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 D2.2

(Analysis Report on the First Series of Scenario Workshops)

Due date of deliverable: M 12
Actual submission date: M 29

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

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

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

1. Statement

The deliverable is completed.

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

2. Use and Verification of Deliverable in INPROFOOD

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

Analysis Report 1
on the
INPROFOOD Scenario Workshops

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

Partners

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AGROPOLIS
Fabien Boulier: inprofood@agropolis.fr

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

Gene Rowe Evaluations
Gene Rowe: generowe00@gmail.com

Contents

Tables

Acknowledgements

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

Executive summary

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

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

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

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

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

• 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.

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

This report presents an analysis of Series 1 of these scenario workshops. The thirteen workshops saw altogether 204 participants from 186 organizations, of which 43 (23.1%) represented non-profit organizations without business ties, 54 (29%) business associations, 4 (2.2%) single enterprises, 72 (38.7%) the public sector; and 13 (7%) were organizations that do not fall into the targeted categories or for which it remained unclear to which category they belong (e.g. they perhaps overlapped between more than one category).

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

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

Stakeholder input was analysed for common topics: research topics and areas and common demands from research programming on food and health. Altogether, stakeholders named more than 300 research topics and research areas. Those that were mentioned more than once were clustered into 18 more general topics and areas, which address agricultural, economic, medical, natural, social and technical sciences and the humanities. Common demands from research programming were analysed in two ways: along the guiding discussion themes and across them. Lists of the topics and the suggestions can be found at the end of this report.

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

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

[6] Lund declaration, p. 1

[7] op.cit, p. 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

The workshop plan

The workplan in a nutshell

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Targeted stakeholders

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

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

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

Three categories have been identified:

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

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

In the first series no single enterprises were eligible, only business associations of SMEs, farmers and corporations such as economic chambers. As to the public academic sector, in Series 1 the public universities were a target group. It was planned that organizers would ask rectors and vice-rectors to send a delegate to the workshop, and it was specified that the disciplinary angle should remain open to include also the humanities and the social sciences and to make interdisciplinary deliberation possible. Even if food technologists and dieticians presumably would be more interested than other experts, no disciplinary pre-selection should be performed in the recruitment phase.

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

While the identification of public organisations proved to be relatively easy, the classification and subsequently the recruitment of CSOs posed some practical problems. The category "NPOs without business ties" proved to be most challenging, followed by business associations, of which many are established and registered as nonprofit organizations.

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

Recruitment

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

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

Recruitment by sortition

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

Agenda, common discussion themes

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

According to the common agenda, in the introduction to the workshops, participants should be informed about the framework of the workshops and the INPROFOOD project, they heard about the objectives of the workshop they would participate in and what would be done with the results, and the workshop organizer summed up the briefing paper the participants received before the workshop. Instead of a conventional round, in which participants introduced themselves, exercises in action sociometry should make visible the

commonalities and dissimilarities of participants by literally taking a place or position in the room.

After this introduction, the workshop plan included a dynamic switching between breakout sessions and plenaries. Before the workshop each participant should be assigned to one of the three stakeholder categories. At the beginning in three homogeneous groups, each one representing one of the stakeholder categories, participants would then discuss which topics should be researched, and after this develop worst case scenarios on research programming on food and health. The aim was for participants to look for mutual understanding and consensus whenever possible, but it was made clear that disagreement should not be ironed out and differences should be named. According to the plan, all working groups should put the outcomes of their sessions to discussion in a plenary. In the next round participants should develop best case scenarios on research programming on food and health in heterogeneous (mixed) groups, which were designed to consist of representatives of all three stakeholder categories, as far as possible in even numbers and according to participants' personal preferences. Also the results of the heterogeneous groups should be discussed in a plenary, in which participants examined commonalities and similarities as well as dissent between the heterogeneous groups. Dissent should retain its place.

Common agenda[17]

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

Table 1: Common agenda

Common procedures

Common information materials

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

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

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

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

Professional facilitators

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

Evaluation

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

Instructions for breakout sessions[19]

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

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

Documentation

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

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

Implementation

Workshop dates, places and titles

Workshops Series 1	Date	Workshop title
Ankara (Turkey)	2 November 2012	*Nutrition and Innovative Approaches on Food Production*
Athens (Greece)	19 November 2012	*Ερευνητικός Σχεδιασμός στους τομείς της Υγείας και της Διατροφής (Research Programming on food and health)*
Bonn (Germany)	5 February 2013	*Ernährung und Lebensmittel – Forschung 2020 (Nutrition and Food – Research 2020)*
Bratislava (Slovakia)	9 November 2012	*How can research programmes foster healthy and sustainable food innovation?*
Brussels (Belgium)	22 January 2013	*How can research programmes foster healthy and sustainable food innovation?*
Copenhagen (Denmark)	9 January 2013	*How can research programmes foster future healthy eating and well-being in our society?*
London (United Kingdom)	14 December 2012	*Scenario workshop - Research programming on food and health*
Maastricht (The Netherlands)	16 November 2012	*Scenario workshop "Onderzoeksprogrammering op het gebied van Voeding en Gezondheid"(Research programming on food and health)*
Madrid (Spain)	24 February 2013	*About Financial Politics/Programmes Search to Foster Food Innovation in the Health Area*
Paris (France)	15 November 2013	*Atelier d'échanges sur l'implication de la société civile dans la programmation de la recherche relative à l'alimentation en lien avec la santé (Participative workshop on the involvement of civil society in the research programming process in the field of food and health)*
Porto (Portugal)	6 November 2012	*Cenários para o planeamento da investigação em Alimentação e Saúde (Scenario workshop on food and health research programming)*
Rome (Italy)	23 October 2012	*Scenario workshop Verso una ricerca alimentare sicura e sostenibile (Towards a safe and sustainable food research)*
Vienna (Austria)	21 November 2012	*Szenarioworkshop „Forschungsförderung in der Lebensmittel- und Gesundheitsförderung" (Scenario workshop „Research programming on food and health")*

Table 2: Workshop dates and titles

Before the results can be analysed, it is important to establish in which context these results came about. For example, all aspects of workshop preparation and recruitment can influence the outcomes, which, among others, most likely depend on who is actually

involved or excluded from the discussions. Not only the workshop structure, the agenda, the facilitation and the documentation, but also the recruitment strategy is relevant for comparability. Again there are circulatory effects to be expected: A demonstratively transparent recruitment procedure most likely attracts different organizations than an invitation to a networking event with important players. Apart from the question, which specific organization types were targeted, selected, invited and subsequently represented during the workshop, variations of the common agenda, the information given to the deliberating participants and how the workshops were conducted, determines if and in which ways workshops and working group results are comparable to each other. Beyond this, the thematic framing of a workshop and its agenda have a more obvious impact on comparability. If a workshop is about research programming that deals with food, health and sustainability the deliberators may come up with different ideas than if they believe they are participating in a workshop on food and health research in general or if the workshop started with the presentation of an obesity epidemic that leads to certain health challenges. Deliberations will mostly move within the framework defined by the organizer's information materials and introductions. Additionally, the information given to potential organizations before the workshop takes place, impacts on which organizations are interested enough to send a delegate to stay a whole workshop day. Slightly different information can attract different participants, and different participants can come to different conclusions.

Recruitment

As explained in the workplan, for Series 1 there was a common recruitment scheme based on sortition. A few workshop organizers used a different approach. The methods used and a rough estimation of the hierarchy level of participants are shown in Table 2.

Recruitment methods

Workshops Series 1	Recruitment method	"Power, outreach hierarchy" (rough estimation)
Ankara	Database & other	Mostly L
Athens	Database & "lottery"	Mostly M & L
Bonn	Database & invitations by e-mail	Not available
Bratislava	Database & "lottery"	Mostly L
Brussels	Database & "lottery"	L
Copenhagen	Database & other	L
London	Database & "lottery"	L
Maastricht	Database & "lottery" & other	Mostly L
Madrid	Database & "lottery"	L
Paris	Database & "lottery"	L
Porto	Database & "lottery"	Mostly L
Rome	Database & "lottery"	L & M
Vienna	Database & "lottery"	L

Table 3: Recruitment methods and participant hierarchy level

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

Thematic framing

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

Framing

Workshops Series 1	Briefing Paper*	Additional information**	Introduction & presentation *
Ankara			Information on INPROFOOD and presentation of the agenda.
Athens	Sent to participants before the workshop	No	Presentation of agenda + introduction to INPROFOOD and research programming, short overview of the project's environment, information on how the results will be used.
Bonn			Information on INPROFOOD and the agenda.
Bratislava	Sent to participants before the workshop	No	Presentation of agenda + introduction to INPROFOOD and topic.
Brussels			Agenda, information on research programming on food & health in Belgium according to the FAHRE Country Report Belgium
Copenhagen			Introduction to INPROFOOD, presentation of state-of-art research programming .
London			Overview of the overall INPROFOOD project and how the workshop fits within it, short overview of the project's environment.
Maastricht		No	Presentations of the INPROFOOD objectives, expected impacts, scope and purpose of the workshop, recruitment methodology.
Madrid	Participants received it at the workshop	No	Presentation of agenda + introduction to INPROFOOD and research programming, short overview of the project's environment, information on how the results will be used.
Paris	Participants could read a short version of the briefing paper on posters put at display at the workshop	No	Presentation of agenda + introduction to INPROFOOD and research programming, short overview on the project's environment, information on how the results will be used (2 Power Point presentations).
Porto	Was ready only a few days before the workshop took place	Agenda, facilitator profile	Short presentation on INPROFOOD, the workshops, the agenda and the expected impact of the workshop.
Rome	Was not ready before the workshop took place	No	Information about the purpose of INPROFOOD, the consortium, presentation of the agenda, briefly presentation of the Joint Programming Initiative "A healthy diet for a healthy life" (vision and synthesis of three key areas)
Vienna	Sent to participants before the workshop	No	Presentation of agenda + introduction to INPROFOOD and research programming, short overview of the project's environment, information on how the results will be used.

Table 4: Framing

* This information was taken from the reports.
** Additional information: Information in addition to the general information sheet and briefing paper.Some partners used a (summarized) press release on INPROFOOD in which the project, and consequently the workshop is framed as being on research programming in food and health, especially fighting obesity and diet-related chronic diseases.

Participant structure

Altogether 204 representatives from 186 organizations participated in the workshops of Series 1. Of those 186 organizations 43 (23.1%) were finally categorized as NPOs without business ties, 72 (38.7%) as public entities, 54 (29%) as business related associations. In addition to the originally targeted organized business sector, 4 (2.2%) single enterprises participated. 13 (7%) organizations either do not fall into any of these categories or it was not possible to allocate them to a certain stakeholder category (e.g. due to overlaps between categories).

