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 D2.1

(Detailed Plan for the EASWs. Final version)

Due date of deliverable: M 4
Actual submission date: M 28

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

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

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013)		
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 and an extended version of a former version submitted in M10.

2. Use and Verification of Deliverable in INPROFOOD

This deliverable contains the workplan for the INPROFOOD scenario workshops and as annexes information materials sent to invited participants. Instructions for workshop organisers and the original timeplan for organising the workshops are also included.

inprofood
Towards sustainable food research

Detailed Plan for the INPROFOOD Scenario Workshops.
Final version

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

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 organisations in thirteen countries, which are representing academia, health authorities, business consultants, extra-university research organisations, 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. The scenario workshops are the largest 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 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.

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]. For this, the Danish Board of Technology's methodology on scenario workshops has been adapted.

The first part of this document presents the methodology of the INPROFOOD scenario workshops and its rationale. In the second part the instructions to workshop organisers are described. In the annex the common agenda and all templates for information materials and reporting can be found.

Research on such engagement activities shows that decisions on who is invited to them are often made on an ad hoc basis.[2] This opens up issues of legitimacy and transparency. In view of such participation becoming more wide-spread in the governance of science, the question that demands an answer is, if such an approach yields any reliable (reproducible) results. Because it most likely depends on who actually participates, results are questionable as long there is no possibility to distinguish situational outcomes from others that are confirmed in consultations. To answer such shortcomings of participatory methods, the INPROFOOD project piloted stakeholder recruitment schemes, which involved reaching out also to stakeholders usually not being addressed, the compilation of stakeholder databases based on public sources, sortition (selection by lottery), clear stakeholder categories (also the category "civil society organisation" has been defined), transparent calls for participation, eligibility criteria, and addressing power imbalances by trying to bring together in a workshop only stakeholders, who have more or less the same agenda-setting power. To make workshop outputs comparable, they should be matched as far as possible: with similar participant numbers, addressing the same stakeholder categories and similar stakeholder groups, follow a common agenda and a common methodology, be dedicated to a common topic, and use common recruitment and reporting schemes.

Workshop outcomes can be found in the Analysis Reports 1 – 3 at inprofood.eu.

[1] Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom.
[2] See Reed et al. 2009, e.g.

Background

The European Scenario Workshops (EASW) in INPROFOOD should not only bring together different interest groups but also further develop deliberation methods for the purpose of involving a broad range of interests ("stakeholders") in research programming. INPROFOOD should learn from previous mistakes and attempt to circumvent frequently observed shortcomings of present stakeholder/public deliberation activities. Schemes for involving social actors in policy making are still in an experimental phase, and there is a vivid discussion, if, when, and under which conditions the often articulated hope to "better" policies or to enhance democracy in the governance of science can be achieved.

Challenges in stakeholder involvement

Stakeholder engagement and democratic legitimacy

The often repeated claim that stakeholder deliberation would be a per se non-elitist and inclusive procedure remains contested in scientific literature. Different scholars come to quite sobering conclusions when analysing 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.

It is a central weakness of public and/or stakeholder involvement[3] that participants are selected and invited more or less arbitrarily and then regarded as representatives of certain

[3] As if it goes without saying, in scientific literature stakeholder engagement is frequently considered as public engagement, and researchers frequently use both terms as synonyms as if there is an entity called "the public" of which stakeholders are part of. John Dewey pointed out to this misunderstanding in his book *The Public and Its Problems* in 1927 already. A public, Dewey says, is made up of citizens with a common interest in improving governance in science, for instance. The government or policy makers do not create the public – and they should not try to do so, but offer the best conditions possible for the public to organise itself. This includes to improve public communication and to put public interests before special ones.

citizens' groups (which are again only vaguely defined). Decisions on whom to involve, seem to be made on an ad hoc basis [4] and who should be invited to participatory activities remains a grey zone:

> *Few programs specify who 'the public' is that is to be engaged, what the final outcomes of engagement are, and when and how these outcomes are to be assessed. This may make the term 'public engagement' vulnerable to appropriation by different interests who are often pursuing very different agendas. As noted, there is now a substantial body of social science literature analysing and critiquing the discourses and practices of public engagement that have been found to be limited in terms of advancing citizen participation in science and technology.* [5]

Considered by policy makers as adding to the legitimacy of decision-making, representation seems to be less of an issue than demanded: A*lthough policy makers rely more and more on the input of civil society, scholars find a representation discourse conspicuously absent*.[6] Representation suffers by the fact, that not all concerned social groups participate in engagement activities to the same extent. Participation in policy deliberation needs time and resources, which only the elites possess in abundance. Brigitte Geissel puts it as following:

> *Input-Legitimacy is difficult to foster, because [.....] marginalized societal groups are difficult to mobilize. Consultative procedures with self-selected participants seem to be often, but not always, a kind of mouthpiece for already privileged groups.* [7]

Additionally, the invitations to engage in policy discussion are less embraced than hoped for by policy makers. The reasons for "participation fatigue" are not fully researched but vividly discussed among scholars.[8] If citizens' are not as willing to engage in stakeholder

[4] See Reed et al. 2009 and Coccossis et al. 2006

[5] Petersen & Bowman 2012

[6] Beate Kohler-Koch 2010

[7] Geissel 2008

[8] Cornwall 2008

deliberations, as would be necessary for rightfully claiming that engagement methods are inclusive and non-elitist, one has to think about the conditions participants are offered.

Unequal chances for participation can easily derive from unequal distribution of time resources and budgets. Participation is not only costly if there are travel expenses, it is also costly in terms of working time that could be spent on other activities. The risk for this investment then lies entirely on those who deliberate. They should have faith that there will be well-facilitated discussions and reporting will not distort any of their voiced opinions. Apart from costs, abstinence from taking part in deliberations does not necessarily mean lack of interest: Not everybody might share the belief that stakeholder deliberation would automatically lead to less elitist decision making, fairer policies or better balanced discussions.

The idea of making science more democratic by engaging "the public" or societal "stakeholders" is a claim that is still to be proved:

> *Participatory governance is a concept that is receiving increasing prominence. However, more empirical research is needed to clarify whether participatory governance is beneficial or detrimental to democracy.*[9]

Maybe participation of social actors does not improve democratic governance of science but de-democratize governance if the status quo of stakeholder engagement is not considerably improved. Yannis Papadopoulos reflects:

> *if multi-level governance is uncoupled and remote from representative government, (...) decisions are made in reality by actors other than those (...) regarded as authorised decision-makers by the people or the affected communities. The effectiveness of the democratic feedback loop is thus undermined: the retrospective evaluation of office holders on the grounds of their policy achievements, and the prospective evaluation of candidates on the grounds of their pledges become to a large extent fictitious.* [10]

[9] Geissel 2009

[10] Papadopoulos 2010

That engagement practices do not necessarily lead to more democracy is not surprising: democracy was never achieved just by bringing together a group of people and have them agree on something.

It is a challenge to avoid repetitive consultations among mostly the same players ("the usual suspects"). The question is also how to avoid that potentially interested organisations are excluded from being considered as stakeholders in such a consultation and how not to make arbitrary decisions when inviting stakeholders. Making decisions transparent is not enough, because decision-making can be transparent, but nevertheless arbitrary.

How are research programmes developed and how are different interest groups involved? Stakeholders might inform national ministries, the European Parliament and/or the European Commission about their strategic and research priorities, comment on draft versions of the programme and later on work programmes, which do not circulate publicly, participate in expert groups organised by public authorities, lobby for call topics, and participate in the peer review of proposals and in programme evaluation. At worst, such stakeholders could be commissioned with research projects on exactly the topics they have successfully lobbied for, herewith increasing their influence on future research programming. Robert K. Merton called the effect of such cumulative advantages for already advantaged actors the Matthew effect.[11] The more an individual is known, the more it is likely that others will attribute competence and importance to her/him. This increases this person's chances to interact with high level policy makers, of being invited to consultations, of receiving funds, or publishing in prestigious journals, etc., which results in being more widely known, being seen as more competent and receiving a disproportionate share of financial and human resources. It leads to "the concentration of scientific resources and talent".[12] Attributed merits can be justified, but the Matthew effect creates a well-known social dynamic that facilitates closed clubs reinforcing themselves. Reaching out beyond such circles by bringing new actors into the process helps to broaden perspectives on food, health and sustainability and increase legitimacy of such stakeholder involvement. With mainly targeting organisations who do not often participate in lobbying and participatory

[11] Merton 1968

[12] Merton 1968, p. 62

activities, whether hidden or not, this also helps to avoid any repetition of prior stakeholder involvement and start a learning process all those involved – workshop participants, organisers, client and maybe a broader public – could gain from.

When it comes to deliberation on policies, inviting certain persons, organisations, interest groups or “stakeholders” could very easily turn into allocating power - power to define a problem, power to suggest future solutions, power to set directions that make turning back difficult or impossible, or maybe even power to build informal networks which decide who will be invited to future deliberations.

The development of reliable public and stakeholder engagement activities is in its early stages and much has to be done if such methods should ever meet reasonable standards of democratic legitimacy. For the issues INPROFOOD is dealing with, namely research programming in the area of food and health, combined with an environmental sustainability perspective, this means that there is not a ready-for-use set of public engagement methods yet, to bring representatives of different interests to the table, but that novel methods should be developed to improve stakeholder deliberation on a such multi-faceted and sensitive issue.

Challenges on the micro-level: social and human factors

Besides questions of representation and legitimacy, psychological and social factors deserve special attention, too.

Facilitators, organisers & group dynamics

The effect interviewers have on interviewees is documented in methodological handbooks on social scientific research.[13] All aspects of appearance, age, sex and other characteristics of an interviewer may impact on the outcomes of an interview. It seems likely that the same applies to a facilitator, even a very professional one. Equally it seems unlikely that the characteristics of any institution conducting a workshop would have no influence at all on which stakeholders and individual organisations attend a workshop and how participants discuss an issue. Likewise, it must be expected that participants influence each others not

[13] Schell/Hill/Esser 1989, p. 323

only in respect to rational reflection. The effects of group dynamics and group pressure are well known in social psychology. Attitudes and anticipated reactions of others heavily impact on our own behaviours. The confidence with which somebody brings a certain opinion forward, often depends on whether this opinion represents a minority or a majority position, or whether approval or rejection is anticipated. A good facilitator may reduce social effects, but it would be overly optimistic to believe that these can be fully eradicated.[14] Because it is impossible to fully erase situational effects as described above - so the reasoning of the authors – the pragmatic solution was to carry out several workshops independently from each other. As it seems unlikely that workshops conducted differently from each other produce the same coincidental "errors", they may yield some common outcomes which could be better trusted than the results of one workshop only.

Documentation and interpretation

Any person perceives only a small part of what actually is communicated. Hence documentation always contains elements of interpretation. The more layers of interpretation there are, the more communication errors accumulate and change the meaning of the original messages. If a group of persons is asked about the most important results of a deliberation, each of them may give different answers. This is similar to the hermeneutic circle: An interpretation of a text or an utterance always build upon a previous understanding. Usually this understanding is not the same of those who produced the text or made the utterance. Even if we do our best to revise prejudices and be open-minded, we cannot avoid this circle.[15]

Principally, above mentioned biases are not fully avoidable in any single stakeholder deliberation activity. There is no method to distinguish between deliberation outcomes that result from purposeful reflections from results that are due to the "human factor" of groups dynamics or individual perceptions. But by comparing the outcomes of workshops held in different places and with different organisations, such effects have less impact, because their effects on the outcomes will not be reproduced easily. On the other hand, if

[14] Griffith/Fuller/Northcraft 1998

[15] Ast 1808, Gadamer 1960

participants in different places come up with similar ideas independently from each other, these ideas deserve more attention than if they come up only in one workshop.

Power balance and diversity: regional outreach & hierarchy levels

Are participants in an equal position to talk about the issue of concern? Hierarchies in real life are likely to hamper a free exchange of ideas and experiences. Direct dependencies unavoidably lead to bargaining and negotiation: researchers and scientists will present their project ideas to potential fund givers (public or private); young researchers, will present themselves in a good light in front of people that can help or hinder their future career. Even if professional facilitators can create an atmosphere of fair and equal communication, it cannot be assumed that real life inequalities would simply disappear into thin air. More likely, the weaker participants hold back (some of) their opinions. Or, maybe even worse, a good atmosphere creates an illusion of equality, and later on, when real life hierarchies catch up, some regret their frankness in the heat of the discussions. This is another reason why the authors considered it as sensible to invite organisations considered to be on a more equal level to each other.

