



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research



Project 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***

Due date of deliverable: M 4

Actual submission date: M 10

Start date of project: November 1<sup>st</sup> 2011

Duration: 3 years

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

<b>Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013)</b>		
<b>Dissemination Level</b>		
<b>PU</b>	Public	<b>x</b>
<b>PP</b>	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
<b>RE</b>	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
<b>CO</b>	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research

## **1. Statement**

(e.g. Deliverable completed. If not completed, please state the reasons of the delay and the new date of completion)

The deliverable is completed, but is a living document that will be updated and gradually enlarged regularly. It has turned out that it is not sensible to pre-determine all details of all three EASW series. We need to learn from the first series of EASWs and react to practical questions that only come up during their organisation. It has turned out that such issues can differ hugely between partners.

## **2. Use and Verification of Deliverable in INPROFOOD**

(provide for a description of your activities, including e.g. electronic samples of material produced, photos, lists, etc.)

This deliverable contains a detailed timetable of the activities for organising and conducting the adapted European Awareness Scenario Workshops as described in the Technical Annex to the INPROFOOD grant agreement, a matrix of stakeholders eligible for participating them with a rationale for the applied criteria, and a list of questions INPROFOOD partners frequently asked while preparing the workshops.

This deliverable is used as a vademecum by partners organising an EASW and is part of the activities to make the process of organising the EASWs as transparent as possible to the public.



**DETAILED PLAN FOR WP2: ADAPTED EUROPEAN AWARENESS SCENARIO WORKSHOPS (EASW)**

**August 2012** Databases for the selection of participants in the 1<sup>st</sup> series ready (large organisations)

**August 2012** 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

**August 2012** 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



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research

<b>September 2012</b>	<p>Re-invitation of already invited non-repliers by email</p> <p>Depending on registrations and expression of interest in replacement: invite next entries or ask if there is interest to replace.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Where necessary, web conferences with hired facilitators in order to harmonise the way the EASWs are carried out.</p> <p>Format for reports on each EASW available</p>
<b>October – November 2012</b>	<p>1<sup>st</sup> series of EASW. No information flow until all of them are finished.</p>
<b>November 2012</b>	<p>Documentation of EASW according to a common format.</p> <p>Deliverable Report on EASWs Series 1</p>
<b>December 2012</b>	<p>D2.2 Analysis Report Series 1</p> <p>Open calls for participation targeted to CSOs</p>
<b>January 2013</b>	<p>Databases for the selection of participants in the 2<sup>nd</sup> series ready (medium organisations)</p> <p>Random selection and invitation of participants</p>
<b>March – April 2013</b>	<p>2<sup>nd</sup> series of EASW</p>
<b>April 2013</b>	<p>D2.3 Analysis Report Series 2</p> <p>Open calls for participation targeted to CSOs</p>
<b>July 2013</b>	<p>Databases for the selection of participants in the 3<sup>rd</sup> series ready (small organisations)</p> <p>Random selection and invitation of participants</p>
<b>October – November 2013</b>	<p>3<sup>rd</sup> series of workshops (small stakeholders)</p>



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research

**November** D2.4 Analysis Report Series 3  
**2013**



## STAKEHOLDERS ELIGIBLE FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE EASW

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.

	<b>Not-for-profit citizen gr</b>	<b>Public authorities, Policy Makers</b>	<b>Business and Industry</b>	<b>Political parties and churches</b>
	<i>Legal non profit-statutes, donations (can apply for public funds), decision making by members, independent from government and business</i>	<i>Part of or controlled by the government. Entitled by the citizens through elections in democracies</i>	<i>Competes on the market without substantial help from the government or public funds.</i>	<i>Different ties to governments in the participating Member States! Exclude or strictly balance participation within one workshop.</i>
<b>Experts</b>				
<b>Research institutes</b>	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	
<b>Professions</b>	Professional Associations (phycisians, nurses, dietary assistants, etc.)	Public chambers for certain professions (do not exist in all countries)		



<b>Prevention of disease</b>	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)	
<b>Research funders</b>				
	Non-profit funds dedicated to research for the citizens	Ministries, parliament, Governmental agencies, district governments	Funds given by enterprises	Funds given by churches or political parties.
<b>Consumers</b>				
<b>Health concerns</b>	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.
<b>Age groups (children, elderly, pregnant women, etc.)</b>	Parents associations, teachers Associations, senior citizen NPOs.	Ministries and departments, public authorities		
<b>Ethical or religious issues</b>	Vegan, vegetarian, animal protection groups			Religious food restrictions
<b>Social and</b>	World hunger,			Groups with strong ties to



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research

<b>environmental concerns</b>	environment preservation, working conditions NPOs such as Oxfam, FoodWatch			political parties or churches
<b>Producers</b>				
<b>Food production</b>		Supervisory public authorities	Associations of food producing enterprises, food industry	
<b>Special diet markets</b>		Supervisory authorities, Food labels from government	Production of vegan, kosher, etc., producers of special food for certain health conditions, age groups or pregnant women	
<b>Sustainability</b>		Related government agencies and departments, Public regulators of competition	Social responsibility associations, organic food labels, Associations like Fair Trade, Slow Food..	



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research

## **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.



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

**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 Databases**

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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> . 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.



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research

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 **small, medium** or **large** organisations. This reference to “**size**” can be only done roughly, it is used as a **proxy for influence and 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”



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research

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.



## **FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS**

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:

### **1.) How many databases are necessary?**

Each of us has to compile THREE databases, one database per stakeholder = one DB 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 need you use a national lottery?**

You can use any lottery. As long as it does not create strong language barriers, you can also use the lottery in another country or an international 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 as there is an archive.

### **4.) Does the Science Shop Vienna validate the entries in the different databases?**

No, the Science Shop Vienna gives 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 and beyond how they proceeded as non-arbitrarily as possible.

### **5.) What else are the explanatory texts about?**

They should not only explain, but also show that it is a huge effort to aim for non-arbitrariness instead of just inviting the usual individuals who then get over-proportional influence on policy making. It also needs to show the limitations, which data in the diverse 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 (at least large) organisations and  
b) because of data protection laws. (Making personal data public without consent would be a breach 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 organisations 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 under the influence of enterprises (funds, decision making), we will shift this organisation to the business stakeholder database. It will be 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.



## 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 borders 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
<b>Set 1</b> (6-7 regions)	Self help groups	Independent institutes	Associations of small enterprises
<b>Set 2</b> (6-7 regions)	Environmental and social NPOs	Public university institutes	Special diet producers
<b>TOTAL 13 EASWs</b>	<b>Non-profit organisaions</b>	<b>Research and science organisations</b>	<b>Business related Organisations</b>



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research

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 **should 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.



**inprofood**  
Towards sustainable food research

**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.