Workshops Series 1	NPOs without business ties	Public organizations	Business associations	Enterprises	Other stakeholders	Total
Ankara	4	6	4	0	2	**16**
Athens	6	6	1	0	0	**13**
Bonn	2	2	3	1	5	**13**
Bratislava	3	9	8	0	0	**20**
Brussels	2	5	0	0	1	**8**
Copenhagen	1	6	5	1	2	**15**
London	2	2	2	0	1	**7**
Maastricht	2	3	1	2	0	**8**
Madrid	0	5	8	0	1	**14**
Paris	6	9	3	0	0	**18**
Porto	2	5	5	0	0	**12**
Rome	5	7	5	0	1	**18**
Vienna	8	7	9	0	0	**24**
Total	**43**	**72**	**54**	**4**	**13**	**186**

Table 5: Organizations by stakeholder category (final classification)

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

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

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

Re-classifications: Harmonizing categorization

From originally 68 representatives from “NPOs without business ties”, 48 stayed in this category, 1 was shifted to the public category, 8 to Business and 11 to Other. From originally 82 public entities, 1 was shifted to NPO without business ties and 2 were re-categorized as “Other”. Here we subsumed organizations that either do not fit in any category or are difficult to categorize (e.g. due to overlaps between categories). Among others, participants having been re-categorized, represented a European consortium, technology platforms, business associations or organizations with mixed characteristics. Sometimes desk research was not sufficient to clearly decide into which category an organization belongs. Of 54 delegates in the business category 3 were specified as coming from single enterprises and 1 was shifted to “Other”, while 49 remained in the business association category. The following table presents the performed re-categorization of individual participants (except for two workshops).

Shifts in stakeholder categories (individual participants)

Workshops Series 1	Stays in NPO	Shifted from NPO to PUB	Shifted from NPO to BUS	Shifted from NPO to OTH	Stays in PUB	Shifted from PUB to NPO	Shifted from PUB to OTH	Stays in BUS	Shifted from BUS to ENT	Shifted from BUS to OTH	Total
Ankara	4	0	0	2	6	0	0	4	0	0	**16**
Athens	8	0	0	0	7	0	0	1	0	0	**16**
Bonn	3	0	2	4	2	1	1	2	1	1	**17**
Bratislava	4	0	0	0	9	0	0	8	0	0	**21**
Brussels	3	1	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	**11**
Copenhagen	1	0	2	2	7	0	0	4	1	0	**17**
London	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	**7**
Maastricht	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	**8**
Madrid	0	0	4	1	5	0	0	4	0	0	**14**
Paris	6	0	0	0	9	0	0	4	0	0	**19**
Porto	2	0	0	0	9	0	0	5	0	0	**16**
Rome	5	0	0	1	7	0	0	5	0	0	**18**
Vienna	8	0	0	0	7	0	0	9	0	0	**24**
Total	**48**	**1**	**8**	**11**	**79**	**1**	**2**	**49**	**4**	**1**	**204**

Table 6: Re-categorization of participants

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

The categorization difficulties indicate a major problem: a fairly inconsistent definition of the NPO category across political institutions and countries. As it is now, an industrial association often is considered a non-profit organization as is an environmental grassroots organization. If the definition of NPOs is stricter than usual, it becomes much more difficult to recruit what appear to be non-profit organizations – organized civil society - than is generally assumed, at

least, if these organizations are expected not to depend on the private sector in terms of members or funding. The outcomes of stakeholder involvement processes might be less often based on civil society's input than is claimed.

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

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

Addressing a lower hierarchy level (size or geographical outreach) differed widely. For several organizers it was more difficult to recruit this "level" than recruiting "large" players. Most likely, these organizations do not have sufficient resources to spend a whole workshop day, or in the case, where travelling is necessary, even more time. Additionally, according to recent literature[21], another obstacle could be the so-called "participation fatigue". This may have developed in some of the Northern countries, where participatory involvement activities are performed frequently. In some of the partner countries, the economic crisis most likely had an impact on the participation of medium sized organizations as well.

Although ideally only one delegate per participating organization should come, sometimes more than one attended the workshop. Hence there are more participants than

[21] Horst, 2014

organizations. Altogether, the Series 1 workshops saw 204 participants

Workshops Series 1	NPOs without business ties	Public organizations	Business associations	Enterprises	Other stakeholders	Total number of participants
Ankara	4	6	4	0	2	**16**
Athens	8	7	1	0	0	**16**
Bonn	4	2	4	1	6	**17**
Bratislava	4	9	8	0	0	**21**
Brussels	3	7	0	0	1	**11**
Copenhagen	1	7	6	1	2	**17**
London	2	2	2	0	1	**7**
Maastricht	2	3	1	2	0	**8**
Madrid	0	5	8	0	1	**14**
Paris	6	9	4	0	0	**19**
Porto	2	9	5	0	0	**16**
Rome	5	7	5	0	1	**18**
Vienna	8	7	9	0	0	**24**
Total	**49**	**80**	**57**	**4**	**14**	**204**

Table 7: Individuals by consolidated stakeholder category

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

Work-shop 1	Ankara	Athens	Bratis-lava	Brussels	Copen-hagen	London	Maas-tricht	Madrid	Paris	Porto	Rome	Vienna
Female	8	8	10	6	10	5	2	10	7	13	6	11
Male	8	8	11	5	7	2	6	4	12	3	12	13

Table 8: Distribution of female and male participants by workshop

Realization of the agenda

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

Documentation

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

Comparability of the workshops

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

Distinguishing categories correctly is a most important condition in these workshops in which different "stakeholders" are grouped into homogeneous and heterogeneous teams. After categorization homogeneous groups can become mixed groups, heterogeneous groups can turn into more homogeneous groups.

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

Instructions for working groups

	Working groups	**Tasks**
Ankara	• Homogeneous group 1: NPO • Homogeneous group 2: Business/food sector • Homogeneous group 3: Public sector	Other
	Mixed group 1 Mixed group 2 Mixed group 3	Other
	Remarks:	Two participants from food technology/engineering sector organizations were shifted from the category "NPO without business ties" (NPO) to "other" (OTH).
Athens	• Homogeneous group 1: NGOs • Homogeneous group 2: Public organizations	Research topics and areas Worst case/s
	• Mixed group 1 • Mixed group 2 • Mixed group 3 • Mixed group 4	Best case/s
	Remarks:	The agenda was followed closely. Only one BUS participant joins in the NPO group in the morning. No re-categorisation was performed.
Bonn	• Small group Scientists • Small group Nutrition & elderly people • Small group Associations, communication & consultants	Nutrition and food - contemporary situation: *Describe the contemporary nutrition. / Which contemporary research does exist and which innovations are developed right now?*
	• Small group 1 in the afternoon • Small group 2 in the afternoon • Small group 3 in the afternoon	Nutrition and food - contemporary situation in 2020: *How will/shall nutrition and food research change in Germany and Europe? Which innovations do we need? What is my own contribution? What are the implications for my own institution?*
	Remarks:	Participants remain anonymous but the authors received a list of participants from the organizers. Online research lad to some reshifts: From originally 9 NPO participants we would leave 3 in this category, shift 2 to BUS and classify 4 as OTH. From originally 4 participants classified as PUB, we would leave 2 and classify 1 as NPO and another as OTH. From 4 "business associations" 1 is a small enterprise and another categorized as OTH. This workshop yields some interesting outcomes, but is in too different from the other workshop to allow for sound comparison in Series 1.
Bratislava	• Homogeneous group 1: NPOs • Homogeneous group 2: Public sector • Homogeneous group 3: Business sector	Research topics and areas Worst case/s

	• Mixed group 1 • Mixed group 2 • Mixed group 3	Best case/s
	Remarks:	The agenda has been followed very closely, the categorization matches the original categories.
Brussels	• Homogenous group 1: Research & academia • Homogenous group 2: Organizations with business ties • Homogenous group 3: Consumers	Scenarios
	• Heterogeneous group 1 • Heterogeneous group 2 • Heterogeneous group 3	Scenarios
	Remarks:	In the NPO category one organisation was shifted to PUB. In the PUB category, 1 organisations was shifted to OTH.
Copenhagen	• Homogeneous Group 1 (Private) • Homogeneous Group 2 (Public) • Homogeneous Group 3 (NGO)	Research topics and areas (to be studied/not to be studied) Worst case/s
	• Mixed Group 1 • Mixed Group 2 • Mixed Group 3	Best case/s
	Remarks:	From the NPO group 2 participants remained in the category "NPOs without business ties" 1 organisation with 2 delegates was shifted to the business association category (BUS). Additionally, an European consortium in the food sector and a technology consultancy were shifted to OTH. In the business association category one organisation was classified as company and shifted to ENT. The agenda has been largely maintained. Only the Topic question is enlarged by "not to be studied". A communication question is added to the sub-questions in the scenario tasks. The Danish workshops are as special case because they address the Nordic region instead of one country.
London	• Homogeneous Group 1: Public sector • Homogeneous Group 2: Nonprofit/charity sector • Homogeneous Group 3: Food producers + 1 public sector representative	Research topics and areas Worst case/s
	• Mixed group 1 • Mixed group 2	Best case/s
	Remarks:	One NPO without business ties is a private College and was shifted to "OTH". The agenda has been closely followed.
Maastricht	• Homogenous Group - Non-Profit Stakeholders Group • Homogenous Group – Business Stakeholders Group	Research topics and areas (sticky notes) Worst case/s

	• Homogenous Group – Public Stakeholder Group	
	• Mixed group 1 • Mixed group 2	Best case/s
	Remarks:	In the business association group two companies were shifted to ENT. The report names all organisations without specifying categorisation for the homogeneous group. (The categorisation in this report was performed by its authors.) The agenda has been roughly followed.
Madrid	• Homogeneous group Blue: NPO • Homogeneous Group Red: Public sector • Homogeneous group Green: Business sector	Research topics and areas Identification of barriers and difficulties in funding and research and in the area of food and health, and what should be avoided in the organisation of funding and research.
	• Mixed group 1 • Mixed group 2 • Mixed group 3	Best case/s
	Remarks:	The workshop followed the agenda. In the NPO group 4 organisations were re-categorized as business associations/technology platforms and shifted to a second BUS group (BUS2), and a 5th organisation was shifted. All other categories remained unchanged.
Paris	• Homogeneous Group 1: Public institutions • Homogeneous Group 2: Civil society • Homogeneous Group 3: Business sphere	Research topics and areas Worst case/s Homogeneous group 3: Other outcome
	• Mixed Group A • Mixed Group B • Mixed group C	Other outcome
	Remarks:	No regrouping was performed. The agenda roughly follows the working plan.
Porto	• Homogeneous Group 1 – Public Organisations • Homogeneous Group 2 – Non-Profit Organisations • Homogeneous Group 3 – Business Organisations	Research topics and areas Worst case/s
	• Heterogeneous Group #1 • Heterogeneous Group #2 • Heterogeneous Group #3	Best case/s
	Remarks:	The agenda follows closely the working plan, the categorization was maintained like in the original.
Rome	• Homogeneous Group 1: Business & industries • Homogeneous Group 2: Not-for-profit organizations • Homogeneous Group 3: Public authorities & policy makers	NEGATIVE VISION in health food year 2030. The unwanted developments in the next 17 years in relation to food and quality of life, research policy and programming in the food, food innovation.
	• Mixed Group 1	Mixed groups: positive vision 2030, conditions,

	• Mixed Group 2 • Mixed Group 3	actors, actions
	Remarks:	Although the workshop yields some very interesting outcomes, the framing, agenda and tasks are quite different from the working plan, which hampers comparability profoundly.
Vienna	• Homogeneous working group "Business associations" • Homogeneous working group "Public organizations" • Homogeneous group "NPOs without business ties"	Research topics and areas Worst case/s
	Mixed working group 1 Mixed working group 2 Mixed working group 3 Mixed working group 4	Best case/s
	Remarks:	The agenda has been followed very closely, the categorization matches the original categories.