Reproducibility (reliability) of outcomes

The scenario method is not a qualitative research method, it is an engagement method. Instead of meeting scientific criteria, the method has to meet criteria of legitimacy. Participatory deliberation cannot meet the strict scientific standards of experiments where settings can be strictly matched and make it possible to vary one factor and to keep other factors stable, so that the first factor can be investigated without confounding influences. Hence, there is always uncertainty as to whether the outcomes are due to the participating stakeholder categories, specific characteristics of the organisers, the environment, the present individual personalities, their relation to each other outside the participation event, and the group dynamics within that specific combination of people on that specific day. Although the term "control group" does not apply it makes sense to match events as far as possible so that, to some extent, the events are used to "control" each other mutually. Also, replication gives some momentum to the deliberation efforts of participants on a lower hierarchy level and gives them better chances to be heard: The results of one workshop standing alone can easily be discarded. Opponents might rightfully argue that there is no proof that other individuals would not have come to different conclusions. But if a broad range of stakeholders come to some similar results independently from each other in different workshops, their conclusions should gain some weight. This may especially be important if citizens come together who operate without extensive economic power or networks, e.g. the majority of SMEs (small to medium enterprises) and NPOs without business affiliations.

The scenario workshops organised in the framework of INPROFOOD were an attempt to tackle the issues mentioned above to the best extent possible.

The workshop plan

What is a scenario workshop?

To allow for interaction between different actors, it was decided to use an adapted version of the scenario workshop methodology. This method was invented by the Danish Board of Technology, and has been widely applied, often in urban planning. 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.[16] In working groups of varying composition and in plenaries, participants develop scenarios on the workshop topic, name barriers and propose strategies and steps for realizing the goals and overcoming the barriers. Usually such workshops last for 1-2 days. Such a workshop follows three phases - the critical analysis phase, the visionary phase and the implementation phase – "to create a basis for local action". On the agenda are alternating plenum and breakout sessions.

The European Awareness Scenario Workshop (EASW) setting is one which allows for interaction between stakeholders rather than in which presentations are provided to participants. Building on concrete "scenarios" or problem constellations, it invites working group members to think about realistic challenges rather than dreaming up unlikely problems and solving them. As INPROFOOD is dealing with the challenging topic of programme making in the highly contested area of food and health (and sustainability), target groups were not individuals or laypersons, but highly knowledgeable practical and theoretical experts sent by organisations in an official role of delegates. To allow for an intense discussion during one workshop day, 12 – 16 participants were set as ideal target number. Ideally, each organisation should send one delegate only, and in all workshops together gender balance should be reached. One disadvantage of EASWs is their reliance on stakeholder balance, which might never be reached realistically. However, targeting a

[16] 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, last access on 30 August 2013.

certain number of distinctive stakeholders is a good starting point to make “bringing together a broad range of interests” a little more concrete.

Conducting similar workshops independently of each other

The workshops should 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 comparison of the workshop outputs can provide more stable 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.

To avoid mutual influences of workshops on each other, it was agreed in the consortium not to talk about results of a workshop until the whole series had been finished. The workshops would only be reproduced properly, if they were conducted independently of each other and if there were no contamination of thoughts while they were carried out. Hence, organisers would not talk about the results of their workshops before the series of 13 workshops had finished. Exchange about experiences should only take place *after* they had documented the outcomes in their country reports. Otherwise it could not be avoided, that learning about the results of other workshops would influence organisers or facilitators when conducting their own workshop.

Who should participate?

Roughly one can distinguish between methods that involve individual citizens and those that involve organisations, which both have their pros and cons: individual citizens – but only if selected randomly – are less likely to be biased by special interests in the topic and may contribute more open-mindedly on the issues at stake. This advantage is a disadvantage at the same time: outcomes of citizen consultations and deliberations can be quite vague and general as they lack the long term reflection on the topic that often is acquired by an organisation during long-time engagement in a specific issue. From organisations we can expect well-founded opinions based on background knowledge and lived experiences, which they are also trained to express pointedly. Grassroot organisations such as selfhelp groups and environmental organisations as well as business associations have experience in a brought range of issues concerning their work. They lobby for certain policies, and are experienced in presenting their perspectives. Their views, if they are based on their missions, are longstanding, deeply rooted and less likely to change spontaneously. If participants have only limited time for acquiring information and for the actual deliberation – which is almost always the case – a deliberation of delegates from organisations might yield more substantiated outcomes than the deliberation of individual citizens. On the other hand, again, the same interest of organisations in the topics they are pursuing that forms the basis for their excellent background knowledge can undermine a free exchange of ideas and lead to negotiating organisational interests instead of societal ones. While in citizen involvement there is a standard of selecting participants randomly from defined areas (frequently taking account of characteristics like sex and age), in stakeholder involvement questions of selection, accountability and legitimacy remain widely open (see Abels 2009).[17] - In the INPROFOOD project, which deals with highly contested thematic areas – food, nutrition, health, sustainability, the directions innovation should take – inviting citizens posed the risk of merely reproducing general discussions along well-trodded paths. Consequently, the decision has been made to identify participants on a institutional basis.

Stakeholder categories: Reaching out beyond the known circles

To address similar stakeholder categories and groups, **eligibility criteria** were established by setting up a matrix of stakeholder categories (see annex N), which were further specified by naming stakeholder groups. For determining stakeholder categories and groups, it was necessary to get an overview on what kind of stakeholders there are in the different countries where the workshops took place, and how easily they could be found. Hence, each workshop organiser investigated for her/his respective region, which organisation types and information on them was accessible. Hence, the basic categories were tied to core characteristics that could be identified across different countries: Three basic categories have been identified:

[17] Urban/Strähle 2012a, p. 374. The publication we refer to, is Abels 2009.

- public organisations (PUB)
- business-related organisations (BUS) and
- citizen non-profit organisations / NPOs without business ties (NPO)

The core distinctions were based on the following questions: to whom is an organisation acountable to? Where does its financing come from? Who are its members?

The **range of stakeholders** was widened by looking for stakeholders, who might be strongly affected by food, health and sustainability but have not been regularly involved in stakeholder consultations. To reach out beyond established links, new organisations and institutions were targeted across all stakeholder categories , such as parents associations, regional farm-workers associations, self-help groups. Working fields and academic disciplines should also be broader than usual.

It can never be assumed that women and men, senior citizens and young people come to same conclusions when deliberating on a topic. For this reason it was considered to have a certain number workshops with participants of homogeneous sex and age groups. Later, however, the consortium decied that, for this project, which is a pilot, this proposal seemed to make recruitment of delegates from organisations too difficult and complicated, so it was not tried out.

Diversification in respect of power levels and hierarchies

Power imbalances can derive from multiple factors, like size, financial resources, governmental authority, regional outreach, and many more. It is not feasible to consider all of them and level them out. If **power imbalances** have to be avoided, but powerful and less powerful actors shall participate, the solution is to have them participate in different workshops. So it was decided that in each country three scenario workshops would take place and three levels of social hierarchy were determined: small, medium and large, with size being a proxy for power, influence and decision efficacy. A national research council has more decision efficacy than a regional cluster of research institutes specializing in technical development, which probably has more power than a single private social scientific research institute. The organisation of a workshop with the simultaneous presence of, for example, a small local initiative and an association of large industries would need to be avoided. In an ideal case, patients groups and doctors, researchers and funders would not participate in the same workshops.

Targeting different power levels **separately** has another advantage: it is also a means of diversification and makes sure that not only the most powerful actors deliberate: because the “biggest” players have access to decision making processes on policies in the area of sustainable food and health research anyway, new or neglected perspectives and blind spots might be rather found on the second and third hierarchy levels. Although the three main stakeholder categories seemed to allow for inviting a high number of different organisation types to a workshop, combining these three categories and roughly distinguishing between three power levels substantially narrowed the range of eligible organisation types for each workshop series.

The main goal of separating participants on the basis of different hierarchy levels does not lead to clear-cut distinctions, but helps to make sure that other than the stronger organisations (the “larger players”) would be included in the workshops and to ensure that “smaller players” would not be hampered by greater hierarchy gaps. The estimation of hierarchy levels, depends on the organisation type. The use of the terms “large”, “medium” and “small” constitute a well established way to characterize enterprises, but are less useful in respect to other organisation types. The distinction between small, medium and large organisations depends on several factors: the size of a country, its governance systems, the roles specific organisations play in respect to food, health and environmental sustainability. Without detailed research, clear-cut criteria on these distinctions cannot be valid. For pragmatic reasons, the INPROFOOD consortium decided on rules of thumb tailored to the respective countries in which the workshops took place. The stakeholder matrix provided the overall framework for these rules.

Targeting business associations seemed preferable to targeting single businesses. Participation of enterprises in research policy oriented workshops could create an competition advantage for them. Subsequently, in all three workshop series companies were excluded. In the first series, only business associations were eligible but not single businesses. In the second and third workshop series, single SMEs were allowed, because during the exploration of stakeholder landscapes evidence showed that SMEs were often not organised on a local or regional level. Small to medium enterprises constitute the overwhelming majority of food industries in Europe, hence they should not be excluded from participation on the grounds that they are not sufficiently organised.

In respect to the non-profit category, hierarchy levels are more difficult to estimate. Should one count members, budgets, employees or other aspects? The non-profit category is already complicated by the fact that it does not often appear in its pure form but in hybridisation with economic, governmental, religious or other interests. Identifying "NPOs without business ties" is already a demanding task. For the first series, the "large players", organisations with national outreach were targeted. International sub-organisations were also counted as large entities as well as were umbrella organisations. For the practical reason that NPOs without business ties were under-represented in the first series in many workshops, it was decided to drop all restrictions for this category in the second and third series, apart from excluding umbrella and international organisations. As discussed in the beginning, some partners were able to distinguish between a more national, regional or local scope.

The hierarchy levels of the third category, public organisations, could be best estimated on the basis of their geographical outreach. Optimally, the first series would be conducted with national entities, the second on a more regional level, *and* the third on a more local level. What of course cannot be entirely prevented is that "size" is a relative term in respect to the size of a country. (Larger) public universities were allocated to the highest hierarchy level, while single institutions and departments should be invited to Series 2 or Series 3.

Final allocation of organisations to a stakeholder category

Bringing together different actors is complicated by the fact that it is not always clear who represents which interests, because in a complex society, responsibilities and interests are not clear-cut. Determining if an organisation is eligible or to which of the defined stakeholder categories it belongs, often needs extensive background research. For example, there are quite a few NPOs dominated or even entirely run by enterprises, which constitute a quite different interest group than what is understood commonly as "civil society". Public authorities and universities cooperate with companies and share common perspectives, and governments establish Public-Private-Partnerships, which themselves unite a broad range of stakeholders from science, industry and/or the non-profit sector.

Performing background research during the database compilation would not be practicable to a certain extent, at least if there should be a reasonable number of entries to select by lot. Hence, workshop organizers pre-categorized their stakeholder databases beforehand only as far as they could know. After being randomly selected or, in the case of the call for participation, 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. If it turned out that a selected organization really belonged to a different category, it should be reassigned accordingly. If recruitment was done by an open call for participation, the allocation to a category was not performed by the organizations that signed up, but by the organizers according to the eligibility criteria.

A practical issue: Specifying „civil society"

Stakeholder deliberation often claims to include "civil society" or "the non-profit sector". Both terms describe an extra-ordinarily wide field of different actors and contradicting definitions can be found in different contexts, so that without further specification the terms are hardly useful. More recently, this diagnosis has been confirmed by the EU-funded project CONSIDER that focusses on the participation of civil society organisations (CSO) in research:

> *What is a CSO? There is no universally accepted definition of civil society organisation. The lack of clarity surrounding the term means that those engaged in discussions about CSOs may not be talking about the same thing. Further complicating matters, CSO is a rather rarefied English term with no equivalent in many other language contexts.*[18]

For arriving at a working definition of civil society or non-profit organisation, we consulted several official websites of the European Commission. On its Civil Society Homepage (CISOCH) the European Commission's DG Development and Cooperation defines civil society organisations as "non-market and non-state organisations and structures in which people organise to pursue shared objectives and ideals".[19] Among others, this includes farmers' associations and professional associations. According to the INPROFOOD stakeholder matrix, these are business-oriented organisations. CISOCH distinguishes four different levels:

[18] CONSIDER 2013, p.2

[19] European Commission, Wiki of the Civil Society Helpdesk (CISOCH): "Civil society organisation"

Informal groupings, legally registered organisations "working for the benefit of the population or in service delivery", geographic or thematic networks, and networks of networks. In the framework of the European Commission's FP7 funding scheme "Research for the Benefit of Specific Groups: Civil Society Organisations (BSG_CSO)" CSOs are defined as "non-governmental, not-for-profit, not representing commercial interests and pursuing a common purpose for the public interest."[20]. And in the guidelines of the FLEGT Programme it was defined "as a not-for-profit organisation that pursues an issue(s) and values defined by its members or constituency and that contributes to the common good or public interest."[21] The last two definitions would come close the understanding of the term NPO used for the workshops, but are less strict, because they allow for labelling NPOs, which are to a crucial extent dependent on funding or sponsoring by companies, as CSOs. For the workshops, CSOs with funding or sponsoring income small compared to their revenues are not ruled out as citizen non-profit organisations, i.e. NPOs without business ties. The distinction between NPOs and "citizen NPOs" was made to exclude from the NPO category business associations, which are often established as non-profit organisations, such as Chambers of Commerce, foundations dependent on corporations, banks and other kinds of companies, government-controlled NGOs, and front-running: "grassroot organisations" set up or entertained by enterprises with a questionable understanding of corporate social responsibility, which sometimes pretend to be environmental groups, but promote only the objectives of the enterprises standing behind them. In addition to belonging to one of the stakeholder categories the following participation criteria were set up: Participants must not be in role conflict because they belong to more than one stakeholder group or category; and have no direct dependencies or links among participants.

