*
Changing consumer behaviour *(4 NPO, 2 public sector groups, 1 private sector group, 1 group with participants from civil society and the private sector; 7 workshops)*
Understanding consumer behaviour *(6 private sector, 3 public sector, 3 NPO groups; 7 workshops)*
Consumer information *(5 private sector, 4 public sector, 2 NPO groups; 6 workshops)*
Control & regulation *(2 private sector, 2 public sector, 2 NPO groups, 1 group with participants from civil society and the private sector; 6 workshops)*
Environmental sustainability *(3 private sector, 3 NPO, 3 public sector groups; 8 workshops)*
Seeing the whole picture, creating synergies *(3 private sector, 2 NPO, 2 public sector groups; 7 workshops)*
Local food production *(5 private sector, 2 NPO, 5 public sector groups; 7 workshops)*
Health impacts of certain diets *(4 public sector, 3 NPO, 2 private sector groups; 5 workshops)*
Food ingredients and additives *(2 private sector, 2 public sector, 3 NPO groups, 1 group with participants from civil society and the private sector; 5 workshops)*
Specific nutrition needs *(2 private sector, 3 public sector groups; 5 workshops)*
Food safety *(3 private sector, 3 public sector groups, 1 NPO group, 1 group with participants from civil society and the private sector, 1 group with other stakeholders; 7 workshops)*
Packaging *(3 private sector groups, 1 public sector group; 4 workshops)*
Food industry *(3 public sector groups, 1 private sector group, 1 NPO group; 4 workshops)*
Genetically modified organisms *(2 private sector groups, 1 NPO, 1 public sector group, 1 group with participants from civil society and the private sector; 5 workshops)*
Health conditions: obesity *(1 public sector, 1 private sector, 1 NPO group; 3 workshops)*
Food quality *(4 NPO, 2 public sector groups, 1 private sector group; 6 workshops)*
Food production *(8 private sector, 3 NPO, 3 public sector groups, 1 group with participants from civil society and the private sector ; 11 workshops)*
Meta level: How to arrive at research topics reflecting societal demands *(2 NPO and 2 public sector groups; 2 workshops)*

Table 44: List of common topics: Research areas/topics

* In brackets the number of working groups, split into categories, and the number of workshops are indicated, in which the topic was mentioned. For detailed information on the groups see summary on the respective topic.

List of common topics: Research programming – Analysis 1*
Decision making on topics/ areas/themes: • Broad involvement of stakeholders (14 groups of all stakeholder categories; 5 workshops) • Independency and objectivity in decisions on topics (10 groups of all stakeholder categories; 5 workshops)
Decision making on project funding: • Independent and impartial, without conflicts of interest (15 groups of all stakeholder categories; 6 workshops) • Transparency (7 groups of all stakeholder categories; 4 workshops) • Knowledgeable reviewers (4 groups of all stakeholder categories; 2 workshops) • Multidisciplinary setting (4 groups of all stakeholder categories; 4 workshops) • Inclusion of stakeholders (9 groups of all stakeholder categories; 5 workshops) • No dominating stakeholders (7 groups of all stakeholder categories; 4 workshops) • Perspective on publicly funded research and innovation that is broader than expected economic benefit (6 groups of all stakeholder categories; 4 workshops)
Quality criteria for funding: • Broader focus than on research alone (8 groups of all stakeholder categories; 5 workshops)
Exploitation of results: • Publish all results (16 groups of all stakeholder categories; 9 workshops) • Patents on raw materials and genes unacceptable (4 groups of all stakeholder categories; 2 workshops) • Targeted dissemination activities (5 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 4 workshops)
Evaluation: • Independence of evaluators/reviewers (6 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 4 workshops)
Project design: • Less bureaucratic project monitoring (6 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 2 workshops) • Broader call topics (2 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 2 workshops)

Table 45: List of common topics: Research programming – Analysis 1

* In brackets the number of working groups and the number of workshops are indicated, in which the topic was mentioned. For detailed information on the groups see summary on the respective theme.

List of common topics: Research programming – Analysis 2*
Broad involvement of stakeholders, citizens, policy makers and experts instead of power accumulation (5 workshops)
Thinking out of the box and in a more systemic view (5 workshops)
Mostly, the influence of large industry or single private interests is deplored (8 workshops)
Politics as interference in the independence of research (5 workshops)
Independent committees, boards and panels (6 workshops)
Independence and impartiality (5 workshops)
A socially responsible exploitation of results (7 workshops)
Availability and use of results (10 workshops)
Intellectual property rights (4 workshops)
Acceptance of results irrespective of whether they are positive, negative, desired or not (9 workshops)
No misleading of citizens and consumers (4 workshops)
Lessening of administrative requirements (3 workshops)
Duration and time scale of research projects (3 workshops)
Better access of small organizations and smaller consortia to research (2 workshops)
Open calls versus specific topics (5 workshops)

Table 46: List of common topics: Research programming – Analysis 2

* In brackets the number of working groups and the number of workshops are indicated, in which the topic was mentioned. For detailed information on the groups see summary on the respective topic.