Table 9: Instructions for working groups

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

On the previous pages all workshops have been described according to these variations. This overview allows the grouping of the workshops according to their similarities and the determination of which parts of them can be compared to others, and in which respect. While all workshops have triggered vivid discussion and interesting outputs, comparing them has its challenges. Differences in the implementation of the workplan limit the comparability of stakeholder input across workshops. Two workshops followed a different agenda, two workshops had a different topic than suggested in the working plan, the recruitment schemes for a few workshops was less transparent than planned, some workshops framed the area of food and health without the sustainability angle and/or as food and obesity. It is questionable whether, due to cultural differences, it is possible to conduct matched workshops. From this we might conclude that achieving sufficient matching of workshop for analysis is quite a challenge.

Some framing is inevitable, and every framing is limiting and has some blind spots. In some cases a narrow framing of the issue could be countered by targeting stakeholders usually not being addressed within such a framing. These stakeholders opened up the framing by bringing in additional perspectives. We consider this an indication that the basic assumption

was not wrong: targeting a quite broad range of stakeholders since this counters organizers' blind spots and contributes to more robust results.

Outcomes

References to outcomes of deliberations (posters)

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

Boxes:

Delegates: 6 PUB

Homog. group 1 „Public" / p3

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

Footnotes:

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

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

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

Abbreviations concerning deliberators:

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

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

What sources were used for the analysis of the workshops?

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

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

Common topics

Topics to be researched

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

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

Affordability of healthy food

Apparently the economic crisis that began in 2008 is mirrored in some of the workshop input. This is a topic brought up by NPOs and public sector representatives in four workshops. In the Athens workshops participants linked the economic crisis with a deteriorization of health conditions, in the Porto workshop participants pointed out to the appearance of new poverty (e.g. In the middle classes), in the London workshop participants linked health with income equalities, and in the Bratislava and the Athens workshop participants demanded cheap food of good quality. The potential tension between low income and healthy nutrition conjures up in terms of income inequality, poverty, affordability of healthy food or the necessity to change unhealthy nutritional habits in low income families in all three workshop series. Thus there is a link to the topic on how to change consumer behaviour towards more healthy nutritional habits.

	Athens (GR)	**Porto (PT)**	**London (UK)**	**Bratislava (SK)**
NPO	Nutrition –economic crisis – health: Cost reduction			
	Ho1 p1 / 8 NPO 1 BUS			
PUB	Production of high quality and healthy foods with low cost	(3) appearance of new poverty;		Cheap and quality food /freshness
	Ho2 p1 / 7 PUB	*Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB*		*Ho2 p1 (n.2.0) / 9 PUB*
MX			Income/health inequalities Affordability of food products	
			Ho2 p1 (fig. 5) / 1 NPO 1 xxy	

Table 10: Affordability of food

Consumer behaviour

The whole issue of research on how to make citizens consume high quality, that is healthy (and sustainable) food, came up frequently in public sector, civil society and heterogeneous groups. But there are quite different approaches. Buying fresh products is not only more sustainable and healthier, it is also viewed as being more expensive. The readiness to spend money on food is not only a cultural issue, but also an issue of affordability, especially for the

poorer citizens. Their number has risen because of the economic crisis. Eating culture, taking time to enjoy meals also has to do with living conditions and the time that can be spent with cooking ("traditional food" versus "convenience products"). A strongly educational approach sees the reason for consumers' behaviours in a lack of information: Because people are not educated enough – so the assumption – they buy unhealthy food, become obese and increase their risk of cardio-vascular diseases.

Children were named more often than other special target groups, because sub-optimal nutrition has stronger consequences, an impact on the development. Additionally, habits are formed in childhood that may persist for the rest of their life. The question of advertising and its impact was another important issue.

Consumer behaviour appeared in several workshops as a suggested research area and also in different working groups. Often it was viewed as a problem, and the necessity to change it seemed to be unquestioned (in particular by public sector representatives and heterogeneous groups; the private sector representatives showed no interest in convincing the consumer of a more healthy lifestyle), but the contexts in which it was discussed were not identical. The focus could lie on healthy food choices, psychological issues or genetical predispositions, purchasing power, consumer demands or on eating cultures, with the implicit question of how willing or able consumers are to spend more money on food with higher quality. It could be seen more as result of faulty education or information, or be rather attributed to societal or physiological conditions under which citizens live and work.

Stakeholders of all categories considered consumer behaviour an important research topic. On the one hand there was interest in inducing more healthy nutrition by consumers; on the other hand there was interest in understanding consumer behaviour: what appeals to consumers, their habits and how they are formed (by representatives of all stakeholder categories, mostly by ones of the private and public sector). Open questions remain as to how exactly consumers are supposed to behave. Understanding and evaluating methods does also not necessarily imply that the consumer is responsible for "non-compliance" to dietary advice.

	Vienna (AT)	Copenhagen (DK)	Paris (FR)	Athens (GR)	Porto (PT)	Bratislava (SK)	London (UK)
BUS	- organic - everybody wants it - decision on the market – Nutrition - embedded into living environments - always shaped by societal developments	Behaviour- what creates, what influences, how to measure Communication/decision structure					* Stakeholder engagement/influence - media, awareness £?, 'fashion' -----> Education/Consumer
	Ho2 p1 / 9 BUS	*p3: Ho2 / 4 BUS 1 ENT*					*Ho3 p2 (fig. 12) / 2 BUS 1****
BUS2		o Meal types o Meal culture o Behaviour o The role and influence of the schools					
		p5: Ho3 / 1 NPO 2 BUS 2 OTH					
NPO	How come nutrional decisions about? - Effects of advertising --- psycholog. K * social research nutrition sociology * Educational strategies		information and education on food diversity and food balance	Promote changes in consumer behavior (education - knowledge)			
	Ho3 p1 / 8 NPO		*Ho2 p1 / 6 NPO*	*Ho1 p1 / 8 NPO 1 BUS*			
PUB	Shaping of taste and sense of smell during infancy and youth * persuasive methods 4) How does information – communication affect consumers?	* Genetics and lifestyle * Behaviour research * Goal-oriented prevention including weak groups	Acceptance/willingness to pay Consumers behaviour	Develop consumer behaviors in the sector of food consumption Ho2 p1 / 7 PUB	(2) the existence of 'barriers' to healthy and pro -environment eating behaviours; (4) food and health education	What does the consumer want?	Education healthy nutrient -dense
	Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB	*p1: Ho1 / 7 PUB*	*Ho1 p2 / 9 PUB*		*Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB*	*Ho2 p1 (n.2.0) / 9 PUB*	*Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 2 PUB*

							Human behavior/psychology – choice mechanisms Consumer research – why do they buy certain products
							*Ho2 p1 (fig. 5) / 1 NPO 1****

Table 11: Consumer behaviour

Consumer information

NPO and public sector representatives suggested this topic. Both demanded the improvement of consumer information by giving clearer information on origin (as did as the only private sector representatives the ones in the Vienna workshop) and health claims and to investigate how to optimally deliver this information to the consumer. Also one of the heterogeneous groups in the Maastricht workshop mentioned these topics. For these stakeholders apparently current food labelling gives insufficient information and does not present information in a way that it is clear to the consumer.

	Vienna (AT)	**Athens (GR)**	**Paris (FR)**	**Maastricht (NL)**	**Bratislava (SK)**	**London (UK)**
BUS	- flaws in food-labelling (i.a.: Fisch/Attersee) (1)					
	Ho2 p1 / 9 BUS					
NPO	* Improvement of Information Transparency for consumers - how does the right information reach its target?	No CE (label on products), instead the country of origin of each product should be labelled	truth + great transparency of products		Simpler labelling of food – colours·	
	Ho3 p1 / 8 NPO	*Ho1 p1 / 8 NPO 1 BUS*	*Ho2 p1 / 6 NPO*		*Ho1 p1 (n.1.0) / 4 NPO*	

PUB	* Children / youths * declarations	Investigation on the different ways information from the sector of food & health can be used	(4) check of health claims e.g.: fatty acids for lowering DMLA type II diabetes cardio vascular diseases obesity chronic inflammatory bowel diseases cancers cognitive disorders arthritis		Awareness and needs of consumer – how to inform?	knowledge/info. product label accuracy
	Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB	*Ho2 p1 / 7 PUB*	*Ho1 p3 / 9 PUB*		*Ho2 p1 (n.2.0) / 9 PUB*	*Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 2 PUB*
MX				b) Marketing vs. education: f) Conflicting messages in the Media: b) Scientific communication towards citizens: c) Reliability of information: f) Paradigm shift: from focus on disease to a focus on being healthy:		Clarification systems for foods based on healthiness eg. Traffic light systems Use/understanding of food labeling
				Sticky N. / diverse		*Ho2 p1 (fig. 5) / 1 NPO 1****

Table 12: Consumer information

Control & regulation

This topic was of overproportional interest to NPO representatives, who suggested more research on effects of policy, especially on effects of financial and agricultural policy, and requested better control and monitoring of certain food ingredients. Representatives of the public sector suggested to do research on the effects of subventions, i.e. on effects of policy, and on legal aspects of labelling. Also representatives of the private sector demanded research on policy effects, one group of them mentioned the control of compliance with regulations as a research topic.