Common agenda

Matching a series of diverse workshops requires a common agenda. Together with Katharina Novy, the professional facilitator, who also coordinated the Austrian workshops, Regina Reimer, Michael Strähle and Christine Urban of Wissenschaftsladen Wien – Science Shop

[20] European Commission, A new funding scheme for the active participation of civil society organisations in research

[21] European Union / Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) FLEGT Programme (GCP/GLO/395/EC), Call for Project Proposals, Guidelines for VPA countries, p.4, Fn.2

Vienna, the organisation coordinating the workpackage in which the workshops took place, set up an agenda for the workshops. Compared to the original scenario workshop concept, the number of participants would be lower and no action plans would be made. Consent would be welcome, but dissent accepted and documented to the same extent. In an online meeting, Katharina Novy explained the agenda in full detail to workshop facilitators of all partners, who also received the instructions in written form.[22]

Because the workshops would be on research programming for socially and environmentally sustainable food innovations, the following aspects of research funding 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 any level. As explained before, to a considerable extent the outcomes of group discussions depend on who is being invited. Dominating participants, controversies and power imbalances among participants can create undesired group dynamics. The workshop agenda with alternating working groups and plenary sessions is very intense and the steps are interdependent. This requires independent professional facilitators who coordinate the workshops and keep up an inspiring and motivating atmosphere.

Common information and invitation materials

There was a common invitation letter with an information sheet on the workshop and the INPROFOOD project, in general. Stakeholders who agreed to participate, received a common briefing paper with some general information about research programming, explanations on food innovation and some background information on food and health.[23] This briefing paper served also as a common starting point for the scenario workshop. A shortened version of this text was planned to be put on display on the morning of the workshops. In this way the deliberation could be scheduled for one day only and thus attract a broader range of stakeholders.

[22] For the agenda and the instructions for the facilitators, see annexes F, G, I, J, K, and L.

[23] See annex E.

Organisations, which have been listed in a database but not selected (yet), should receive a so-called replacement letter. Because it is not realistic to expect that most of the invited organisations eventually participate, organisers wrote a letter/email to “replacements” from a list of randomly invited organisations. Those organisations were informed that it is possible that they would be invited and asked to reply if they were principally interested in participation if other organisations dropped out. Participants have been informed that the workshops were different from conferences and information events. The general information sheet informed them about the nature and the objectives of the workshop, why and how the participants have been invited, how the outcomes will be documented and what will be done with them.

Workshop organisers were asked to translate these materials into the language(s) in which their workshop were held. Templates for information materials can be found in the annex; respective translations by partners can be found in the annexes of workshop reports or together in an extra file at www.inprofood.eu/documentation.

At the workshop participants should have received a folder with the general information sheet, a list of participants (each participant was identified by name, affiliation and stakeholder category), the briefing paper, the INPROFOOD brochure, and perhaps also some information about the organisers. Small organisations often do not have the resources for participating in such deliberation activities. To allow for their participation, several partners offered participants to cover their travel expenses.

Tackling the representation problem - democratic recruitment strategies

Public random drawing from databases

INPROFOOD, which is dealing with a highly contested arena, in which interests, views and cultures clash and where a lot of financial gain or loss is at stake, brought an element of sortition into stakeholder deliberation.

Improving the public credibility of a participatory activity and making this kind of activity more attractive to already fatigued or sceptical organisations, started with recruiting workshop participants in a way that can be trusted by a wider public. Instead of handpicking invitees, a pool of potential candidates was compiled. The decision on who is asked first was made by lot. Each candidate had the same chance to attend, if s/he was interested. Sortition is not a new invention, but similar forms of random selection have a long tradition in democratic governance. It goes without saying that compiling a database from which invitees are drawn, must follow the same degree of transparency and impartiality for specific organisations as all other steps of recruitment. All kinds of possible participants were collected by the consortium, then Wissenschaftsladen Wien - Science Shop Vienna clustered them and sent out a matrix (see annex). Partners gave feedback on which organisation types were present in their countries, and which they could easily find or not.

Drawing randomly can only increase public acceptance, if a very high degree of transparency is maintained. Nothing must take place behind the curtains, but each step needs to be performed publicly and in a way that demonstrates to all interested parties how manipulation is ruled out. That means that the databases, the dates of lottery draws and the method of selection were to be pre-announced. Equally it is necessary to clarify, how the pool of candidates, the database, was compiled.

As expected, partners gave feedback that there are no complete lists of all stakeholders in food, health and sustainability. Regretfully, only in a number of EU Member States and Associated Countries are there sufficient reliable information resources to compile comprehensive databases to draw from. Most often INPROFOOD partners described a lack of directories on non-profit organisations or small and medium enterprises. As much as possible, the entries of the databases were taken from freely accessible public online sources such as online databases, directories and link lists hosted and maintained by public authorities. Where this was not possible due to a lack of such reliable resources, it was decided that this should be well documented and that less optimal sources could be consulted. Irrespective of which sources were used, the databases were compiled rather with the help of a system rather than by hand picking entries. To be transparent and checkable, the random selection should be based on public lottery draws. Together with the databases, it was decided to include explanations of how the databases had been compiled. Thus, the online sources would be named, necessary compromises described, and, optionally, difficulties in information retrieval pointed out. It was consented that the dates of the public lottery draws would also be published – with all draws taking place after the publication of the databases. After the lottery draws a list of the selected organisations to be asked to participate would be published online, too. (For examples please go to http://www.inprofood.eu/documentation/.)

If it is the goal to improve democratic legitimacy of stakeholder engagement, then it is crucial that each single step of the procedure can be observed and verified by the critical citizen. All interested parties should be able to observe and verify the whole procedure from the very beginning to the end. A transparent recruitment scheme would be publicly available.

Recruitment by Call for Participation

While some organisers did not experience too many difficulties to compile databases, randomly select and invite participants, others reported challenges to recruit sufficient participants for their first workshop. For this reason, a second recruitment scheme was developed: Calls for Participation, which partners could choose as an alternative to recruitment by drawing invitees from a database by using a public lottery. In case too many participants signed up, the lot should decide again who would be able to attend.

The **Calls for Participation** were conceived to be as transparent as the original recruitment strategy and equally avoided arbitrary invitation of participants. There was a general text for all calls, which was adapted to national, regional and local circumstances by specific participation criteria for public entities, NPOs and SMEs, respectively their associations.[24] Partners released such public calls and promoted them within a short time interval. They sent them to media, umbrella organisations (so they can spread it to their members), mailinglists, universities, business associations, etc. Additionally, the authors of this report asked 15 European umbrella organisations of CSOs to spread the calls among their regional members. As before, participation of every organisation was limited to one person. Universities were addressed at department level. Consequently participation was restricted to one person per department.

The call text specified criteria interested organisations had to meet. The calls addressed **organisations of small or medium power**, **regional outreach, budgets, etc.** Criteria referred

[24] See http://scenario-workshops.net.

to "**small" and "medium" organisations in terms of power and influence**, which allows for interpretation: **regional outreach, available funds, hierarchy levels, or other aspects**. Within this frame there was a lot of room for flexibility so partners could set up criteria adapted to their countries: the number of organisations of a certain type in a certain area, available travel budgets, etc. Workshop organisers could define **absolute criteria** or **relative criteria.** For example, one could target all health-related NPOs (without business ties) in district/town/region A and B, and target the larger region for the second and the smaller one for the third workshop series. Or they could also assign the NPOs *after* they signed up and ask them on which regional level they operate. Then those with the broader outreach could be assigned to EASW 2 and those with smaller outreach to EASW 3.

For the Calls for Participation a website was set up, where potential participants were publicly listed after they had signed up there. The call website is a Word Press content management system (CMS), set up, hosted and administrated by the authors of this report. Organisations interested in participating signed up with the name of the organisation, the personal name of their delegate, e-mail address and city/town in which they are situated. Each automatically signatory received a message with a link to confirm their interest. By clicking on this confirmation link, signatories were listed on the call website with their organisation's name and the city or town in which their are located, but without their personal names. Once a signature had been confirmed, it could not be changed by signatories. On the website partners published their translations of the common text in the languages in which their workshops were held. To each call text a separate list of signatories was attached. At the close of a call, partners received a spreadsheet with confirmed and unconfirmed signatures, which was automatically generated by the CMS. In case of a too high number of signatures a simple public random selection was foreseen, too.

Eight workshop organisers decided to use the second recruitment scheme, with one of them setting up their own call website. The others decided to go with the recruitment scheme of the first series. Sometimes the recruitment scheme of Series one (compiled database and "lottery" draw) was combined with this new online call for participation.

The Calls for Participation can be found at http://scenario-workshops.net.

Documentation and authenticity

It was agreed that workshop documentation should authentically reflect participants' input with as little interpretation as possible; with each workshop to be documented descriptively. Thus, participants' input should not be subjected to in-depth analysis, but reported as authentically as possible. Participants were delegates from organisations. It was proposed that they would be named in the workshop report's participant list, but would not be named as the contributors of specific input. Photos of working groups' flipchart posters, their transcriptions and English translations would form the core documentation. It was decided that there should be a report on every workshop in English. Also, if the workshop had been held in a different language, there would also be a version in that language publicly available. Participants' input would be recorded on flipchart posters. Each workshop report would authentically document the input with photos of the posters, transcripts of the posters and including a description of the workshop activities and a list of workshop participants. The participants' input would not be interpreted at this level. All workshops reports would be available for free download at the INPROFOOD website at least and remain available in their original form.

The analysis phase occurs only when considering together the results of all workshops of a series (large, medium and small institutions, respectively), or all together. The objective then is 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 (under the assumption that large, medium or small organisations might not put forward the same ideas). Topics appearing independently in different workshops of a series are less likely to stem from situational factors only.

Methodological limitations of the scenario workshops in INPROFOOD

Conducting three series of matched EASWs, which resulted in altogether 35 workshops, in an international and transdisciplinary setting is a novel participation activity.[25] To the knowledge of the authors, this is the largest transnational public engagement activity applying scenario workshops. At the same time some new standards for participatory deliberation have been introduced, e. g. replication, transparency, non-arbitrary recruitment, authentic documentation. Through all steps flexibility and fine-tuning were necessary.

Some scholars warn against uncritical enthusiasm about engagement methods and urge for using them more cautiously:

> *Just as we might urge protagonists of gene therapy, stem cell research and synthetic biology to be careful about hyping the potential outcomes of their technologies, engagement protagonists should be careful not to over-state the ability of the engagement paradigm to deliver solutions.*[26]

Although a lot of effort is made to reduce some of the shortcomings of participatory stakeholder deliberation, there remain some limitations that cannot be solved. Stakeholder participation is not appropriate to learn about the opinions and views of different sectors of the population. It is impossible to estimate how much any given group of participants would be typical or atypical for any given “stakeholder”. To make even a qualified guess one would have to know the how frequent interests, desires and opinions are found in the defined sub-populations of citizens.

If quantitative results are desired, like the views of certain segments in society, then the methods would have to be quantitative, too. Polls or other forms of social research or participatory events or public consultations are no substitute for representative democracy.

Another principle is that no representatives can speak for anybody but for themselves or the ones that explicitly entitled them to do so. Any CSO does not represent "civil society", any

[25] In four cases EASW2 and EASW3 had to be merged due to a lack of participants.
[26] Horst 2014

patient group does not cover "patient groups". If this kind of representation was required, only institutions could participate that were elected in a formal democratic procedure.