Clusters of common research topics/areas
Klaus Hadwiger

Clusters of common research topics/areas*
Consumers • Suitable information and labelling (transparency, readability, understandability, full information about ingredients, origin and contents) • Influence of marketing (advertisement to vulnerable population groups) • Targeted education (on food quality, cooking, ingredients, balanced diets)
Food Safety and Security • Reliable and fast detection (microbiology, toxicology, chemistry) • Personal food security (enough to eat, good quality) • Authenticity (prevention of food scams, detection)
Food Production • Regional Products • Traditional Products • Support for small producers • Short Supply Chain • Environmentally safe and sustainable (biodiversity, pesticide residuals, organic) • Minimal Processing • Food for certain population groups (e.g. allergies, age groups, genetic) • GMO (risks, benefits, legislation, regulation, information) • Packaging (environmentally safe, smart) • Reduction of waste and by-products • Low fat, low sugar
Healthy eating • Prevention and reduction of overweight/obesity • Mechanisms of nutrition • Eating behavior • Why do we eat what (habits, class, regions) • Meat replacements

Table 47: Clusters of common research topics/areas

* The information given in this table reflects only the authors's view and is not to be understood as a replacement for Table 44.

Final remarks

The three series of altogether 35 scenario workshops conducted in different regions all over Europe attempted to reach a higher level of transparency, inclusiveness and reproducibility than has been reached or attempted in similar stakeholder involvement activities. Introducing more transparent recruitment schemes, addressing a broader range of stakeholders, tackling power imbalances and a more authentic documentation were an important step to increase transparency. Provided a sufficient number of such scenario workshops are conducted, they may yield promising outcomes, if transparency is increased, the addressed stakeholder range is broadened and considerable efforts are made to include stakeholders, who are usually not consulted. But such workshops have still some shortcomings the organizers of the INPROFOOD scenario workshops could not entirely eliminate. Thus the outcomes should not be considered as representative stakeholder output. Reducing shortcomings of such stakeholder involvement must remain a central goal, if stakeholder involvement should gain better acceptance among citizens and if the outcomes should be a reliable, i.e. reproducible, result of deliberations among representatives of certain interest groups. A lack of reproducibility can easily create a biased picture of stakeholder interests. The question of representation and thus the possibilities and limitations of generalizing about the workshop outcomes was a permanent discussion among members of the INPROFOOD consortium. The authors of this report do not assume that organizations invited to stakeholder consultations necessarily represent the interests and views of certain larger groups as a whole. We are sceptical that such a workshop alone could be useful for policy making. A participant from a university does not represent the interests and views of academia, because of competing interests and views (which also cannot be singled out by referring to disciplines) in this group of actors, since it is far from being homogeneous. Unless they have been elected as representatives, representatives of academia are representatives of academia only in the sense that they belong to academia. If stakeholders are invited as representatives of certain groups, there is a certain danger that political fictions are created. If policy makers invite the mentioned member of academia among other few members of academia to a stakeholder consultation as representatives of the interests of academia and consider their input as comprising the most important academic interests, a political fiction is created: the fiction of a more or less homogeneous academic sphere or of an academic sphere which shares more than very general interests

and views, which can be known without asking its members. This applies not only to academia, but to other groups as well. Of course it is even more complicated: A person can be a member of academia, a member of a parents association and married to the owner of an SME. They can represent public, social and private economic interests alike. This diversity of interests and views limits the usefulness of such stakeholder involvement if the goal is decision-making, which takes stakeholder interests and concerns of legitimacy into account. The INPROFOOD scenario workshops share this limitation with stakeholder involvement activities in general. And although in INPROFOOD – maybe for the first time - a lot of efforts were made to involve other organizations than those that are part of established networks and/or are known to policy makers or other organizers of stakeholder involvement activities, fundamental questions on the democratic legitimization of such governance instruments are still to be tackled systematically. If the goal is decision-making, there is a certain danger that political decision-making lacks sufficient legitimacy because stakeholder involvement is instrumentalized by those who promote it. If the goal is opening up governance, stakeholder involvement can contribute to it, if its weaknesses, in particular in respect to legitimacy, are closely scrutinized and tackled. Tackling the weaknesses is a process that is never completed, but so is opening up governance. The question is what is the ultimate goal of stakeholder involvement: decision-making or inclusive governance?[73] Also inclusive governance requires decision-making. There is always the question of balancing efficiency and openness, top-down and bottom-up. Irrespective of the decision, the open issues of legitimacy of decision-making based on stakeholder involvement should not be neglected.