	Bratislava (SK)	Vienna (AT)	Athens (GR)	Paris (FR)	Porto (PT)	Maastricht (NL)
BUS	Control of compliance with legislative norms and duties·	research regarding erroneous developments of the all-powerful market policy - example: "throw-away behaviour"				
	Ho3 p2 (n.3.2) / 8 BUS	*Ho2 p1 / 9 BUS*				
NPO	Continuous and systematic monitoring of natrium in food· Effectiveness of tax benefiting for domestic food products Domestic versus exotic fruit	* Effect of taxes - e.g. organic / conventional	Control mechanisms Reform of the (wrong) agricultural policies	more controlled salt and sugar contents in food products		
	Ho1 p1 (n.1.0) / 4 NPO	*Ho3 p1 / 8 NPO*	*Ho1 p1 / 8 NPO 1 BUS*	*Ho2 p1 / 6 NPO*		
PUB		subventions: influence / effect (1)			(9) legal aspects of labelling	
		Ho1 p2 / 7 PUB			Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB	
MX						c) Legal solutions: a) Autonomy versus control through Government:
						Sticky N. / diverse

Table 13: Control & regulation

Environmental sustainability

Half of the groups that mentioned environmental sustainability as an important research area were groups of public sector representatives. Among others, topics under the cluster “environmental sustainability” include environmental impact assessment of food products, potential trade-offs between health and sustainability demands, research on organic agriculture and, the most frequent suggestion, food waste. Avoiding waste, the use of by-products, recycling of all materials was important for very different interest groups. Two working groups in two different workshops even chose this topic as an example for deliberating on research structures. According to the workshop participants the question was not if but HOW sustainability should be achieved. Sometimes

this topic appears to be mentioned less as a research topic than a demand.

	Vienna (AT)	Madrid (ES)	London (UK)	Paris (FR)	Porto (PT)	Athens (GR)
BUS	In which direction does ORGANIC develop? [...] strawberries from Asia - versus economic crisis in Southern Europe – Norovirus [...] Clustering: Origine - ORGANIC - Eating culture [...] environmental effects for example: use of medical drugs – excretions -- > sewage treatment plant -- > environment	Optimisation and recycling of raw materials Use of by -products	Economic: production consumer Environmental/Ecological Availability/Accessibility Food Miles Seasonality			
	Ho2 p1&2 / 9 BUS	*Ho1 p1 (blue) / 4 BUS2 1 OTH*	*Ho3 p1 (fig. 11) / 2 BUS 1****			
NPO						Environmental effects [...] Use of by -products:
						Ho1 p1 / 8 NPO 1 BUS
PUB			reduce waste	(5) interest of organic products	(1) development of sustainable products [...] (3) production of organic /environmental friendly food; [...] (5) valorisation of sub - products;	
			Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 2 PUB	*Ho1 p2 / 9 PUB*	*Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB*	
			Food wastage e.g. what foods in what proportions [...] Healthy vs sustainable – what to do when recommendations conflict			

			[...] Food preservation Agriculture/ecology Marine biology			
			*Ho2 p1 (fig. 5) / 1 NPO 1****			

Table 14: Environmental sustainability

Food ingredients and food additives

Mentioned by representatives of all three stakeholder categories, this topic was mainly linked to food safety: health risks, e.g., but a heterogeneous group and a group of public sector representatives wanted also to see research on food additives for the purpose of enhancing health.

	Vienna (AT)	**Madrid (ES)**	**Bratislava (SK)**	**Paris (FR)**	**Porto (PT)**
BUS		A lot of R&D+i focused on compounds and not on food. Interactions?	content of nutrients and contaminants in food labelling and control of labelling· [...] health harmlessness of food – and of ingredients added to the food identity of supplied foods and food products· [...] Glucose -fructose corn syrup and its maleficience		
		Ho3 p1 (green) / 4 BUS	*Ho3 p1&2 (n.3.1&2) / 8 BUS*		
NPO	* risks of additives, ingredients for conservation, aroma, auxiliary agents, pesticides, ...		Analysis of food composition – whether it corresponds with producer information (proportion of allergens and colorants), Unsaturated fatty acids [...] Harmfulness of monosodium glutamate (myth or fact?)		
	Ho3 p1 / 8 NPO		*Ho1 p1 (n.1.0) / 4 NPO*		

PUB				sweeteners additives degradation products [....] (2) functional ingredients e.g.: phytosterols, omega 3, probiotics	(2) reduction of contaminants in food and the environment;
				Ho1 p1&3 / 9 PUB	*Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB*

Table 15: Food ingredients and food additives

Research areas and topics of local, regional or national importance

Stakeholders regularly mentioned the importance of local, regional and national aspects, be it in relation to traditional food and diet or, as in the case of mostly civil society representatives, in relation to regional production and consumption and tax incentives for "domestic" products.

	Vienna (AT)	**Copenhagen (DK)**	**Athens (GR)**	**Porto (PT)**
BUS2		National context		
		p5: Ho3 / 1 NPO 2 BUS 2 OTH		
NPO	- regional		Market management (from the farmer directly to the consumer) [...] Research on indigenous (local) products	
	Ho3 p1 / 8 NPO		*Ho1 p1 / 8 NPO 1 BUS*	
PUB				(6) healthy/traditional food (traditional Atlantic food).·
				Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB

Table 16: Research areas and topics of local, regional or national importance

Specific nutrition needs

Research on how to nourish certain population groups was demanded only by public sector representatives. Special nutrition needs concern the very young, the very old and individuals with food allergies/intolerances.

	Bratislava (SK)	**Paris (FR)**	**Porto (PT)**	**Vienna (AT)**
NPO	Differentiating products with highest level of allergens			
	Ho1 p1 (n.1.0) / 4 NPO			
PUB	Food for specific groups	Population groups (particularly risky and vulnerable populations): *[--->prevention]*	(8) specific needs of the elderly; and	* allergies
	Ho2 p1 (n.2.0) / 9 PUB	*poster3 (hg1) / 9 PUB*	*Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB*	*Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB*

Table 17: Specific nutrition needs

Food safety

This topic was also suggested by the public sector representatives most often. It is closely linked to topics on food ingredients and additives. Safety and security were mentioned in connection with allergens, ingredients and contaminants.

	Bratislava (SK)	**London (UK)**	**Paris (FR)**	**Vienna (AT)**
BUS		Residues; Producer & Processor Hygiene; Biosecurity (Disease Management & Control) (E. Coli etc); Food Security [...] - plant/animal (biosecurity, links to health) - human (food links) - contaminants		food - security: "ONE HEALTH Strategy"

		*Ho3 p1 (fig. 11) / 2 BUS 1****		*Ho2 p2 / 9 BUS*
NPO	analysis of samples from school canteen·[...] Differentiating products with highest level of allergens			
	Ho1 p1 (n.1.0) / 4 NPO			
PUB	Food harmlessness, safety of food chain		(2) food safety [--->prevention]	* food security * threshold values (0) [...] * Limits of detection
	Ho2 p1 (n.2.0) / 9 PUB		*Ho1 p3 / 9 PUB*	*Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB*
MX		Chemistry/toxicology (e.g. potential – re: health effects of new nutrients)		
		*Ho2 p1 (fig. 5) / 1 NPO 1****		

Table 18: Food safety

Food supply/availability

Brought up by representatives of the public sector and civil society only, public sector stakeholders related food supply and availability of food to land use, food sufficiency and accessibility of food, while in the Vienna workshop the group of civil society representatives discussed food supply under the perspective of alternative food systems (alternatives to supermarkets).

	Athens (GR)	**Bratislava (SK)**	**London (UK)**	**Paris (FR)**	**Vienna (AT)**
NPO					* [Move] away from distribution [channels] of large industries - also economic aspects [...] * different forms of organization [or: ways to organize] producers ~ consumers (turn away from supermarket), organic [products] box,..
					Ho3 p1 / 8 NPO

PUB	Cover food sufficiency and best use of agricultural land, focusing on producing food products	Food sufficiency	ways to increase bioavail. + access to healthy foods (fruit & veg) availability	- food matrix	
	Ho2 p1 / 7 PUB	*Ho2 p1 (n.2.0) / 9 PUB*	*Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 2 PUB*	*Ho1 p2 / 9 PUB*	
MX			How to get these foods to the people that need them		
			*Ho2 p1 (fig. 5) / 1 NPO 1****		

Table 19: Food supply/availability

Genetically modified organisms

Suggested in five workshops – only by representatives of the private and the public sector -, research on GMOs was suggested in connection with the improvement of plants and research on their effects on health, the economy and society at large.

	Bratislava (SK)	**London (UK)**	**Paris (FR)**	**Vienna (AT)**
BUS	genetic material in plant products and animal products·			
	Ho3 p1 (n.3.1) / 8 BUS			
BUS	Genetic Improvement			
	Ho1 p1 (blue) / 4 BUS2 1 OTH			
PUB		genetic alter [...] gm foods/ high nutrient foods/ use less water resist. to bacteria/ natural (10 days) vs genetic	GMOs: health risks; technical aspect - risks for health/ prevention -	gene technology --- > effects health versus economic /economic / social
		Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 2 PUB	*Ho1 p1 / 9 PUB*	*Ho1 p2 / 7 PUB*

Table 20: Genetically modified organisms

Healthiness of food

Topics clustered under healthiness cover safety and prevention aspects, the healthiness of traditional food and the need for long-term studies to determine the healthiness of specific food or even specific diets.

	Bratislava (SK)	**Vienna (AT)**	**Porto (PT)**	**Maastricht (NL)**	**London (UK)**
BUS		Which evaluation criteria are to be applied in order to determine which food is healthy? - long term trials - less numerical games (for example: vitamins) - more "VITALITY" (2)			Balance (Benefits vs Risks); [...] "good foods"/"bad foods" Related to chronic diseases Definition & perception ---> Health preventative AND control
		Ho2 p1 / 9 BUS			*Ho3 p1 (fig. 11) / 2 BUS 1****
NPO	Evaluating the contribution of dairy products with regard to the cardio - vascular prevention (calcium)· [...] Morbidity and mortality of vegetarians and vegans				
	Ho1 p1 (n.1.0) / 4 NPO				
PUB	Healthy diet and diseases		(3) absence of healthy diets, traditional, organic, reduced salt and sugar, or traditional Atlantic food.·		
	Ho2 p1 (n.2.0) / 9 PUB		*Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB*		
MX				d) Healthy ≠ nutrition:	
				Sticky N. / diverse	

Table 21: Healthiness of food

New food products

Suggestions for research for new products include targeting niches, doing research on traditional food, novel or functional food, and convenience products. There are no big differences on this between stakeholder groups.