Outcomes of stakeholder engagement cannot also be generalized. They do not form a survey among citizens and do not allow the determination of what certain social groups think about certain issues in general. Firstly, because it is not possible to establish representativeness, if representativeness means that a certain type of organisation would be “representative” for all or at least most other organisations of the same type. There is also no solid basis to assume somebody would be a “typical” member of a certain interest group. Also, most invited organisations do not have a legal mandate to speak for the population or certain sectors of society. If statements about certain social groups or “stakeholders” are to be made, there is no way around complicated statistic procedures. If political recommendations are made, politically legitimated decision makers should make the decisions.

Stakeholder engagement is not democratically representative participation in policy making. Representation would require a clear definition of a population which would then receive potential policy making rights, from which a statistical sample would have to be drawn. There is no such definition until now. If we want to gain or maintain “society’s” credibility, citizens or at least their elected governments would need some kind of consensus as to which “stakeholders” they would trust to influence policy making to the benefit of all.

If the workshops would have been engagement activities organised by policy makers on research programming in food and health themselves, maybe it would have been quite easy to attract a lot of participants in the workshops in quite a short time. But as is now, no participation scheme has sufficient legitimacy to allow for such influence on policy making. Democratic governance of science and research is still in development. Up to now, it is a complicated process that raises still unsolved questions on legitimacy.

References

- Abels, G. (2009), Citizens' Deliberation and the EU Democratic Deficit: Is There a Model for Participatory Democracy?, Tübinger Arbeitspapiere zur Intergrationsforschung, 1/2009
- Ast, Friedrich (1808), Grundlinien der Grammatik, Hermeneutik und Kritik, Landshut
- 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
- CONSIDER Consortium (2013), Optimising civil society participation in research policy. Relevant findings from CONSIDER (Civil Society Organisations in Designing Research Governance), a research project investigating CSO involvement in EU-funded research, Policy Brief 1 – July 2013, updated August 2013, http://www.consider-project.eu/consider-policy-brief/, last access on 15 January 2014
- Cornwall, Andrea (2008), Unpacking 'Participation': models, meanings and practices, in: Community Development Journal, vol. 43, 3, pp. 269-283
- Danish Board of Technology, Description of the scenario workshop methodology, http://www.tekno.dk/subpage.php3?article=1235&toppic=kategori12&language=uk#scenario, last access on 30 August 2013
- Dewey, John (1927), The Public and its Problems, New York
- European Commission, Wiki of the Civil Society Helpdesk (CISOCH): "Civil society organisation", https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/aidco/index.php/Civil_society_organisation, last access on 30 August 2013
- European Commission, A new funding scheme for the active participation of civil society organisations 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 Union / Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) FLEGT Programme (GCP/GLO/395/EC) , Call for Project Proposals, Guidelines for VPA countries
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1960), Wahrheit und Methode, Tübingen

- 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, http://www.gesellschaftswissenschaften.uni-frankfurt.de/institut_2/bgeissel/upload/literatur/Participatory_Governance.pdf, last access on 30 August 2013
- Griffith, Terri L./Fuller, Mark A./Northcraft, Gregory B. (1998), Facilitator Influence in Group Support Systems: Intended and Unintended Effects, Information Systems Research, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 20-36
- Horst, Maja (2014), On the weakness of strong ties, in: Public Understanding of Science , vol 23, no. 1, pp. 43-47
- Kohler-Koch, Beate (2010), Civil society and EU democracy: 'astroturf' representation?, in: Journal of European Public Policy, vol. 17, 1, pp. 100-116
- Merton, Robert K. (1968), The Matthew Effect in Science, in: Science, 159(3810), pp. 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
- Alan Petersen, Alan/Bowman, Diana (2012), Engaging whom and for what ends? Australian stakeholders' constructions of public engagement in relation to nanotechnologies, in; Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics, Vol. 12, pp. 67-79
- 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, pp. 1933–1949

- Schell, R. /Hill, Paul B./Esser, E. (1989), Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung, 1989
- Urban, Christine/Strähle, Michael (2012a), 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/Strähle, Michael (2012b), Detailed Plan for the EASWs, http://www.inprofood.eu/reporting/, last access on 30 August 2013

Annexes

Annex A: Letter of invitation

Dear ....,

We are pleased to inform you that your organisation (NAME OF THE ORGANISATION) has been chosen to participate in the scenario workshop RESEARCH PROGRAMMING IN FOOD & HEALTH to be held in (city) on (date).

This event will be organised through the project INPROFOOD Â- Towards inclusive research programming for sustainable food innovations project (www.inprofood.eu) funded under the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Union. The project aims at bringing together civil society, academia and business to improve food and health research by IDENTIFYING SOCIALLY INCLUSIVE SOLUTIONS.

This is a unique opportunity to contribute to a Europe-wide scientific and political debate on food and health.

The one-day workshop will gather scientists, policy makers, and representatives of non-profit organisations and business associations to discuss research programming in the area of food & health in (include your country's name here) and co-create scenarios of desirable future programming. Participants of the event will have the opportunity to exchange their opinions in this area and develop alternative scenarios in an informal atmosphere with no formal slide presentations and lectures. They will be able to contribute their experiences, make suggestions and raise concerns, as well as identify barriers/ suggest solutions so that research programming better addresses societal interests.

The person to attend the event from your organisation should have some interest in the area of food and health research (see information sheet).

Participation in the event is FREE, but the NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IS STRICTLY LIMITED.

We would kindly ask you to please let us know the name and contact details of the person who can participate from your organisation until (DATE). In case your organisation cannot be part of this event, please let us know as soon as possible, so that we can select another potential participant as a replacement.

For more information on the project and the workshop including the methodology for choosing potential participants, please find attached the following documents:
* Project brochure in English (link if mail)
* Information sheet

Best wishes,

Annex B: Information sheet

(attachment to invitation letter, here unformatted)

RESEARCH PROGRAMMING IN FOOD & HEALTH
SCENARIO WORKSHOP

INPROFOOD - *Towards inclusive research programming for sustainable food innovations* project, funded by the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (www.inprofood.eu), aims at bringing together civil society, academia and business to tackle policy questions on food and health research.

The project will:

Contribute to adapting the governance of research and technological development in the area of food and health to facilitate sustainable and inclusive solutions;
Help further incorporate public concerns in science, research and technical development;
Contribute to an improved transnational cooperation;
Provide experiential feedback to underpin the policy debate on a "new social contract" between science and society by providing evidence on societal demands to support practical guidelines for inclusive, sustainable research designs.

The one-day scenario workshop will gather scientists, policy makers, and representatives of non-profit organisations and business associations to discuss research programming in the area of food & health and co-create scenarios of desirable future programming.

This workshop is part of a series of almost identical scenario workshops held in 13 European countries. Participants are chosen from three major stakeholder groups (public entities, business organisations and non-profit bodies) through a random selection to avoid arbitrary invitations. Your organisation has also been selected that way. (For more information about the random selection procedure, please visit the project website at http://www.inprofood.eu/documentation/).

Being a scenario workshop, this event is not a formal workshop with presentations, but is organised in a relaxed atmosphere and includes activities, such as brainstorming, scenario development, group discussions and others.

The report will be broadly disseminated to nonprofit organisations, governments and business associations in order to foster reflection and discussion. All participants will be named, by name and institution, but the individual contributions will remain anonymous.

For methodological reasons, none of the representatives can have conflict of interest. This means that participants should not have strong ties with organisations that belong to more than one stakeholder group. Participants should also have some interest in the area of food and health research as well.

Workshop venue:
Workshop date:
Contact information:

Annex C: Letter for those entries in the database that were not selected (yet)

Dear .....,

We have included your organisation in our stakeholder database for project INPROFOOD Towards inclusive research programming for sustainable food innovations. This project is funded by the European Commission under the 7th Framework Programme.

All organisations listed in the database are potentially concerned by the topic of the project, among others, universities, selfhelp groups, larger environmental NPOs, policy makers and business associations. As a listed stakeholder you will be informed about project results and invited to comment or give feedback at a later stage.

On DATE OF SCENARIO WORKSHOP we will organise a scenario workshop on research programming in food and health. The participants are not chosen arbitrarily, but they are selected from the stakeholder database by a transparent random procedure.

Your organisation was drawn as a replacement organisation in case one of the first selected stakeholders cannot participate. We friendly ask you to inform us to at your earliest convenience, if you would be interested able to send a member participant of your organisation in case we need to replace a selected organisation.

For more information on the project and the workshop, including the methodology for choosing potential participants, please go to inprofood.eu and inprofood.eu/documentation/. We also attach an information paper on the scenario workshops.

Best regards,

Annex D: General workshop information for participants

What is it about?

To meet future environmental and demographic challenges, we also need research policies that foster healthy AND sustainable food innovation. A healthier diet for a growing and ageing society that suffers from lack of physical activity is at the core of modern health policies. The threat of climate change and the scarcity of resources urgently demand for sustainable technologies. Apart from healthiness, safety and affordability, today's consumers ask for compliance with ethical and environmental standards. Food producers are challenged to provide smarter products (in Europe, they are often small and medium enterprises, but a strong economic sector and job creator).

On the European level the linking of food and health receives a lot of attention: health claims for food products will be restricted and need stronger scientific evidence. Food labelling regulations have been refined recently. Some Member States even put taxes on sweets, sugar, certain fats food products that they judge as unhealthy. In the Joint Programming Initiative *A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life* Member States aims at developing common visions and research agendas.

Long-term research programming is a tricky task. The standards for healthiness and sustainability are constantly changing, and research programmes on food innovation should allow for flexibility to react to such developments. Also what is considered as innovation is subject to change. It demands a political framework on a European and national level to the development of which this workshop will contribute.

Agenda

In small working groups of changing composition and sitting in a circle you will mostly discuss along your experiences, demands and concerns the various aspects of research programming in food & health research. There will be two rounds of working groups and plenary sessions on the working groups, the second round will build upon the first. Together with the other participants, you will draft worst-case and best-case scenarios of research programming for healthy and sustainable innovations in the food area on an equal footing. That way, you will discuss potential pitfalls, intended/unintended effects and standards demanded for research programmes to foster healthy and sustainable food innovation. A professional facilitator will keep up collaboration among participants on an equal footing and an inspiring and motivating atmosphere. Because of this workshop structure, we kindly request you to attend the whole workshop and not to leave earlier or come later.

Why have you been invited?

By taking recourse to reliable, public web resources we systematically compiled a database of organisations. We also want to distribute evenly the opportunities for potentially concerned organisations (stakeholders) to bring in their demands, experiences and opinions. For invitations we applied a random selection scheme based on public lottery numbers.

Documentation

The documentation of the workshop will be a descriptive presentation of working group findings without much interpretation. Contributions will not be identified by name. You and the organisation you are representing will be named only in a list of all workshop participants. For each working group only the number of stakeholder "representatives" by group will be given, but not which persons participated in which working group. So participants can speak more freely and working groups will better cooperate.

Outcomes will be documented for each working group separately. We will not present a consensus only, but different trains of thoughts and opinions are equally valuable.

What will we do with the results?
The outcomes of working groups will be compared to the outcomes of working groups in similar scenario workshops in 12 other European countries.[27] The national documentation will be available in *(fill in the language your workshop will be held in)* and an English translation of the report will be included into the cross-regional comparing report. Both reports will be brought to the attention of national and European politicians, large health and sustainability networks, innovators, etc.

The reports of the national workshops and the report comparing the workshops conducted in different regions will be of high interest to the European Commission, which funds the INPROFOOD project. They will be available for free download at inprofood.eu and other websites.

There will be a strong effort to bring them to the attention of not only national and international policy makers, but also to civil society, business communities and the research community all over Europe. The results will also feed into an Open Space Conference of civil society and business representatives, researchers, scientists, and policy makers from all over Europe scheduled for 2013.

A NOTE FOR PARTICIPANTS WHO NEED TO TRAVEL TO ATTEND THE WORKSHOP:
If you need to travel for attending the workshop, you will be reimbursed for your travel expenses (hotel accommodation up to 90 €, train ticket (2nd class ... fill in your conditions).

[27] Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, and the United Kingdom

Annex E: Briefing paper

HOW CAN RESEARCH PROGRAMMES FOSTER HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE FOOD INNOVATION?