[73] Sterling, 2008; Delgado/Kjoelberg/Wickson, 2011

References

- Abels, G. (2009), Citizens' Deliberation and the EU Democratic Deficit: Is There a Model for Participatory Democracy?, Tübinger Arbeitspapiere zur Intergrations-forschung, 1/2009
- Bilderbeek, Rob & Andersen, Ida, Local Scenario-Workshop Sustainable Urban Living in the Coming Decades: Organization Manual, http://cordis.europa.eu/easw/src/cookbook.htm, last access on 30 August 2013
- Coccossis, Harry / Hatzilakou, Dionisia / Mexa, Alexandra / Svoronou, Eleni / Giorgos Kallis (2006), Deliberative Visioning: A Critical View. Observations From a Scenario Workshop for Water Management in a Greek Island, ERSA Conference Papers 06
- Danish Board of Technology, Workshop Methods, http://www.tekno.dk/subpage.php3?article=1235&toppic=kategori12&language=uk , last access on 30 August 2013
- Delgado, Ana / Kjoelberg, Kamilla Lein / Wickson, Fern (2011), Public engagement coming of age. From theory to practice in STS encounters with nanotechnology, in: Public Understanding of Science, Volume 20, Issue 6, pp. 826-845
- European Commission, A new funding scheme for the active participation of civil society organizations in research, http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/bsg-cso-scheme_en.pdf, last access on 30 August 2013
- European Commission, Wiki of the Civil Society Helpdesk (CISOCH): "Civil society organization", https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/aidco/index.php/Civil_society_organization, last access on 30 August 2013
- European Commission, Europe 2020 - Europe's growth strategy, http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm, last access on 30 August 2013
- European Commission (2010), Work Programme 2011, Capacities, Part 5, Science in Society 2011, C(2010)4903, 19 July 2010
- European Union / Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) FLEGT Programme (GCP/GLO/395/EC) , Call for Project Proposals, Guidelines for VPA countries

- Geissel, Brigitte (2008), Improving the Quality of Democracy at the Local Level: German Experiences with Participative Democratic Innovations, Paper for the Conference “Quality of Democracy, Participation and Governance: The Local Perspective”, May 23-24, 2008 – Castello del Buonconsiglio – Trento, http://www.provincia.tn.it/binary/pat/link_home/geissel_Trento_08_final.1211796325.pdf, last access on 30 August 2013
- Geissel, Brigitte (2009), Participatory Governance: Hope or Danger for Democracy? A Case Study of Local Agenda 21, in: Local Government Studies Vol. 35, No. 4, 401–414, August 2009, http://www.gesellschaftswissenschaften.uni-frankfurt.de/institut_2/bgeissel/upload/literatur/Participatory_Governance.pdf, last access on 30 August 2013
- Horst, Maja (2014), On the weakness of strong ties, in: Public Understanding of Science , vol 23, no. 1, pp. 43-47
- Merton, Robert K. (1968), The Matthew Effect in Science, in: Science, 159(3810): 56-63, January 5, 1968, http://www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/merton/matthew1.pdf, last access on 30 August 2013
- Papadopoulos, Yannis (2010), Accountability and Multi-Level Governance: More Accountability, Less Democracy?, in: West European Politics, Volume 33, Issue 5, 2010, pp. 1030–1049, also http://paperroom.ipsa.org/papers/paper_2873.pdf, last access on 30 August 2013
- Reed, M.S. / Graves, A. / Dandy, N. / Posthumus, H. / Hubacek, K. / Morris, J. / Prell, C./ Quinn , C.H. / Stringer, L.C. (2009), Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management, in: Journal of Environmental Management 90 (January 2009), pp. 1933–1949
- Stirling, Andy (2008), “Opening up” and “closing down”. Power, Perception and Pluralism in the Social Appraisal of Technology, in: Science, Technology and Human Values, Volume 22, Issue 2, pp. 262-294
- Swedish presidency of the European Union (2009), The Lund Declaration, July 2009, http://www.era.gv.at/attach/1lund_declaration_final_version_9_july.pdf, last access on 30 August 2013
- Urban, Christine & Michael Strähle (2012), Developing methods for selecting participants for adapted European Awareness Scenario Workshops with stakeholders concerned with food technology and health issues, in: Bucchi, Massimiano & Brian Trench (eds.), Quality, Honesty and Beauty in Science and

Technology Communication. Proceedings of PCST2012, the 12th International Public Communication of Science and Technology Conference, Florence, Italy, 18 – 20 April 2012. Vicenza: Observa Science in Society, 2012, pp. 374-376

- Urban, Christine & Michael Strähle (2012), Detailed Plan for the EASWs, http://www.inprofood.eu/reporting/, last access on 30 August 2013

Annex: Workshop Reports

C.01: Workshop 2 Ankara
C.02: Workshop 2 Berlin
C.03: Workshop 2 Bratislava
C.04: Workshop 2 Brussels
C.05: Workshop 2 Copenhagen
C.06: Workshop 2 Guildford
C.07: Workshop 2 Maastricht
C.08: Workshop 2 Madrid
C.09: Workshop 2 Montpellier
C.10: Workshop 2 Porto
C.11: Workshop 2 Thessaloniki
C.12: Workshop 2 Vicenza
C.13: Workshop 2 Vienna

The reports are available for download at http://www.inprofood.eu/documentation.