	Madrid (ES)	**Copenhagen (DK)**	**London (UK)**	**Athens (GR)**	**Porto (PT)**
BUS **BUS2**	- Need to make greater efforts in R&D+i in raw materials that reduce external dependency, even focussing on traditional products	o Taste o Preparation o Enjoyment	- ongoing knowledge/adaptive management Processing effect? – fiber refinement etc Artificial additives ---> Production systems - sustainability		
	Ho3 p1 (green) / 4 BUS	*p5: Ho3 / 1 NPO 2 BUS 2 OTH*	*Ho3 p2 (fig. 12) / 2 BUS 1****		
NPO				Production of innovative food products	
				Ho1 p1 / 8 NPO 1 BUS	
PUB	Novel foods		product development		(1) the need for valorisation and differentiation of products; [...} (7) development of food for specific niches; .
	Ho2 p1 (red) / 5 PUB		*Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 2 PUB*		*Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB*
MX			Developing new types of food products- eg. Increasing healthiness of snacks		
			*Ho2 p1 (fig. 5) / 1 NPO 1****		

Table 22: New food products

Prevention

	London (UK)	**Paris (FR)**	**Porto (PT)**	**Athens (GR)**	**Maastricht (NL)**
NPO				Prevention of chronic diseases	

				Ho1 p1 / 8 NPO 1 BUS	
PUB		[---> prevention] short -term / long -term renewing frequency [...] (2) link with the events of life	(5) primary and secondary preventive aspects – allergies, intolerances		
		Ho1 p2 / 9 PUB	*Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB*		
MX	Epidemiology – dietary factors affecting risk of disease or disease prevention				h) More focus on prevention:
	*Ho2 p1 (fig. 5) / 1 NPO 1****				*Sticky N. / diverse*

Table 23: Prevention

Food quality

Food quality was a topic mentioned mostly by representatives of the public sector. No civil society representative mentioned it. One group of private sector representatives mentioned product quality, one group of private and public sector representatives mentioned it in connection to availability and accessibility of quality food, public sector representatives mentioned it in connection with nutrition value, well-being or affordability.

	Athens (GR)	**Bratislava (SK)**	**Copenhagen (DK)**	**London (UK)**	**Paris (FR)**
BUS		Quality of food Quality of products· [...] Quality KKZ·		Quality: Nutrition; Appearance; Taste; Seasonal Availability/Accessibility (Shelf-life?)	
		Ho3 p1&2 (n.3.1&2) / 8 BUS		*Ho3 p1 (fig. 11) / 2 BUS 1****	
PUB	Production of high quality and healthy foods with low cost	Cheap and quality food /freshness	* Molecular understanding of food quality	quality	Improvement/optimisation [...] quality, well -being (3)
	Ho2 p1 / 7 PUB	*Ho2 p1 (n.2.0) / 9 PUB*	*p1: Ho1 / 7 PUB*	*Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 2 PUB*	*Ho1 p1 / 9 PUB*

Table 24: Food quality

Food production

Food production was not a research topic demanded by civil society representatives; it was a topic suggested especially by the private and the public sector. Under this cluster we summarised suggestions by private sector representatives to do research on animal welfare, automatization, biotechnological innovation, plant nutrition, breeding, new processing technologies, and efficient use of resources. Public sector representatives mostly demanded research on environmentally sustainable food production. There seems to be a telling difference between the two stakeholder categories, but making such a generalization on the basis of the input from five groups would be jumping to conclusions.

	Bratislava (SK)	**London (UK)**	**Madrid (ES)**	**Vienna (AT)**
BUS	Breeding		- Use of biofactory plants - Bioprospecting - Use of plant improvement - Genetic Improvement - Prophylaxis - Animal welfare - Feed Improvement Animal - Plant nutrition - Harness New species [...] - Automation. Mechanization	new production technologies efficiency (process-efficient consumption of water & energy)
	Ho3 p2 (n.3.2) / 8 BUS		*Ho1 p1 (blue) / 4 BUS2 1 OTH*	*Ho2 p2 / 9 BUS*
PUB		area availability (deprived areas) cost		* resources / sustainability * preservation: enhancing agents and additives (2) * fertilisation * support regional consumption (production) * Transportation
		Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 2 PUB		*Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB*

Table 25: Food production

Food processing

Mostly public sector representatives mentioned this topic, especially in connection to food safety, but also to nutrition value and processing technologies. A heterogeneous group of stakeholders discussed it also under the perspective of environmental sustainability.

	London (UK)	**Athens (GR)**	**Paris (FR)**	**Porto (PT)**
BUS	- safe - ecological/natural resource Balance - economic/social Balance (eg imports) (CBA nutrition vs sustainability)			
	*Ho3 p2 (fig. 12) / 2 BUS 1****			
PUB	processing (unit damage) research – nutrition/processing	Use of new preservation and processing methods. Research on their effects on human health.	processes [---> health risks] [...] - processes [---> prevention]	(6) development of new processing technologies;
	Ho1 p1 (fig. 1) / 2 PUB	*Ho2 p1 / 7 PUB*	*Ho1 p1 / 9 PUB*	*Ho1 p2 (notes) / 9 PUB*

Table 26: Food processing

Meta level

In addition to listing research topics, some working groups named general conditions to be met by research, e.g. In one workshop two groups demanded interdisciplinarity, in another workshop two groups thought that academic freedom should be taken seriously, a heterogeneous group suggested a bottom-up approach for arriving at research topics, while others asked for radical innovation, answering to research demands of the private sector or remained sceptical of agreement among stakeholders.

	Vienna (AT)	**Copenhagen (DK)**	**Bratislava (SK)**	**London (UK)**	**Maastricht (NL)**	**Madrid (ES)**	**Paris (FR)**
BUS		* Interdisciplinarity – method, evidence	Responsibility of ALL involved ·	Who? (Key players have different drivers) Communication & Interaction? Health professions, Researchers/science,		- Inexorable duration of health research - Lack of understanding and joint vision of the food chain - Firstly little orientation	

				Policy makers, Retailers, Producers/processors, Media lead to different perceptions & choices/actions		of R&D+i towards the needs of the sector and Lack of leadership in processes	
		p3: Ho2 / 4 BUS 1 ENT	*Ho3 p2 (n.3.2) / 8 BUS*	*Ho3 p1 (fig. 11) / 2 BUS 1****		*Ho3 p1 (green) / 4 BUS*	
NPO	- independent research						
	Ho3 p1 / 8 NPO						
PUB	* Exploitation	* Bridge-building between natural science and other sciences					Radical innovation
	Ho1 p1 / 7 PUB	*p1: Ho1 / 7 PUB*					*Ho1 p1 / 9 PUB*
MX					a) Bottom-up approach: e) Collaboration among stakeholders		
					Sticky N. / diverse		

Table 27: Meta level

Other topics that were suggested or discussed in one or two workshops only included:

- Allergies,
- Animal feed,
- Biodiversity,
- Biofuels,
- Convenience,
- Questions of corporate social responsibility,
- Dichotomy city/countryside,
- Durability of food products,
- Eating culture,
- Appeal to the consumers,
- Health conditions,
- Malnutrition,
- Marketing,
- Meat alternatives (protein),
- Packaging,
- Personalized diet,
- Pleasure and taste,
- Physical activity, and
- Portion size.

Recommending certain topics for future investment of public research funds is a sensitive matter, and the question remains how far stakeholder involvement alone is a method for doing so. On the basis of one workshop series patterns cannot be discerned. Several general topics appear several times and across working groups, but the context may differ. If the 35 workshops of all three series are grouped and compared, which was done in the third analysis report, certain patterns may show up.

Common topics on research programming

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

First approach: Analysis along discussion themes

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

Decision making on topics/areas/themes

Input on this discussion topic partly overlaps with the input on the topic *decision-making on funding*. Stakeholders of all three categories suggested that decisions on topics should be made by **involving stakeholders in a bottom-up process** (10 mixed, 3 private sector groups, 1 civil society group in 7 workshops). This does not come as a surprise, because stakeholders making themselves heard by participating in such a scenario workshop obviously would like to have a say: for example, as a civil society representative with a social mission, by pursuing economic interest or as a policy maker trying to balance interests. An input contradicting this demand would have been a surprise, of course. Remarkably, with the exception of one workshop, participants asked for reaching out beyond the triangle scientists/researchers – policy makers – private sector. Public sector and civil society representatives also demanded that **public interest be put first** (4 public sector, 3 civil society groups, 1 private sector, 1 mixed group in 5 workshops), but here and there participants had different ideas on who should have a say on topics: civil society organizations or consumers, companies, researchers or panels, or who should not have a say: companies (one group of civil society representatives), politicians (one group of civil society representatives) or consumers (one group of private sector representative). Many groups made clear that more than one organization should decide, some groups (4 mixed groups, 1 private sector, 1 civil society group in 4 workshops) suggested to involve as many stakeholders as possible. The challenge stakeholders pointed out, is to organize a credible decision making process on topics, which

involve stakeholders in a bottom-up process but do not disadvantage certain stakeholder groups in favour of others. Proposals have been made for an independent organization to organize stakeholder involvement (2 mixed groups in 1 workshop), for organizing consultations or public hearings (5 mixed groups in 3 workshops) and for independent panels representing a diversity of stakeholders (2 mixed groups, 1 private sector group in 1 workshop)

Worst case

Athens	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
Decision making processes: Private companies with direct or indirect interests	Delegates: 8 NPO, 1 BUS, *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit“/ p2*
Athens	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
Decision making processes: to be clearly defined by private interests	Delegates: 7 PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public“/ p2*
Paris	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
scientist (s) [who] isolate him/herself missionary /connections with or belonging to pressure groups	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p4*
Paris	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
non independent expertise for the programme - examined by expert who is not specialised on the topic examining expert with no expertise in the topic - decision made by a ministry alone, with no consultation of scientists - or an EPST (scientific institution) alone	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p4*
Paris	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
decision made by one big company economical interests - political interests - no common view on programming	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p4*
Paris	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
no orientation of programme no goal/orientation defined	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p4*
Paris	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
An industry manager must not decide on its own	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p3*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
A1 Lobbying – Ministry of Agriculture -// - also positive - 2. Administrative works 3. 4. Insufficient 5. It is not always transparent = - Specific criteria are missing (point system) 6. conflict of interests exist	Delegates: 8 BUS, *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p3 (n.3.3)*
Porto	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
No one.	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p4: (notes)*
Porto	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
The active participation of the different actors favours researching the unknown.	Delegates: 2 NPO, *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p3 (notes)*
Porto	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
Have an approach that doesn’t include all stakeholders; The funding agency alone;	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p4 (notes)*

London	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
Profit Education/experience (lack of) in food production Companies' (own interest) initiative Top down vs. bottom up Ignore research	Delegates: 2 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public"/ p2 (fig. 2)*
London	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
= -food industry = -no ONE on their own -shouldn't be the case of who shouts loudest or just one individual making decision -not considering level eg. Local/national or which decision is being made and what this means (eg resource allocation and needs of different communities	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 *** *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit"/ p2 (fig. 6)*
London	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
Any single voice Any single voice	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 *** *Homog. group 3 „Business" / p3 (fig. 13)*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
* A few operators * Isolated * No one	Delegates: 7PUB, *p2: Homog. group 1, „Public"*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
* Not –focused * "Political compromise" * Closed fora * Not relevant for the society nor trade	Delegates: 4 BUS, 1 ENT *p4: Homog. group 2, „Business"*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
* Without literature review/ background information * The press * Narrow forum * Industry with commercial interest	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 2 OTH, *p6: Homog. group 3, „Nonprofit"*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
a. No balance between fundamental and applied science: 'research relevance' b. Not only uniform research [is wanted] mat multidisciplinarte c. No mentioning of sustainable criteria	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 2 / p1*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
a. No research which does not specifically states the social relevance of the research. b. No mono-disciplinary research. c. Not only [research on a] national-scale only national-scale	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
* driven by industry * science driven * lobbying (one-sided) <--> freedom of research • restriction of knowledge/understanding-oriented research • purely short-time topics * no continuity	Delegates: 7PUB *Worst „Public"/ p1/2 PUB*
Vienna	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
*) [Involving} clearing panels (research + production = practice) before decision is made, is an absolute must *) ethics committee should be consulted	Delegates: 9 BUS *Worst „Business" / p1/2 BUS*
Vienna	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
* by industry or in dependency on industry, laboratories in industrial hand, little research at universities few [people], not participation orientated policy --> which avoids uncomfortable topics	Delegates: 8NPO *Worst „Nonprofit"/ p1/2 NPO*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
* Consumers * Not only the researcher should decide upon the topics/areas/themes for research * The decisions should not solely be taken by one stakeholder	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 2 OTH, *p6: Homog. group 3, „Nonprofit"*