1. Background

"The availability of safe, nutritious, affordable and healthy food has taken on a new and pressing dimension in the face of an ever growing global population and increasing environmental and sustainability concerns."[28]

European governments are struggling with the growing social and economic consequences of an alarming increase in directly or indirectly diet-related diseases, including malnutrition, overweight, micronutrient deficiencies and food intolerances and allergies in subgroups of the population.[29] "The population of Europe is ageing - within EU Member States, the number of people over 80 years is estimated to increase by about 30% over the next 50 years." A shrinking working population with a higher proportion of retired people could overburden our health and welfare systems. European policies aim at healthy ageing, not only on expanding life years and also preventing or postponing the onset of diseases. [30]

"The obvious links between food quality, human health, and the capacity of ecosystems (...) must be explored in view of optimizing the food systems, making them safe, resilient and efficient, and keeping the competitiveness of (...) the food-industry, in a changing world."[31] In Europe, food industry is the second largest manufacturing sector and one of the most important job creators. This sector consists mainly (to 99%) of small and medium enterprises" [32]. Today's consumers not only demand for safe, healthy, and tasty food, but they pay also attention to ethical and ecological issues. Additionally, consumer need products that are easy to prepare and remain affordable for them. [33]

Food health claims, regulations and research demands

Food innovation can go wrong, too. A very well known example are the margarines which were propagated as heart protecting alternative to butter. Meanwhile scientist found out that the trans-fats in these margarines cause more arterial damage than anything else. Today, they are regarded as one of the main risk factors for cardio vascular diseases.[34] More recent research indicates that high fructose intake, might trigger metabolic changes that are especially unhealthy for people with diabetes pre-disposition. New microbiological and nutrigenomic research point to individual vulnerabilities of diverse population groups and often reverses previous scientific views. Today the relations between nutrition and physical activity/immobility are seen as much more complex than

[28] http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/food/policy/index_en.htm
[29] Strategic Research Agenda. 2012-2020 and beyond. Joint Programming Initiative. A healthy diet for a healthy life, 2012, p. 10
[30] Joint Programming Initiative, A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life. The vision for 2030, management board of the JPI HDL, 2010, p. 12
[31] http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/food/policy/index_en.htm
[32] http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/eu-market/index_en.htm
[33] Joint Programming Initiative, A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life. The vision for 2030, management board of the JPI HDL, 2010, pp. 6, 12, 16
[34] See also http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/1085248/trans-fat

ever before. Recent EU regulations substantially reduce health claims for food. They mirror a trend towards more caution with definite assertions of the healthiness of specific food products.

European policy makers consent that it is necessary to gain more (accurate) insight on the complex connections between physical activity and nutrition on the one hand and its positive or negative consequences for individual health. They demand a stronger evidence base for food “healthiness”, which is constantly adapted according to new research.[35]

2. A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life

21 countries agreed to bundle their resources in the *Joint Programming Initiative (JPI) A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life*. On the website the future vision of the members is summarized as following: "In 2030 all Europeans will have the motivation, ability and opportunity to consume a healthy diet from a variety of foods, have healthy levels of physical activity and the incidence of diet-related diseases will have decreased significantly**."**[36]

They identify **three key areas**:[37]
1) Determinants of diet and physical activity: ensuring the healthy choice is the easy choice
2) Diet and food production: developing high-quality, healthy, safe and sustainable food products.
3) Diet-related chronic diseases: preventing diet-related, chronic diseases and increasing the quality of life.

In this workshop we deal with point 2, **Diet and food production:** ”The challenge is to stimulate the European consumers to select foods that fit into a healthy diet and to **stimulate the food industry to produce healthier foods in a sustainable way**. In 2030, European consumers will have a good choice of healthy foods to choose from: the healthy choice has become the easy choice.”[38]

What can food innovation be about?
There is an enormously wide range of possible innovation. It can mean changing texture or taste of food. It can address packaging or improving hygiene at the different stages of food production. New analytical methods can optimise processing and make end-products more healthy and cost-effective and reduce waste. Below you find some examples:

primary food properties & healthiness of final product ♦ carrying beneficial components into final product ♦ non-traditional EU food groups like algae ♦ reduce high sugar, salt & saturated fat ♦ optimise the level of bioactive components ♦ novel food product textures ♦ minimize, respectively utilise by-products & waste ♦ rapid analytical methods ♦ high quality & low cost processing hygiene ♦ bio-processing and separation technologies ♦ effects of preservation, processing & preparation ♦ impact of processing on allergenic potential ♦ maintain the healthy properties after processing ♦ flexible, intelligent and convenient packaging ♦ convenience foods ♦ tailor-made products for specific groups ♦ attractive meals for children/the elderly ♦ flexible,

[35] Joint Programming Initiative A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life. The vision for 2030, 2010
[36] https://www.healthydietforhealthylife.eu/index.php?index=24
[37] https://www.healthydietforhealthylife.eu/index.php?index=23-
[38] http://www.jpihdhl.eu/

distributed and miniaturised processing systems ♦ consumer acceptable production & processing[39]

3. Research programming

Research funding schemes require some fundamental decisions and essential framework conditions for effective implementation. In principle, should funding be available for any research topic researchers propose? Or should research funders launch competitive, thematic calls for proposals? Should this apply only to applied research, that is research seeking to find solutions for everyday problems such as curing illnesses, or also basic research, that is research conducted to increase our understanding of phenomena or behaviour, e.g.? Launching thematic calls partly allows for steering research to defined political demands otherwise not being answered by researchers and scientists, but there is a risk we neglect other crucial questions and basic knowledge needs. **Thematic programmes open up questions on topic selection, stakeholder involvement and conflicting interests.**

Both approaches have open issues in common. The European Union published voluntary guidelines on framework conditions for research programming to address them.[40] According to the Voluntary Guidelines, "funding decisions must be based on clearly described rules and procedures, adequately publicised" (p.21). In the following we refer to these guidelines.

Research can be highly controversial. Think about the use of human embryonic stem cells. First of all, a decision has to be made on what qualifies as ethically responsible research.

It is good practice that research proposals are (also) **evaluated by experts**. For being transparent, such evaluation requires a set of clear and defined evaluation criteria a proposal must meet to pass the evaluation. **But how to decide what is relevant high-quality research leading to sustainable and healthy innovations?**

There are questions of **selecting the evaluators**. Who should select them? Who qualifies as an evaluator? Sometimes there are conflicts of interest. Scientist A has a contract with sugar company C, scientist B submits a proposal on a sugar substitute, and A judges it as irrelevant just because it is against sugar. Scientist A might also steal some of B's ideas. According to the Voluntary Guidelines the evaluation of proposals requires recognised impartially chosen experts. They should also be "balanced in terms of gender, age, affiliation and nationality, including representatives from civil society. The use of a common and certified expert database (...) could be considered." There should be a code of conduct reviewers must adhere to, "which should include provisions regarding confidentiality, declaration of conflict of interest, ethical issues (...) Suitable controls should be put in place to avoid errors and ensure the fairness of the evaluation process." (pp.21f.). But **how to guarantee independent research and fair evaluation?**

[39] Joint Programming Initiative A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life. The vision for 2030, 2010, p. 17

[40] Voluntary Guidelines on Framework Conditions for Joint Programming in Research 2010, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2011, http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/docs/en/voluntary_guidelines.pdf

Research programmes are **evaluated** in terms of having met their objectives, but according to the Voluntary Guidelines there is no **common methodology** on this. Additionally, a “common method for the selection of evaluators should be developed, taking into account that (...) there could be scarcity of truly independent and competent evaluators with no conflict of interest.”[41] **Another challenge would be how to assess an innovation really is healthy and sustainable.**

When research has been conducted, sometimes the **results** are publicly available, sometimes not, irrespective if they were publicly funded. Usually they are published in scientific journals or used for filing patents, e.g. **Here are open questions on the use and ownership of research results.**

When it comes to the area of food and health, sometimes we see a **rapid change** in what is considered a major societal challenge or alternative ways are found to solve a problem that make another approach obsolete. **How can research programmes remain flexible enough to respond timely to such developments?**

To come to a **common understanding of societal challenges**, policy makers commission forward-looking activities to early identify them. For achieving this “it is critical to have a clear picture of the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved: the initiator, the clients, the providers of resources.”[42] Different experts are asked about their opinions and stakeholders from civil society and economy are consulted, among other things. Building on this, research agendas are drafted. **This opens up questions on how to determine who is a relevant stakeholder and how to make the process credible.**

[41] Voluntary Guidelines on Framework Conditions for Joint Programming in Research 2010, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2011, page 34
[42] Voluntary Guidelines on Framework Conditions for Joint Programming in Research 2010, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2011, page 28

Annex F: Instructions for facilitators

(by Katharina Novy)

FINAL WORKSHOP PLAN

Objectives of the workshops

- **Clarification concerning topic (clusters) that are perceived as important. – Commonalities and differences (within and between interest groups) are identified.**
  It is not about consenting on this or that topic, but it is about imaging various future perspectives, which will be analysed when we compare the workshops conducted independently at very different places.
- **Clarification, which criteria science programmes should fulfil according to participants**
  What should a programme (not) contain, if it is to trigger more sustainable innovation, how should it be organised environmentally and socially acceptable, trustworthy and transparent? We don't expect the participants to develop and agree on detailed procedures. They are meant to declare the criteria that are crucial to them in each stage of research.
  Dimensions to be considered :
  - **Determination of topics/areas/themes:** Who should decide about topics of research programmes, who should judge its relevance? Which actors should be involved on which issues? Where should they give their opinions (or not)? How should responsibilities be divided? How are decisions made? How are conflicts of interest and between interest groups clarified?
  - **Decision on funding:** How should projects be selected for funding? Which procedure is appropriate? Which actors are to be involved, how should evaluators be selected? How can "independence of science" be guaranteed?
  - **Quality criteria for project funding:** What would be relevant scientific criteria? What would be sustainability criteria to decide on funding?
  - **Exploitation of results:** How should research results be used? Who is owner of the funded innovations?
  - **Post-evaluation:** How and by whom should sustainability and research quality be assessed?
  - **What else is important ...**
- Where it is possible, an attempt is made to get a common vision. Where it is not possible, differences are made visible and transparent.

Attitude/approach of facilitator

*** High esteem for the various contributions**
*** Impartiality**
*** Awareness of diversity**
*** Care for a good atmosphere during the discussion**
*** Demand self-organisation from participants**:

- What is not written on the flipcharts might fall into oblivion after the event. What is important needs to be written down
- In the Working sessions participants themselves have to pay attention to good working conditions and a good atmosphere. (see: Instructions for working groups)

*** Transparency** is an objective: Search for common opinions and solutions, but at the same time revealing different views and different interests can be an essential result of discussion and reflection

*** Analytical view of differences:** Differences (for instance, between the desires of the different stakeholders) should not just be accepted, but it is necessary to talk and inquire in order to thematise and uncover the views and interests behind these differences.

<u>Some details on procedures</u>

Working groups no. 1: Homogeneous groups

At the beginning the task of the homogeneous groups is explained in the plenum. The groups receive an instruction paper and flip charts. One flip chart is structured according the headlines of the questions.The instruction paper you can find below.

Facilitator makes short visits to the groups, is at disposal for technical questions, takes care that the groups deal with the topics within the given time frame. It is not necessary that the topics are completed (which also would not be feasible within the given time!), but pay attention that no group gets stuck in one topic. Everything that is regarded as important should receive some place.

Plenary after the homogeneous groups

Procedure

Each group presents its flip chart: in the first round only the results on the topic areas, in the second round, after discussing the topics in the plenary, the results related to funding programmes.

One person presents, the other working group members can complement. After this, members of other groups are invited to ask questions.

Concerning the topics

After the third group's presentation: Participants comment in the plenum: Where do participants see communalities, where do they see dissimilarities? Are there logical clusters of topics? How can the potential differences between stakeholders be explained?

(Attention: This is NOT about majority decision or vote!)

Concerning the funding programmes

After the third group again commenting in the plenary: Where do participants perceive commonalities? Are similar topics tackled? Where are there obvious differences between interests? Give some time for discussion, but results are not targeted yet, do not encourage "hardening".

Working groups no. 2: Heterogeneous groups

Building on the worst case scenarios of the homogeneous groups, mixed groups will design criteria for best case scenarios. Which criteria would characterize food/health innovation programmes that lead to sustainability, fairness and transparency? Which criteria need (more) attention to ensure solid future-orientated smart innovation activities? (Note: There should not be made attempts to draft full programmes or work out details!)

Clustering for heterogeneous groups

To ensure that the results are comparable, as far as possible all three stakeholder groups should be evenly distributed in every heterogeneous group, at best 2-2-2 or 1-1-1. It is likely that some "rest groups" will remain, e.g. 2-1-1. We cannot prevent this, so our answer is: transparency and working on the differences. This means: Note on the flip charts on the group discussions which stakeholder group was represented in which number and take a look if, respectively to what extent the results of one group differs from those of the others. In each workshop at least two groups should be balanced to make them comparable across the INPROFOOD project.

As much as possible the composition of the groups should take place according to personal preferences of participants. (No organising by numbering, etc. by the facilitator) This improves the group performance considerably. Clustering by location (a flip chart board for each group).

Before the clustering, it must be clear already how many groups in which composition there will be (otherwise the „rest group“ might consist of „leftovers“ who could be ready to leave rather quickly).

Plenary on best case scenario
Procedure
The charts are put on display in an exhibition style. Participants have time to view them and talk to each other: Which aspects of the other scenarios appeal to me? What are my concerns?

During the plenary session participants can ask questions of understanding about scenarios. Then participants can address aspects they consider as needing explanations (Attention: no lectures, please!), also dissenting views in groups can be voiced here.

Afterwards – optimally item by item – look for commonalities and similarities in the perspectives. Note possible dissent. The facilitator marks this by highlighting (underlining, flash, etc.) and additions. It is crucial that dissent retains its place.

Action sociometry
Facilitators, who are not experienced in this method could also use other forms of „warm up“, but there must NOT be a simple introduction round. After this warm up, there should be following group situation:

- All participants should have said something (not all of them in the plenum!)
- There has been opportunity for first and agreeable contacts
- An overall impression of the participants has developed
- The participants have related a little to the topic ---> the working groups can deal with more specific issues

The action sociometry makes visible in the room the commonalities and dissimilarities of participants – by literally taking a place/position in the room. The participants get into contact with each other in relation to their roles and in relation to the topic.

Rationale of the action sociometry
Participants start to talk, but not in a plenary situation, not single statements, but they should actually talk to each other – a warm up for getting into motion
Quicker and more efficient way to get an overview – no lengthy introduction round

Leading criteria
(The questions are not to be realized by 100%. This is mostly about making visible the diversity and various interests and about getting into talking to each other.)

1. According to stakeholder-groups, + short introduction – only name and institution - everything else comes later (not more space/time is given so that no monologues are possible).
2. Where is my / our interest:
   - we do science, research
   - we regulate food and/or fund research
   - we represent concerned people

- o we produce food
- o other interests

Participants turn to each other and talk to each other standing in small groups for some minutes. “Where is my interest in research and innovation programmes on food and health in relation to my own profession or civil engagement?”
Participants remain standing in the room and tell some of their thoughts to the respective others in the plenum.

3. My institution has experiences with research or innovation programmes on national or EU level
   - ”very experienced (100%) ……. (until now) not involved at all (0%)”: Positioning according to this scale.
   - People with similar position turn to each other: Why am I standing at this place? In which way experienced/involved, in which way not experienced/involved?
   - Short and guided exchange in plenum. Point out the important perspectives of both, those already involved and not yet
4. End with getting together the stakeholder groups again – they will meet after the break for the first workshop unit.

<u>Instructions for working groups</u>

Working Groups 1:

Important Research Fields and Worst Case Scenarios for Research and Innovation Programmes on Food and Health

- Decide on a person to take down notes on the flip chart. The notes are also the documentation.
- Make sure everybody has a say in a balanced way.
- Look for mutual understanding and consensus whenever possible. But do not understate or iron out disagreement or differences, make them transparent.

1) **Discussion of important research fields** concerning the development of high-quality, healthy, safe and sustainable food products:
   Which topics – from your point of view - should be researched?
   Is it possible to form clusters of topics in a reasonable way? (ca. 25 min)

2) **Discussion of ways to organise research funding** in this field:
   Define the Worst Case in research funding in the scope of food and health. How should funding NOT be organised? Think about your own experiences and remain as concrete as possible. Take notes on the flip chart – and complement the given sections if something important is missing. (ca. 50 min)

   The Worst Case in relation to:
   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 organised? 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 ...**

3) If during the worst case scenarios „**Best Case“ descriptions emerge** already, please note them on an extra flip chart.

Working Groups 2:

Best Case Scenarios for Research and Innovation Programmes on Food and Health

- Decide on a person to take down notes on the flip chart. The notes are also the documentation.
- Make sure everybody has a say in a balanced way.
- Look for mutual understanding and consensus whenever possible. But do not understate or iron out disagreement or differences, make them transparent.

Draft the dimensions of a best-case:
How should research and innovation programmes on the development of high-quality, healthy, safe and sustainable food products be organised?

- Take the worst-case scenarios as a starting point.
- Avoid being too abstract and general. Rely on your experience and specific information on real cases.
- Discuss where there are differences and look for a joint solution. Where you find none, write down the different scenarios.
- Consider the dimensions, as before:
    - Decision making on Topics/ areas/ themes
    - Decision making on project funding
    - Quality criteria for funding
    - Exploitation of results
    - Evaluation
    - Project design
    - Other important questions …

Annex G: Agenda

Time	Duration	Who?	Agenda item	Procedure by keywords	Materials	Notes
			Arriving, coffee	1 Poster INPROFOOD project, 2-3 Poster with focussed information on research programming / innovation in food & health. Participants are invited to view the posters with catchwords and "put them into their minds".		
9:00	*10*	*EASW organiser*	**Formal welcome/opening**	EASW Organiser Welcoming of participants, mention INPROFOOD shortly		
	5	*Facilitator*	**Welcome by facilitator**			
	5	*Facilitator*	**Presentation of workshop schedule**			
	5	*EASW organiser*	**Clarification of project's scope**	Framework of this EASW, of all matched EASWs, the INPROFOOD project Objectives of the EASW, what will happen with the results? Facilitator supports by questions and clarifications. *No discussion* with participants at this point! (too early!)		Clear and short, supported with a flipchart
	10	*EASW organiser*	**Refers to the project environment**	Research programming concerning the topics. Short overview and pointing out that there is a poster for orientation.		
9:45	*20 - 30*	*Facilitator*	**Action sociometry**	See text.		Sensitive, a lot of experience necessary!
10:10		*Facilitator*	**Instructions for homogeneous groups**	Finish action sociometry by making stakeholder groups visible (colours) again. Present the tasks of the working groups		

Time	Duration	Who?	Agenda item	Procedure by keywords	Materials	Notes
				After the break the working groups begin without further instruction. During the break participants should look at the posters. Staff is available for questions regarding the posters		
10:20	*15*	*EASW organiser*	**BREAK**	+ looking at the poster/s.		EASW organiser is available for questions on the posters
10:35	*75-80 + extra time*	*Homogeneous working groups*	**Topics and worst case scenario**	25 min Topics 55 min Worst case scenario		
12:05	*15*		**BREAK**			
12:20	*45*		**Plenum**			
13:05	*75- 90*		**LUNCH**			
14:30	*15*	*Plenum, facilitator*	**Plenum**	Clarification of heterogeneous groups		
	70- 80	*Heterogeneous (mixed) working groups*		Best case scenario (builds on worst case scenario)		
16:00	*25*		**BREAK**	Hang up flip charts in exhibition style		
16:25	*10-15*	*Plenum, facilitator*	**Plenum - Exhibition**	Participants look at exhibition of best case scenarios and talk about them while passing them: Which aspects from other scenarios appeal to me? What concerns do I have?		
	35-45	*Plenum, facilitator*	**Plenum – Talking and clarification**	Inquiring, additions, etc. Discuss similarities, commonalities and differences of the posters, and write them down. Look for consensus, make dissent transparent/visible.		
17:20	*5-10*	*Muttering pairwise*	**Reflection**	“In my opinion, what is the most important result of the day, on what would I like to put particular emphasis?”		

Time	Duration	Who?	Agenda item	Procedure by keywords	Materials	Notes
		Plenum, facilitator	**End**	1 sentence on the most important result 1 feedback sentence		
17:45		*Facilitator, EASW organiser*	**End**	Facilitator concludes the workshop Handing out of evaluation sheets. Have to be filled in!		
		EASW organiser	**Thanks, soft transition to buffet**	Thanks from you, explain what happens with the results, how participants will hear from organisers .. - and invitation to the buffet		
	10		**Filling in evaluation sheets**	Fill in the evaluation sheets before the buffet is offered.		
18:00			**Buffet**	Eating and drinking, networking is possible if desired.		

Annex H: Template for the EASW report

(COVER) REPORT ON EASW: Title – date - place

0. TABLE OF CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION
A few lines about the INPROFOOD project.

2. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
A simple list: Name of the participant, organisation:
Last name, first name, organisation's name stakeholder group

3. WORKSHOP DESIGN AND AGENDA

4. WORKING GROUPS
4.1 HOMOGENEOUS WORKING GROUPS

PHOTOS OF FLIP CHARTS from the facilitator, task for working groups.

<u>**Homogeneous Group 1**</u>

PHOTO of POSTER

Translation *English*
Explanation:
Use your notes to complement what was said during the poster session.
Avoid your own interpretation or judgements as good as you can.
***Constellation**: sub-stakeholders (no names!)*

<u>**Homogeneous Group 2**</u>

PHOTO of POSTER

Translation *English*
Explanation:
Use your notes to complement what was said during the poster session.
Avoid your own interpretation or judgements as good as you can.
***Constellation**: sub-stakeholders (no names!)*

REPEAT UNTIL YOU HAVE DONE THIS FOR ALL HOMOGENEOUS GROUPS

4.2 MIXED WORKING GROUPS

PHOTOS OF FLIP CHARTS from the facilitator, task for working groups.

<u>**Mixed Group 1**</u>

PHOTO of POSTER

Translation *English*
Explanation:
Use your notes to complement what was said during the poster session.
Avoid your own interpretation or judgements as good as you can.
***Constellation**: sub-stakeholders (no names!)*

Mixed Group 2

PHOTO of POSTER

Translation *English*
Explanation:
Use your notes to complement what was said during the poster session.
Avoid your own interpretation or judgements as good as you can.
Constellation*: sub-stakeholders (no names!)*

REPEAT UNTIL YOU HAVE DONE THIS FOR ALL HOMOGENEOUS GROUPS

5. OTHER OUTCOMES
You can present here shortly other interesting aspects arising from the final discussion. Again, do not give any names of contributors.

6. FINAL REMARKS
Impression from the workshop, your reflections etc. Write what you like and as much as you like.

7. ANNEX
Some information about the invitation of participants (random selection scheme, etc.)

Annex I: General comment on procedures for EASW organisers

The EASWs are very different from other events! Very often workshops and conferences consist of keynotes, consecutive paper presentations, panel discussions, etc. The scenario workshops will see **none of this**. The agenda mainly consists of working sessions without any presentation and plenary sessions presenting the findings of the participants in these working sessions. **Participants** work together **on an equal footing** within a **given frame**: They develop ideas and visions interactively.

Group dynamical challenges: If participants try to impress each other, compete instead of exchanging ideas, if hierarchies evolve, then the outcomes are of questionable value. The EASWs also must **not become platforms for informal bargaining and/or negotiations**. This would show in the outcomes and would be a quite obvious total contrast of the commitment to transparency, partners voluntarily and publicly oblige themselves.

For these reasons, the method requires a **professional facilitator/moderator**, who will also apply specific **group facilitation methods,** which keep up an **inspiring and motivated atmosphere** for the whole duration of the workshop, which would otherwise be quite exhausting. For example: Instead of the usual introduction round, the participants learn to know each other by grouping them according to different backgrounds and social aspects (see 8., big badges are crucial!) There are different ways to facilitate discussions, some are quite activating, for example, the Fishbowl method. The Science Shop Vienna and its professional facilitator discussed with the professional facilitators of the partners to find out which methods they already know and feel confident to apply.

None of the partners **actively participates in the workshop, all of us only organise it. It is important that none of us interferes in any discussions. Organisers also should try not to show indirect approval or disapproval of inputs given by a stakeholder. You need to be as unremarkable as the literal** fly on the wall**.**

We also calculate at least 2-3 hours **at the very end of the EASW to give participants** occasion for informal talks and networking**, which are prevented during the actual EASWs. There could be an open end buffet or a** social event **to create the necessary atmosphere.**

Annex J: Instructions on scenarios, tasks of working groups and presentations

Starting point

Expecting some quite knowledgeable EASW participants, a presentation of the status quo of research programming will be the starting point. Because there are quite a lot of different beliefs what actually is going on, we will not impose our own ideas of "the" status quo, but use official information given by national governments.

Mostly we will use **existing online material from government websites**, which we will not change, of course.[43] (We will give some more information in the next part of this toolkit. The guiding questions will refer to the making of scenarios for programme making, pre- and post-evaluations of projects, at which stages which interest groups should be involved and how, peer review challenges, societal and environmental desires/concerns, access to results, possible property rights, allocation of funding, guidelines for sustainable policies, etc., etc. etc. They will address programming in general and not refer to each single programme.) Because the governments of almost all partner countries participate in the Joint Programming Initiative a Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life (JPI HDHL), common **briefing papers** refer to the common agendas of this strategy.