Porto	*Worst case: Decisions General*
Because we all have a contribution of knowledge. 2. Decisions should be taken after evaluation of sharing knowledge. 3. Can and should be involved in decisions, taking into account that these decisions will have to be a result of an evaluation of representatives of the civil society and not only the political view. Decisions are taken in a limited time and without the purpose of being an added -value for the area of food and health. 5. Reviewers should be selected taking into account different areas of intervention of food and health. 6. Evaluation should not be organized in an unidirectional way, by people that defend the same interests.	Delegates: 2 NPO, *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p3 (notes)*
Porto	*Worst case: Decisions General*
- not consult the stakeholders If a particular reality is generalized, dissociated from a transversal vision; Without communication between ministries; Without a long term vision.	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p4 (notes)*
Vienna	*Worst case: Decision on Topics*
independent research institutions independent panels non-profit research broad COLLECTION of topics	Delegates: 8 NPO *Worst „Nonprofit“/ p1/2 NPO*

Table 28: Worst case decision making on topics/areas/themes

Best case

Athens	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
To have public interest as a priority with the active participation of all interested parties and organizations	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Athens	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
Based on importance Effects on physical, psychological and sentimental health	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Athens	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
Participation of consumers and producers in the decision making processes, as well as of relevant local institutions Banning of the ministerial immunity of prosecution and establishing specific fines to the politicians who do not take under consideration the positions of local communities	Delegates: 2 NPO, 1 PUB, 1 *** *Mixed group 4 / p1*
Bratislava	*Best Case: Decision on Topics*
A.1. Politicians, should decide about the topics. Experts groups from different EU countries 2. Consumers and patient groups should participate, 3rd. Sector (it´s not like that today)	Delegates: 4 NPO, *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit“/ p2 (n.1.1)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
1A Slovak Research and Development Agency negatively evaluates Only one agency – not enough! Who decides about topic? Experts? Foreign vs SR? Submitter – what is their role? Someone should determine topics – general. „Wildcart“ in SRDA (Slovak Research and Development Agency) Irrelevant evaluators Objectivisation of topics proposed	Delegates: 9 UB, *Homog. group 2 „Public“/ p2 (n.2.1)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
A. 1. Depoliticised public institution in cooperation with Higher Education institutions. 2. Topics based on the public expert discussion 3. At the beginning, throughout the project and at the end (its impact and results) 4. Depoliticised public institution 5. Through public discussion (in cooperation with HE institutions)	Delegates: 1 NPO, 3 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p1 (n.4.1)*

Medial communication (professional) 6. -// - and publishing of results	
Bratislava	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
Umbrella organisation – expert centre for healthy lifestyle and prevention National level – interdepartmental Various experts – medical doctors, philosophers, nutrition specialists, general public, state, 3rd. Sector : - FOOD - Physical activity (certification) - Psycho - Psycho …. Level of Government Plenipotentiary Expert opinions – prevention Opens the calls for projects, evaluates Legislative proposals Popularisation, mediatisation Education in schools Monitor in – organises, assigns Risk factors Veto right	Delegates: 2 NPO, 2 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 2 / p1 (n.5.1)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
Fundraising, lotteries Funding from EU, Norway (EEAA Grants), tax on alcohol/cigarettes B.A1	Delegates: 2 NPO, 2 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 2 / p2 (n.5.2)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
1 Experts (council of government) Consumer? A 2 (other) Scientists - (data collection) A - > expert organisation - > Government A 6 Conflict of interests = > Foreign A	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p2 (n.6.2)*
Porto	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
Different social actors: ministries, government, producers of knowledge, RDT organizations, companies, end -users. Involving all the social actors. Direct multisectorial consultation.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 1 (notes Tab10*
Porto	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
The different elements with interest/action; All the stakeholders. Based on a methodology of consultation of all the elements of the value chain. Should be involved in the planning, monitoring and evaluation.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 2 (notes Tab12*
Porto	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
Stakeholders (universities, clusters, companies,...); Concerted actions among different partners; Dialogue between all areas. Transparency; without conflict of interests. The earliest possible; conflict of interests (disclosure of who they are); Equal to all stakeholders; Transparency; Give time to provide answers.	Delegates: 4 PUB, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 3 (notes Tab14)*
London	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
-integration -best practice -commission research – gaps in knowledge -committee/expert panel/stakeholder: needs assessment/gap analysis -health behavior -equality analysis of inter/ not raising too much expectation -appraisal -how doing/transparent -collaboration (bang for £) -emerging problems/horizon scanning	Delegates: 1 PUB, 1 BUS, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p1 (fig 15)*
London	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
Framework Commissioning (Managing Committee)	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 *** *Mixed group 2 / p1 (fig 18)*

Health Regional Aspects Experts: Research Dieticians Health workers Sustainable Achievable Experts: Industry Raw Materials Availability Consumer (Children especially) Acceptability Impact Experts: Social scientists Nutritionists	
Copenhagen	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
* Idea catalogue * Public hearing * Controlled * Interdisciplinar * Goal oriented * Flexibility in the process/boxes o Bottom-up o Impact	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 BUS 1 BUS/ENT 2 *** *p8: mixed group 1*
Maastricht	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
a. Multidisciplinary stakeholders, (i) government; (ii) consumers; (iii) industry and (iv) science: b. Added value in the market (products/knowledge) c. Direct and indirect relevance: d. The 'Why' question needs to be central: e. Transparency: (1) selection criteria for stakeholders; (2) selection criteria for decision-makers; (3) selection criteria for decision-making.	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Maastricht	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
a. Who decides for the research themes/topics: the scientists, the politicians, the industry and the citizens	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
* mix of experts * independent panels * detached from lobbyism	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
broad collection of topics to work out a research strategy (using the existing infra structure - FFG!) + NGOs suggestions in the consultation process of the Framework Programme decision on subventions	Delegates: 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
panel of industry, consumers, research, NGOs funder ---> advisory role ethics committee panel selection ----> pool of individuals, "random principle"	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
broadly conceived structures or procedures for finding topics (example: rural development) example: media, internet	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 4 / p1*
Madrid	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
- Prioritization of R&D lines also based on Private capital - Public - private coordination (Comp - In - Govt)	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 1 / p1/ (blue)*

Madrid	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
- Open process: technology platforms to draw together the entire sector and operators - Multidisciplinary assessment committees (CE) - Interaction between the technological platforms on the national scale	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 2 / p1/ (red)*
Madrid	*Best case: Decision on Topics*
- based on actual needs of the industry / productive fabric (consumer) - funding in time according to the project goal. long term vs short term - Promote Public - Private partnerships	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 3 / p1/ (green)*

Table 29: Best case decision making on topics/areas/themes

Decision making on project funding

As expected, input on this topic focused mostly on review processes. None of the input can be ascribed to one stakeholder category only. Apparently, on a general level there was some agreement across stakeholder categories that decision making on funding should **involve stakeholders** other than researchers, scientists and funders (7 mixed, 2 NPO groups, 1 public sector in 7 workshops), but it was also mentioned that the review process should not be influenced by a dominating stakeholder and be **independent and impartial, without conflicts of interest** (9 mixed, 5 NPO, 4 public sector, 3 private sector groups in 8 workshops), some working groups mentioned that **buddy systems** (2 public sector groups, 1 NPO group in 3 workshops) **and political agendas are to be avoided** (1 public sector, 1 private sector, 1 mixed group in 3 workshops) in favour of **knowledgeable reviewers** (4 mixed, 3 public sector, 2 business sector groups, 1 NPO group in 5 workshops) or **international experts** (2 public sector groups, 1 mixed group in 2 workshops).

Worst case

Athens	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
Funding: to be based on power structures (based on status position/ 'good connections')	Delegates: 7PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public"/ p2*
Paris	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
only national evaluators - no evaluation grid/model, and/or too many criteria - conflicts of interests - not taking into account the scientific quality of the programme	Delegates: 9PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public"/ p5*
Paris	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
independent evaluation commission: - civil society [stakeholders] {actors} public institutions - enterprises	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit"/ p3*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
B4. Bad (poor) evaluator (foreign evaluates +) Role of client (submitter)? Favourism and corruption Installement delay Undersized funding (project)	Delegates: 9PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public"/ p2 (n.2.1)*

No (financial) means planned for opponents	
Bratislava	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
– anonymity of evaluators 1. We don´t know the rules There are no clear rules 2. Unknown (personal presentation is missing)	Delegates: 8BUS, *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p4 (n.3.4)*
Porto	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
participative processes with monitoring and audition Decisions on financing should be taken with prejudice The idea/project should be audited. Not evaluate the idea/project but only the CV. The reviewers shouldn't propose projects in the areas they are reviewing Criteria not clear, objective, or public.	Delegates: 9PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p4: (notes)*
Porto	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
Politics done through the evaluation of projects (the politics should be independent and previously defined; this way, institutions that didn't have approved projects have a chance to have them approved);	Delegates: 9PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p5: (notes)*
Porto	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
- Not finance what is strategic; Without taking into account the economic/financing return of the results of projects Lobbies; Reviewers with conflict of interests; Without a relevant CV, without training, without industrial vision;	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p4&5 (notes)*
London	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
ignore science poor equipment/false results no knowledge base (avoid fad) no track record or prior research Not fit evidence to do research Personal interest/stakeholders Not understand/care	Delegates: 2 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p2 (fig. 2)*
London	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
b. Decision-making and project funding = - not made by ONE person = - decision-makers/reviewers not conflicted = -reviewers chosen by independent person = -reviewers not with appropriate expertise/range of expertise to cover whole project/range of areas represented eg lay input	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 *** *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p2 (fig. 6)*
London	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
Based on jobs/future work Not selected on £ gain or personal interests	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 *** *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p3 (fig. 13)*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
* National * Not academic competent * Not anonymous reviewers	Delegates: 7PUB, *p2: Homog. group 1, „Public“*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
* Not solely the funding sources * Few funding sources * Political basis of distribution * One shot * Missing continuity * By politicians	Delegates: 4 BUS, 1 ENT *p4: Homog. group 2, „Business“*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
* Not only do research because of merit or H-index * Not only produce scientific results because of merit or H-index * Not only select "the friends" for review (act of friendship) * Project funding must not be given to the same (known) organisations without new consortium compositions	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 2 OTH, *p6: Homog. group 3, „Nonprofit“*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*

a. No transparent criteria b. Substantial political criteria	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 2 / p1*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
Complex and bureaucratical criteria	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
* interdisciplinary proposals are not funded * driven by industry * orientated towards "sexy" journals (topics) * wrong people in the ethics committees (no expertise)	Delegates: 7PUB *Worst „Public"/ p1/2 PUB*
Vienna	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
multiple tracks without horizontal consolidation/coordination decision by [big] industry only without qualified expertises decision by single person / a single office no readiness to take risks	Delegates: 9BUS *Worst „Business" / p1/2 BUS*
Vienna	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
internal decision of a few - without consultation lottery principle buddy system influenced by economic interest/relations no criteria	Delegates: 8NPO *Worst „Nonprofit"/ p1/2 NPO*