Working group tasks

We will start with groups representing one of our three stakeholder category. Each of these **homogeneous groups** develops a common scenario. Emerging topics, questions and seemingly unsolvable challenges are equally important results and need to be documented. Then we will continue with groups consisting of different stakeholders. Both groups will also document issues on which no consensus was found. Remaining conflicting issues are important as well. (If a group seems to harmonize in all aspects, most likely not all engage in the discussions.). Working groups will produce posters with **visual results** on all important issues.

Presentation of results, clarifications and questions

Each working group will nominate **speakers**, who will present the findings according to their poster/flipchart, but this can also be a **source of flaws**. We all have witnessed such presentations in which a speaker stressed her/his favourite positions and left out others. Hence, the other working group participants are invited by the moderator to clarify, correct and complement presenters' explications. Because after the first working group sessions, groups consisting of different stakeholders (mixed teams) will use their results in the second working group sessions, it is wise to make sure that all participants understand the outcomes correctly. So we calculate some room for questions of understanding.

[43] We also reflected on using the strategy paper of the JPI HDHL (= Joint Programming Initiative "Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life") as starting point, because presently almost all Member States negotiate common research programmes in the food and health area, which point to a possible future scenario. But this paper is work in progress, and only some stakeholder types and interest groups have been involved. It would be necessary to contrast it with the statements of more critical NPOs, otherwise we risk to too much predetermine the outcomes of the EASWs.

Annex K: Some practical information for workshop organisers

The moderator/facilitator
The **professional moderator/facilitator** has to be **experienced in dealing with group dynamics** and **discussion processes**. S/he needs to be able to lead participants through the workshop in a neutral and impartial way. The facilitator must give a frame that encourages active participation on an equal footing and counter-act non-proportional discussion time or over-proportional influence of a few.

Facilitators who have not conducted an EASW yet, need to make themselves knowledgeable about this method. Because the EASWs need to be conducted in the same way, the facilitators will be contacted before the EASWs take place.

Location and room
You need **either**

- **1 plenary room + 2-3 smaller rooms** for working sessions; **or**
- **one large room** that allows groups to work undisturbed in a corner. In this case you can use the pin-boards as a kind of folding screen to shield groups against each other.

Do not use theatre seating like in an auditorium or typical classroom seating, but moveable chairs and a few tables to allow for flexibility in arrangements.

A pleasant venue helps to create a stimulating atmosphere. Look for one with an inviting atmosphere, not a bunker without daylight and without windows. Visit the venue with your facilitator days or even weeks before the workshop, so s/he knows before how it looks like.

Name badge
The importance of the name badge is in our experience highly underestimated and an often overlooked issue. People tend to forget names all the time and then they cannot address each other appropriately in a polite way. We need name badges that are readable almost at the length of your plenary room, i.e. some meters. To make orientation easy for everybody, the badges have **three different colours**, one for each stakeholder group.

Breaks
Take care of lunch and sufficient coffee breaks in a relaxed atmosphere. Participants should also have an opportunity to get something to drink during the working sessions so that they keep their strength!

Evaluation
For evaluating the workshops, Gene has prepared a questionnaire. Inform the facilitator to distribute and collect them at the end of the workshop and calculate sufficient time!

Organisers do not talk about their EASWs before they have documented it
To ensure that workshops are conducted independently of each other, organisers do not talk about their EASWs results before all of them in one series have been documented. During each series there will be no information flow between the partners to avoid any influence on each other. Only when the country reports are finished, they can start to exchange experiences.

Annex L: Instructions on documentation

During the workshop
The national workshop reports will be merely descriptive and for the purpose of the deliverable 2.2.

Each organiser needs to make **photos of all the visual outputs of each working group and plenary sessions** (posters, flipcharts, tags with remarks, etc.). All posters and other visual products need to be **fully readable**. These photos do not only spare you a lot of work, but they are **crucial parts of the workshop documentation**. It is best to photograph posters and flipcharts during the breaks.

Additionally organisers write shortly down the explanations given by the producers of the posters during plenary sessions. This should be done by more than one person so that they can compare their notes to compile explanatory texts to the workshop posters. Also discussions will be documented, and each report will also contain a list of emerging topics. Organisers will also document the procedures and give a short impression of the atmosphere.

Purpose of documentation
There will be **no in-depth analysis** of the participants' contributions. The partners conducting the workshops will **respect them as valuable results of the participants' work.** Secondly, trying a deep content analysis of the charts could end up in misinterpretations or far-flung interpretations of what the participants actually said.

Although we made any effort to adapt and improve the EASW approach for INPROFOOD, **some limitations of the method** cannot be eradicated. As participating organisations are not representative, no generalisation on nations can be made, and thus no comparison between countries is possible. We also cannot tell how far generalisations on stakeholder groups are sensible at all, but conducting EASWs without influencing each other might provide some insight into this question.

Annex M: FAQ – Frequently asked questions by workshop organisers

The following list on some practical details of the EASWs is based on the feedbacks and questions which emerged during the preparation of the events. This is not a static document but a work of progress, because more questions may come up during the process. The FAQs are not in order of topic but just added to the list when they come up.

1.) How many databases are necessary?
Each partner has to compile THREE databases, one database per stakeholder = one for citizen NPOs, one for public institutions, one for business-related organisations.

2.) What does each partner publish on the INPROFOOD website?
a) Explanatory text how the databases were compiled as non-arbitrarily as possible.
b) Which lottery and which FUTURE draws (name the exact date) will be used. How the drawn replacement entries will be ranked.
c) The results of the draws and the selections.

3.) Must needs you use a national lottery?
You can use any lottery. As long at it does not create strong language barriers, you can also use the lottery in another country or a European lottery, as long as a certain number out of a lot beginning with one has the same chance to be drawn and as long there is an archive.

4.) Does WLW validate the entries in the different databases?
No, WLW gives a feedback on quite obvious aspects, but the partners are responsible for their entries. In the explanatory text the partners explain to the public of their own countries how they proceeded as non-arbitrarily as possible.

5.) What are the explanatory texts about?
They should not only explain, but also show that is a huge effort to aim for non-arbitrariness instead of just inviting the usual individuals who then get an overproportional influence on policy making. It also needs to show the limitations, which data into the different countries were difficult to find, which data were not retrievable, and what compromises were found to solve such problems.

6.) Why can we not just use past lottery draws?
The public needs to be able to verify the selection as much as possible. Even if databases are in alphabetical orders, it would create unnecessary mistrust and look strange after all the efforts we took.

7.) Why do we not put any addresses and contact data online?
a) because it is not necessary to identify large organisations and
b) because of data protection laws.

8.) In which order do we invite replacements?
As soon as one selected organisation gives feedback that it will not send anybody from their organisation (or if they do not answer after several contact attempts within a deadline), we need to invite a replacement. But now we have from each draw equally ranked replacements. Hence as soon as we have the replacement selections by lottery, we make a list of the possible replacements. Ranking procedures are variable then, because this list is already a strict random selection. You can repeat the lottery number procedure, but you can also count through the replacement databases

pretty much like children do with counting-out-games (such as "eeny, meeny, miny, moe, ..."). You then only use a predetermined, pre-selection announced number (or formula to find this number) which is sufficiently high not to favour the entries at the beginning, and tell the public if you count in or out, and that this counting is not done to select but to determine in which the order SELECTED replacements will be contacted.

9.) Whom do we actually invite and how?

We address organisation to send somebody who fulfils some criteria, not individuals we consider as appropriate. We will write an invitation letter and put down some eligibility criteria for delegates.

10.) Do we exclude organisations and when?

It would be far too much work to check each entry in the databases. Sometimes only extensive research reveals who is behind an organisation.

If possible, we will avoid excluding selections, but shift organisations to another category instead of deleting the entry.

For example, if we find out that a selected NPO is really maintained by enterprises (in respect to funds, decision making), we shift this organisation to the business stakeholder database. It is ranked next to the first selected invitees of this database.

11.) When do we invite replacements?

We need to write to all replacements that it is possible that they will be invited to the EASW, and ask them if they are principally interested to send a participant in case of drop outs. At least 50 replacement organisations per stakeholder need to be asked, more of them would be even better.

12.) What if my database is too small?

Some of your databases may have become a little too small. If you feel that you do not get sufficient registrants, please include "larger" entries you listed as "medium" sized organisations. There is some leeway for defining large. We do not refer to the actual "size" of an organisation, but to potential outreach and power. (An organisation with an outreach beyond one state or that deals with a 1/4 or 1/3 of your country should be listed as "large" anyway.) If your database has only 30 entries per stakeholders - is there a realistic chance to get more then a handful of participants?

13.) How to invite participants?

Here is how we proceed in Vienna: After emailing selected participants, we phone them and explain the concept of a random selection and that we try to avoid arbitrary selection. All but those who cannot come, receive also a printed invitation including the information paper and the INPROFOOD brochure. Those who do not have an e-mail-address, we send the printed version only, but as a confirmation letter. We use real stamps to make them look more personal.

14.) How long should we wait until we invite the next ranked invitees?

This depends a) on the registrations you get from one lot of invitations you send out and b) how many weeks you have until your scenario workshop takes place. If it is difficult for you to get registrations, please do not wait to the end of the deadline of the respective invitees. In Vienna, after the first invitation campaign (29), we sent out lots of 15-20 invitations. Those who do not answer by email we call within a few days. Some want to come, some do not, others are thinking about it. So after a few days, we have a rough idea how many will come and then we go on with the next lot of invitations.

We need not to be over-anxious about having too many registrants. If there are really a few too many (which is very unlikely) then we can still apologize and invite them to the next series in spring or offer them something different, like an online event.

15.) Which hierarchy level must a delegate have?
Addressing universities does not mean the (vice-)rector has to come, but universities can choose a person from any institute that seems appropriate to them. The same holds true for any other large organisations with sub-departments.

16.) Is there a way to contact all organisations listed in the database before they are selected?
It makes sense to inform stakeholders that they are actually listed in the INPROFOOD databases and that it is possible that they are selected. Also, they should gain interest in the INPROFOOD project. Maybe some of them keep the date free in case they are invited. For a letter template, please see Annex C.

17.) How many facilitators are needed?
You will need only one professional moderator. The homogeneous and the mixed working groups both will not be facilitated each, but they will receive clear tasks so that they can work alone for a while.

18.) Number of registrations vs. number of participants
As written before, we aim at 24 - 27 registrations, 8 or 9 registrants from each stakeholder group: We calculate with a higher number of registrants than with actual participants. We think that no more than 65% will actually come at best. The others will apologize too late for searching replacements or they will not appear on the workshop day or at least not timely. Despite of having the same number of registrants for each stakeholder group, it is unlikely that we end up with the exact same numbers of participants from each stakeholder group. This is another reason for the huge number of registrants we need in the first place: If we relied on fewer registrants, there would be good chances that a whole stakeholder drops out spontaneously. How to deal with different situations related to stakeholder representation is part of the workshop plan.

Annex N: Stakeholder matrix and instructions on database compilation

Stakeholders eligible for participation

The **EASW method** demands a **clear separation** of stakeholder interests. The table below presents in a matrix stakeholders eligible for participation in the EASW. **Other stakeholders** or blurring interest groups may be invited to the **open space conference** (WP3), be **interviewed** (WP1) or targeted in **dissemination** activities.

	Not-for-profit citi	**Public authorities, Policy Makers**	**Business and Industry**	**Political parties and churches**
	Legal non profit-statutes, donations (can apply for public funds), decision making by members, independent from government and business	*Part of or controlled by the government. Entitled by the citizens through elections in democracies*	*Competes on the market without substantial help from the government or public funds.*	*Different ties to governments in the participating Member States! Exclude or strictly balance participation within one workshop.*
Experts				
Research institutes	Independent research institutes with NPO statute.	Public universities, governmental research organisations	Laboratory of one or more enterprise/s, private research enterprise, private for-profit universities	
Professions	Professional Assiociations (phycisians, nurses, dietary assistants, etc.)	Public chambers for certain professions (do not exist in all countries)		
Prevention of disease	Related NGOs, often run by professionals groups.	Departments of respective ministries, public health authorities like sickness insurance funds, public social insurance institutions	Insurance companies (to some extent)	
Research funders				
	Non-profit funds dedicated to	Ministries, parliament,	Funds given by enterprises	Funds given by churches or

	research for the citizens	Governmental agencies, district governments		political parties.
Consumers				
Health concerns	Self help-groups on diverse Diseases and health conditions and prevention of diseases.	Ministries and departments, public authorities		Potential stakeholder confounding: Government out-sources tasks to "independent" organisations, self help-groups mostly entertained by professionals, etc.
Age groups (children, elderly, pregnant women, etc.)	Parents associations, teachers Associations, senior citizen NPOs.	Ministries and departments, public authorities		
Ethical or religious issues	Vegan, vegetarian, animal protection groups			Religious food restrictions
Social and environmental concerns	World hunger, environment preservation, working conditions NPOs such as Oxfam, FoodWatch			Groups with strong ties to political parties or churches
Producers				
Food production		Supervisory public authorities	Associations of food producing enterprises, food industry	
Special diet markets		Supervisory authorities, Food labels from government	Production of vegan, koscher, etc., producers of special food for certain health conditions, age groups or pregnant women	
Sustainability		Related	Social	

		government agencies and departments, Public regulators of competition	responsibility associations, organic food labels, Associations like Fair Trade, Slow Food..	