Table 30: Worst case decision making on funding

Best case

Athens	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
To be defined by the final receivers of the research results (in civil society) or their representatives	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Athens	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
Innovative research with high risk Based on the size of the problem	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Bratislava	*Best Case: Decision on Funding*
3. Actors express their opinions in the process of project selection, throughout its execution and at the end asses results and inform actors 5. -// - 6. Develop the software (computer aided system) for tackling of conflicts of interests	Delegates: 4 NPO, *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit"/ p2 (n.1.1)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
B. 1. Usual + assessment of expert community 2. Involvement of private sector under the more preferable conditions determined by state Decrease the number of projects, possibility to end project prematurely	Delegates: 1 NPO, 3 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p1 (n.4.1)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
Externs database Supporting "ours" abroad (Evaluators) – to suggest	Delegates: 2 NPO, 2 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 2 / p2 (n.5.2)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
Multilevel procedure 3 = > and more , Increased objectivity Foreign evaluators Translation Basic course – institutionally treated	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p2 (n.6.2)*
Porto	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
Has to be in accordance with the premises established in the two first topics. Experts in the area; Exempted/without conflict of interests; mixed panels – transversal to the sector.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 1 (notes Tab10*
Porto	*Best case: Decision on Funding*

Based on a defined strategy, establishing priorities and taking into account financial tools. Impartial and with knowledge of the area, and demonstrated merit.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 2 (notes Tab12*
Porto	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
Revisions with a panel of experts, without concern for competition in their areas; Reply within the schedule foreseen; Transparent; Objectivity in the evaluation, with possibility of contesting the results. Scientific and professional competence (relevant CV); panel with a minimum of 3 experts, diversified (from the business environment if there is the creation of a product).	Delegates: 4 PUB, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 3 (notes Tab14*
London	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
-clear criteria/ protocol -peer review/independent process -open calls + specific call -engaging general public/layperson (move beyond pure scientific input)	Delegates: 1 PUB, 1 BUS, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p1 (fig 15)*
London	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
2. Decision makers decided by Framework – contains all relevant experts including laypersons- normal common sense persons	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 *** *Mixed group 2 / p1 (fig 18)*
Copenhagen	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
* The best * Multiple representatives * Relevant for the society * Common thread	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 BUS 1 BUS/ENT 2 *** *p8: mixed group 1*
Maastricht	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
a. Transparency in decision-making: b. Budget per research theme: c. Determining objective criteria (there should be a hierarchy of criteria). da steht: gewichte sie relativ zueinander [There should be a] balance between novelty, feasibility, success and sustainability. independency (no conflict of interests) keine verschränkung von interessen a. Adequate infrastructure: b. Re-adjustment while preserving quality:	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Maastricht	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
a. [There needs to be] transparency in: (i) financing; (ii) outcomes; (iii) interests, (iv) ecetera:	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
* independent commissions of experts * transparency + justification * interdisciplinary	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
national level: analogous panels ensure that all relevant sections of the population are taken into account	Delegates: 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
expert panel for scientific methods applied research => broad panel * basic research -> scientific? , male/female experts	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
- transparent procedure - administration office + specialist consultation (advisory board, reviewers - adjusted to project size, amount of funds (as far as possible - unbureaucratic + quick) + content orientated	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 4 / p1*
Madrid	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
- Influence over decision-making by agencies more localized with more direct knowledge of the problem - "Complete" multidisciplinary assessment groups evaluacion	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 1 / p1/ (blue)*
Madrid	*Best case: Decision on Funding*

- Spain: should have positioning in strategic sectors for the country.	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 2 / p1/3 (red)*
Madrid	*Best case: Decision on Funding*
Decision making 1) Research areas / topics - All in general those involved in the chain - Weight based on the position in the chain 2) Funding - Funding agency - > Advisory bodies abreast of what is being researched. Take into account non duplicity, establishing synergies	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 3 / p1/3 (green)*
Vienna	*positive: Decision on Funding*
broad panel/committee that decides on criteria for research projects	Delegates: 8 NPO *Worst „Nonprofit“/ p1/2 NPO*
Athens	*Worst case: Decision on Funding*
Funding: decisions taken by non -relevant committees, based on economic interests	Delegates: 8 NPO, 1 BUS, *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit“/ p2*

Table 31: Best case on decision making on funding

Quality criteria for funding

Input on this was quite diverse; many themes have been named once or twice only. None of the input can be ascribed to one of stakeholder category only. There is some overlapping with other guiding discussion topics such as decisions on funding. Participants mentioned several **general conditions to be fulfilled by funders and/or applicants** such as clear objectives, originality, and the feasibility of the workplan. The most prominent condition was that the **applicant is competent** in conducting the proposed research (3 mixed, 2 public sector groups in five workshops). Stakeholders of all three categories demanded the **applicability of research results** (2 mixed, 2 public sector groups, 1 civil society group in 5 workshops). An number of groups representing stakeholders of all categories demanded that research projects and research programmes should support **environmental sustainability** (4 mixed groups, 1 private sector, 1 civil society group in 4 workshops) and have a **social benefit** (5 mixed groups, one civil society, 1 private sector group in 5 workshops).

Worst case

Athens	*Worst case: Criteria*
Criteria: based on profit, or political gain (from governments)	Delegates: 8 NPO, 1 BUS, *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit“/ p2*
Athens	*Worst case: Criteria*
Criteria: to exclude innovation due to high risk of failure	Delegates: 7 PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public“/ p2*
Paris	*Worst case: Criteria*
criteria for the quality of financing: no practical applications - no follow -up nor perspectives - opportunity or fashion effect - change in criteria during application phase –[...]	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p5*

non sustainable call – [...] too short delays - (insider trading) – distortion of the results for political or economic opportunism from labs, due to financial pressure	
Paris	*Worst case: Criteria*
worst criterion = marketing criterion	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p3*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Criteria*
Wrong criteria from the beginning Order from practice Awareness about practice Customer of research Final debates – Agency – opponents There are no means to pay rewards to opponents	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public“/ p3 (n.2.2)*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Criteria*
C.1.. Wrong/not the right ones (research for research) 2. SRDA (Slovak Research and Development Agency) – 3 year after projects end – self -funding	Delegates: 8 BUS, *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p4 (n.3.4)*
Porto	*Worst case: Criteria*
Not rewarding reviewers of projects with demonstrated merit and not using independent reviewers. Geographic Region; Evaluation of the institution; Excessive focus on bibliometrics; Match the evaluation to scientific areas.	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p5: (notes)*
Porto	*Worst case: Criteria*
7. Ethics, social/public interest, health, needs, direct utility for the individual, innovation. 8. When a project is focused on a particular interest.	Delegates: 2 NPO, *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p3 (notes)*
London	*Worst case: Criteria*
Not follow scientific process/rigor Poor program of work Poor hypothesis or lack of No scientific gain No end product food/health Limited population (e.g. obese, metabolic sx) Targeted to right people Small sample size; low power	Delegates: 2 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p2 (fig. 2)*
London	*Worst case: Criteria*
Scientific -robust methodology -expertise of research team -potential to impact/change -dissemination& sharing – openness Sustainability -impact on environment -environmental ethics approval Can’t use just one criteria on its own	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 *** *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p3 (fig. 7)*
London	*Worst case: Criteria*
Achievable Nat. resources Impact	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 *** *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p3 (fig. 13)*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Criteria*
* Past performance	Delegates: 7 PUB, *p2: Homog. group 1, „Public“*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Criteria*
* Unclear objective * Few criteria ja * ”State of the art” not included ja * Project is unrealistic ja	Delegates: 4 BUS, 1 ENT *p4: Homog. group 2, „Business“*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Criteria*

b. If research statistics [do not exist then the research will] neither be transparent nor reproducible	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Worst case: Criteria*
* purely oriented on administrative criteria	Delegates: 7 PUB *Worst „Public“/ p1/2 PUB*
Vienna	*Worst case: Criteria*
- practicability --->are not sufficiently - sustainability taken into account - environmental impact - consumers' health	Delegates: 9 BUS *Worst „Business“ / p1/2 BUS*
Vienna	*Worst case: Criteria*
only prospect for profit decides [i.e. decision is only based on a criterion of profitability] non-transparent use of (shallow) buzzwords data protection as excuse the more non-profit orientated the project, the higher the funding	Delegates: 8 NPO *Worst „Nonprofit“/ p1/2 NPO*
Porto	*Worst case: Decision general*
Research in an arbitrary way; Local decisions adapted to the culture; No emphasis on the consumer well -being. Absence of conflict of interests	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p4: (notes)*

Table 32: Worst case on quality criteria for funding

Best case

Athens	*Best case: Criteria*
Innovation Elimination of environmental damage Improvement of the quality of life To take into consideration the characteristics of the population group that is also the receiver of the results Long -term impact (the results should be useful for a long period of time)	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Athens	*Best case: Criteria*
Clear purpose and goals Use of indicators that quantify with realistic terms the sustainability of research results Implementation of tools for internal and external evaluation Well -structured studies (retrospective, quantitative and qualitative) Research focusing on young ages (children)	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Bratislava	*Best Case: Criteria*
Contribution to quality and health improvement - to evaluate originality 2. Model of application	Delegates: 4 NPO, *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit“/ p2 (n.1.1)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Criteria*
Monitoring the value added of project!!	Delegates: 1 NPO, 3 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p2 (n.4.2)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Criteria*
Criteria – health benefits Measurability Economics/ ? Costs Regional character (domestic) food Consumer´s satisfaction Range of benefits with regard to the size of target group - sense of quality of life of citizens - Responsibility for health	Delegates: 2 NPO, 2 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 2 / p2 (n.5.2)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Criteria*
Originality, Innovativeness Socio -economical contribution, expertness of people involved in projects Infrastructure of workplace Point assessment + verbal	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p2 (n.6.2)*