Finding eligible stakeholders and data base compilation

The working plan has laid a focus on an until now uniquely high standard of transparency from the very beginning. The selection of organisations to be invited is non-arbitrary and balanced in an obvious way, which should be plausible to a more critical public, too. Credibility we cannot obtain from academia only, but from all interested citizens, irrespective if they are laypersons or not. We operate in an area in which scientists and scientific results are frequently met with suspicion (and not only among followers of abstruse ideologies). An objective is also to avoid any repetition of stakeholder involvement that has already taken place in past European projects. Targeted organisations are not predominantly those who already very often participated in activities related to research policies. It is a quite innovative approach but it is also a learning process all can gain from.

In a nutshell, for inviting potential participants in the workshops all partners compile **stakeholder databases**, **reveal the sources of entries** and comment on them. That way it is demonstrated that organisations are neither picked or left out based on arbitrary choice or favouritism. The invitees and also potential replacements are then randomly selected. Instead of computer generated numbers publicly available lottery dates are used. The public has occasion to observe the whole procedure from the very beginning to the end.

The entries of the databases are taken from reliable public sources as much as this was possible. These sources comprise websites from governments, public authorities or agencies and literature that is publicly available. Each partner can make necessary compromises and explain them in their comment on how entries made it into the database. These comments are not only experiences others can learn from in the future, but might even contribute – if only to a small extent - to an improvement of data accessibility on national level.

Step 1: Developing Stakeholder Categorisation and eligibility criteria
There are several factors that impact on the choice of stakeholder categories. A lot of possibilities were and still are investigated. How we distinguish between stakeholders impacts on the outcomes of an EASW.

Stakeholders can be categorized according to an endless list of factors and **sub-categories**. They could be categorized according to academic disciplines, organisation types, number of members, financial strength, ties to larger organisations, size, outreach, decision making structures, sources of funding.

The most important factors are described in the following
1.) The **EASW method** itself: The categorisation of the stakeholders need to be appropriate for the **EASW method**, which requires that each participant is member of only one stakeholder category. It only makes sense if strictly **homogeneous** and **inhomogeneous**

stakeholder groups, according to the stakeholder categorisations, need to exchange ideas and develop scenarios.[44] If there is an overlap between stakeholders, if individual participants belong to more than one stakeholder group, then the methodology does not work properly. Some groups may be excluded because categorisation is impossible due to too much overlapping and confounding characteristics.[45]

2.) Matching EASWs: The participants are invited to European Awareness Scenario Workshops (EASW), which will be conducted in several different countries at approximately the same time and matched as well as possible.

3.) Regional environments and structures: We found huge differences in the perception of stakeholder organisations in the different countries and regions. These are differences not only which organisations actually exist in a country or region, but also of regulations and laws under which they operate. The availability of publicly accessible lists of organisations and searchable databases is not the same everywhere.

Before any stakeholder categories could be decided, it was necessary to get an overview of the varying situations and accessibility of data in the different countries. A matrix of potentially relevant groups was compiled and each organiser shortly reported which of them they could find more easily, with difficulties or could not find in their national/regional environments.

Step 2: Categorisation for the assignment to Stakeholder Datebases

Among many possible ways to categorize interest groups, the **most important distinction** is related to the **question of** who has **decision-making power and influence**, e.g., how the directorate is composed and where do funds come from. A state agency on food regulation is principally a different interest group than a citizen NPO advocating for stricter food regulations and an association of enterprises integrating social responsibility into their marketing strategy, even if all of them work on the very same topic.

Hence three **main stakeholder** crystallized:

- **citizen non-profit organisations**: they have no ties to industry or enterprises or other stakeholders.
- **public authorities**
- **business related organisations:** at least in the first series no single enterprises are selected, but only their associations.

Additionally **too strong power imbalances and hierarchies** between participants should be avoided. The EASWS are conducted either with only s**mall, medium** or **large** organisations. This reference to "**size**" can be only done roughly, it is used as a **proxy for influence and**

[44] In the earlier settings this will done by the "same" interest groups separately, but at the later stages the participants are mixed: only persons from different interest groups are teamed up to deliver their results.

[45] Organisations that are not eligible to participate in the EASWs are not principally "bad". Quite on the contrary, we would encourage that they contribute in the scope of other INPROFOOD activities. Conflicting interests of several stakeholders in one person can in other contexts than the EASWs bring in valuable experiences.

power. It does not mean to count the members or employees of an organisation, or to investigate financial resources entry per entry. **"Size"** has to be **determined pragmatically sub-stakeholder by sub-stakeholder but then used with consequence**: for example, a university is usually a larger organisation than a university institute. Hence, the first are invited to the EASWs with the large organisations, and the latter to EASWs either with small or with medium organisations.

Step 3: Confirming eligibility and introducing further criteria AFTER the selection
If an organisation is fully eligible to participate in the role of the stakeholder group it was assigned to, can only be fully confirmed ***after*** it has been selected from the respective database. For example, there are quite a few non-profit-organisations that are run by enterprises as "front organisations". It would be a Sisyphus task to investigate all fund givers and legal backgrounds of all the organisations compiled in the databases, because such information tends to be hidden behind impressive web presentations and brochures. Also, if an organisation does not belong to one stakeholder category only, this is rarely obvious and would need equally much detailed research entry by entry. Hence for practical reasons, the organisers categorize stakeholder databases to their best knowledge beforehand. After the selection, in case of doubt, selected organisations are asked to answer some questions about their decision making structures and financial sources. If it turns out that an organisation does not belong to the stakeholder group it was selected for, it can be assigned to a different stakeholder group. For example, a "citizen non-profit organisation" with strong ties to industry, the organisation would be shifted into the database for business orientated/associated institutions.

Additional eligibility criteria, like **gender** and **age** cannot be determined for organisations, but only for individuals. Hence, selected organisations are asked to send a delegate according to a few such criteria specified in an **invitation letter**. Experience shows that there is often a lack of female participants and/or the female participants are younger and less experienced compared to the male participants.

Further explanations

Limitations
There are citizen panels with randomly selected citizens who do not belong to any interest groups at all with quite good outcomes. Randomness to that degree cannot be achieved target organisations, we want to start with the smallest organisations and initiatives in the partners' neighbourhoods, and find - ideally - all eligible small organisations within defined local boarders that relate to the number of existing entities. We will not put the small organisations in a partner country into the database, because this would be neither economic nor sensible, but an impossible task that does not add value to the project. **Stakeholder approaches are not representative in a statistical sense**, and we cannot conclude national differences on the basis of the inputs of 3 - 4 participants from a theoretical stakeholder population, which only exist as a concept or ideal-type, even if we do our best to separate them clearly. What we can do is comparing, if at different places the same stakeholders (according to our definitions) have **something in common**, and might **cautiously** formulate their **"common visions"**.

A possible solution for sub-stakeholder assignment

In an ideal world, we would define **13 EASWs** with **three matching general stakeholder categories, two groups of sub-stakeholders could be defined**, allowing for additional categorisation. The series could be divided into **two halves (sets)** with more strictly defined stakeholder sub-groups that will match to a higher degree.

In one series of 13 EASWs with consumers, researchers and producers we can define 2 different sets of sub-stakeholders.

EXAMPLE	**Consumers**	**Researchers**	**Producers**
Set 1 (6-7 regions)	Self help groups	Independent institutes	Associations of small enterprises
Set 2 (6-7 regions)	Environmental and social NPOs	Public university institutes	Special diet producers
TOTAL 13 EASWs	**Non-profit organisaions**	**Research and science organisations**	**Business related Organisations**

EASWs with participants belonging to **more than one stakeholder group do not** yield any outcomes that **allow the analysis we aim at**. Hence, participants must not be in role conflict, they must not be member of a relevant self-help group, employed at a relevant governmental institutions or a targeted enterprise at the same time.

What else sh**ould be avoided** in the EASWs **as far as possible:**

- Direct financial dependencies or prospect of financial gain
- Other existential dependencies
- Unbalanced power and authority, organisations of different size and influence
- Combination of stakeholders that already negotiate policies together
- Combination of stakeholders that are in continuous negotiation on issues of no concern for IMPROFOOD

Optimally, patient groups should not be together with doctors or health advisors, researchers not together with potential fund givers, etc.

This substantially **narrows down the possible (sub-)stakeholder combinations**, which seemed quite abundant at first sight.

Stakeholder visibility and their chances to be heard

There are some **well-established stakeholders** with a strong influence on policy making, while others do not have any lobbies and often remain unheard. Through the media we hear about some of them so often that they immediately cross our minds.

A good example are **health conditions** because we are to search for many related organisations and because the imbalances of associations are more evident than in other stakeholder subgroups. They are multiple reasons, e. g. the nature of the health condition (strength, life expectancy, etc.), the emotions a disease evokes (sympathy, pity, anxiety, disgust, ridicule, ...), how society deals with the disease (values, regulations, education about the disease, patient rights, ...), if a disease is alien, or how wide-spread a disease is in a population, etc. Additionally there may be some regional and cultural differences.

Example: Self-Help Groups related to possible diseases: Cardiovascular diseases Digestive diseases Allergies, food intolerances, celiac disease Cancer (prevention) Rare diseases Metabolic diseases, diabetes Neurogenerative diseases, Alzheimer, Epilepsy And many others

The objective of compiling the databases of potential EASW participants is to find as many stakeholder groups as possible that seem to be less often involved in policy debates, but which are (potentially) concerned and might provide new perspectives on finding research topics that are most relevant for society. To find out how often groups participate in policy debates would require a research project of its own. One could only make an estimation and ask organisations directly after they were selected randomly.

Annex O: Original timeplan for the scenario workshops

8/2012	Databases for the selection of participants in the 1st series ready (large organisations) Procedure for random selection of participants available EASW toolkit (how to organise an EASW) available INPROFOOD website will show: • general approach and explanation of procedures • venues, dates, target groups for each EASW. • each database with numbered entries. • database fixed for selection (no changes possible anymore) • for each database description of compilation process (= information sources, their lack, challenges or doubts, ...) • announcement of selection with concrete random procedures and dates of public lotteries Information materials, letters of invitation for workshop participants, letter for interest in replacement available Public random selection. Final clarification of eligibility according to most important criteria Contacting randomly selected organisations: • invitation of the 27 first randomly selected organisations by email, at least 9 from each stakeholder group • collect negative replies and replace by inviting those following in the random selection order by email • email to the 50 next selected (or more), if they would be principally interested in case replacement is necessary Professional facilitators hired, making themselves familiar with the EASW method
9/2012	Re-invitation of already invited non-repliers by email Depending on registrations and expression of interest in replacement: invite next entries or ask if there is interest to replace. Invite next selections until you have 27 registrants. If we calculate a possible drop-out of 11 registered participants that just do not appear at the workshop, at least 16 real registrants will actually participate. Where necessary, web conferences with hired facilitators in order to harmonise the way the EASWs are carried out. Format for reports on each EASW available
10 – 11/2012	1st series of EASW. No information flow until all of them are finished.
11/2012	Documentation of EASW according to a common format.

	Deliverable Report on EASWs Series 1
12/2012	D2.2 Analysis Report Series 1 Open calls for participation targeted to CSOs
1/2013	Databases for the selection of participants in the 2nd series ready (medium organisations) Random selection and invitation of participants
3 – 4/2013	2nd series of EASW
4/2013	D2.3 Analysis Report Series 2 Open calls for participation targeted to CSOs
7/2013	Databases for the selection of participants in the 3rd series ready (small organisations) Random selection and invitation of participants
10 – 11/2013	3rd series of workshops (small stakeholders)
11/2013	D2.4 Analysis Report Series 3

Because in some countries the database compilation took longer than expected, this timeplan could not be kept.