Expert councils – asses the reviews	
Porto	*Best case: Criteria*
Promote research infrastructures; ; promote the production of results promote centres of competence; technology transfer; promote healthy eating plans – create TV programmes, such as 'The Food Minute'; Increase the demand through networks of clusters; Support pilot lines and scale-up; Validation of new products and production technologies; Key technologies; Take into account the ecological footprint/sustainability; Environmental sustainability; Promotion of jobs and mobility; Promotion of best practice in health; Food security/food safety; Social justice in sharing foods; Optimization of resources; Reutilization of sub products; Internationalization. Definition of concrete and objective areas of operation; What is a strategic priority for the region; Epidemiologic studies that validate health claims; Ensure sustainability of the programme after its end; Ensure innovative products sell.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 1 (notes Tab10*
Porto	*Best case: Criteria*
Be differentiated; Fill existing gaps; should be aligned with a strategy that includes know -how on the health sector; Development of longitudinal studies in the area of nutritional epidemiology, aligned with strategies of intervention, monitoring of those studies (example, public health). Knowledge of the target population; Alignment with politics; Design research studies.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 2 (notes Tab12)*
Porto	*Best case: Criteria*
Market need; Address real problems; simple and non -bureaucratic programmes; Calls open permanently and/or with regularity; Sustainability of financing programmes (projects prolonged in time); Integrated,but not volatile programmes. Needs more attention in order to ensure future activities are oriented; Integrated in a strategic vision in the long term, with the involvement of all stakeholders; Ensure the communication between different partners (potential partners, stakeholders). Ex. Functional or nutraceutical foods.	Delegates: 4 PUB, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 3 (notes Tab14*
London	*Best case: Criteria*
-accreditation/confidence in abilities -team or person with expertise -Ho and research questions related to topics + themes -novelty/originality/innovation -dissemination/influence plan (who, what, where) -outcomes acceptable across a wide scope -disseminate across industry -talk with sectors who will be impacted by research	Delegates: 1 PUB, 1 BUS, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p2 (fig 16)*
London	*Best case: Criteria*
- Robust scientific basis - Meets criteria targeted from above at least one strand	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 *** *Mixed group 2 / p1 (fig 18)*

Copenhagen	*Best case: Criteria*
* Excellence * Relevance is implemented * Impact/uptake	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 BUS 1 BUS/ENT 2 *** *p8: mixed group 1*
Maastricht	*Best case: Criteria*
c. Criteria on the use of results/revenues: d. Agreed communication plan steered by collective latform.	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Maastricht	*Best case: Criteria*
a. Quality criteria should be based on best practices within the discipline:	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Criteria*
relevance for citizen (groups of) but also for small groups * sustainability (environment, health, ~)	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Criteria*
feasibility, sustainability, transparency, impact on health , consumers' quality of life taking into account gender aspects, children and youth qualification of institutions conducting research	Delegates: 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Criteria*
incl. socio ecological impact method	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Criteria*
distinction between qualification of the proposer and the quality of the project / proposal GREENPEACE " social benefit coefficient	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 4 / p1*
Madrid	*Best case: Criteria*
Actual impact of the outcome of the project (not just of optimum management)	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 1 / p2/3 (blue)*
Madrid	*Best case: Criteria*
End user Inclusion Useful research outcome for the sector	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 2 / p1/3 (red)*
Madrid	*Best case: Criteria*
projects with participation of companies. the average curriculum of the group must prevail on the name of the senior researcher with potential for transfer Align scientific quality and economic return	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 3 / p2/3 (green)*

Table 33: Best case on quality criteria for funding

Exploitation of results

Discussions on this topic focused on access to research results and applying them. Representatives of all three stakeholder categories proposed to **make research results accessible**, preferably beyond academia (7 mixed, 3 public sector, 3 civil society, 2 private sector groups in 6 workshops). Five working groups (3 mixed, 2 public sector groups in 3 workshops) suggested to make all scientific publications available by **open access**. Among representatives of the private sector there was some interest in **knowledge transfer and applicable results** (6 mixed, 3 private sector groups in 5 workshops). The poster documentation allows the assumption that according to all stakeholder categories dissemination should not be restricted to publishing results in scientific journals, but target a wider public, too. Quite a few workshop participants, mainly from civil society, demanded **all results to be published**, also negative ones (3 civil society, 2 mixed, 1 public sector group in 4 workshops). This topic is close to another one, which was regularly mentioned as well: the **distortion of results**. Representatives of all three stakeholder categories demanded that unjustified extrapolations, twisting, over-interpreting and blowing up the results should be avoided (3 private sector, 2 public sector, 2 civil society, 1 mixed group in 4 workshops). In this workshop series distortion of results was not attributed to media, but mainly to scientists and researchers themselves. Stakeholders of all three categories (3 mixed, 2 public sector groups, 1 civil society group in 3 workshops) requested targeted dissemination activities.

Worst case

Athens	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
government institutions	Delegates: 8NPO, 1 BUS, *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit“/ p2*
Athens	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
Use of results: private appropriation of results	Delegates: 7PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public“/ p2*
Paris	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
wrong use of the results for political or economic objectives subjective presentation - no publication - partial and unfair publication - publication in “confidential” journals - no consortium agreement - extrapolation of animal results to human being - raise false hopes or worries - extreme simplification [leading] to dis -information	Delegates: 9PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p6*
Paris	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
Lack of transparency Give both positive and negative sides	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p4*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
D1. Purpose -built 2. With insufficient use in practice	Delegates: 8BUS, *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p5*

Lobbing influence of big firms	*(n.3.5)*
Porto	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
9. Not used for own benefit (institutional or political). 10. There is no science without sharing knowledge; science should be shared; should be defined that the research should share the knowledge created and scientific findings.	Delegates: 2 NPO, *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p4 (notes)*
Porto	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
Not used (they should be applied); Not explored economically. Definition of the rules during the project. Defined in a non -professional way (should include lawyers, offices of technology transfer)	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p5 (notes)*
London	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
no validated/ replicated results no dissemination to relevant people open access – not patent (use for all) no final study report; no outcomes conflict of outcomes = -what report -only positives, rarely negatives Freedom of information act to company trials -drug trials are public knowledge/ released, rarely food High secrecy	Delegates: 2 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p3 (fig. 3)*
London	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
No individual organization allowed to twist results & use as marketing tool not used in isolation from wider results & wider context results shouldn't be published in paid-for journals negative results shouldn't be suppressed methodology not clear enough to be replicated best practice not shared data souces behind results not made available funder demands input into reports before they are published	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 *** *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p4 (fig. 8)*
London	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
Personal interests Economic _“_ Insignificance	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 *** *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p3 (fig. 13)*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
* Only the pilot project * Unconfirmed by researchers unleserl * Narrow by few operators * Only in the project group- society impact	Delegates: 7 PUB, *p2: Homog. group 1, „Public“*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
* Secret few people are given credit	Delegates: 4 BUS, 1 ENT *p4: Homog. group 2, „Business“*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
* The results of public research may not be held secret (or be taken out a patent) * The results may not be distortion of competition * Rights and patents may not limit relevant research topics * Disrespect for business investment * Basic research - secret results	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 2 OTH, *p6: Homog. group 3, „Nonprofit“*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
a. Not disclosing the research results negative research publications c. Lack of synergy in research	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 2 / p1*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
a. Companies are owner their innovations, without revolving funds.	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
* only within the scientific community (ivory tower) * no open access (open data)	Delegates: 7 PUB *Worst „Public“/ p1/2 PUB*
Vienna	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
*) innovative solutions remain unused at university [level] or other levels	Delegates: 9 BUS

*) the focus often lies too much on the number of publications and not enough on utilization	*Worst „Business“ / p1/2 BUS*
Vienna	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
gather dust in drawers [shelves] are kept secret (especially if results [are] unpopular) medially one-sidedly blown up results presented in a distorted way are not presented in a comprehensible way	Delegates: 8NPO *Worst „Nonprofit“/ p1/2 NPO*
Brussels	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results*
Bad communication	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 OTH, *Homog. group 2 „Business“ (CSO) / p1*

Table 34: Worst case on the exploitation of results

Best case

Athens	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
The results should be available and accessible to the wider public	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Athens	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
Guide for the immediate design and implementation of policies Reflection tool for new research projects	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Athens	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
The results of each research should be applied on pilot programs before their final application on the wider population	Delegates: 2 NPO, 1 PUB, 1 *** *Mixed group 4 / p1*
Bratislava	*Best Case: Exploitation of Results*
Authors, those who carry out the project	Delegates: 4 NPO, *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit“/ p2 (n.1.1)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
Project curse and its results should be controlled by the committee Public expert discussion PR of R&D agencies (funding bodies)	Delegates: 1 NPO, 3 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p2 (n.4.2)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
To motivate consumer (financial benefits, if she/he looses weight) To involve consumer directly (he/she is not only observer!) Expert centre of implementation for target groups Legislative proposals Tax benefits for “?” food Medialisation Involving general public, club, social networks – voting, expressing opinion	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p1 (n.6.1)*
Bratislava	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
Owner of innovations Applicant – cooperation contract – agreement with co -partners in project	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p3 (n.6.3)*
Porto	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
Should be applied and disseminated in case it is of public interest. Respecting the public interest; define in the beginning.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 1 (notes Tab10*
Porto	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
Commercial exploitation; Have financial payback. Should be defined before the study.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 2 (notes Tab12*
Porto	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
Project SHARE (Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe)	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 2 (notes Tab13*
Porto	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
Should be used; union between the business and social interest Defined at the earliest possible moment and organized by professionals	Delegates: 4 PUB, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 3 (notes Tab14*

(technology transfer or legal offices).	
London	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
knowledge transfer Academic -> layperson -policy/practical application/practitioners -cost accessible outcomes/reporting -send information/how to use to the mass population Cost/benefit -is it working? No one person or organization owns results No cherry picking education Good media relations/ no commercial gain -informed media Not generalize outside original context	Delegates: 1 PUB, 1 BUS, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p3 (fig 17)*
London	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
Directly feed to education Control of media Qualified dissemination of results Training of staff/ in shops/ health Involved in food	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 *** *Mixed group 2 / p2 (fig 19)*
Copenhagen	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
* Public available ?Companies/society * Linkage of results ~ society	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 BUS 1 BUS/ENT 2 *** *p8: mixed group 1*
Maastricht	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
private ---> xxxx public ---> "open source"	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
* open access open data * popular scientifically editing (budget!) - costs of publication	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
* free university research (basic + applied): full public accessibility presented in an intelligible way * commissioned cooperative research: limited accessibility Realization by applicable products, methods, procedures	Delegates: 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
open data NGOs, schools, not only scientific community	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
- making results public rapidly - publication of negative / neutral results - active support of valorisation	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 4 / p1*
Madrid	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
Information has to reach the "user": Creating channels of dissemination. Promotion of protection models - regime xxxx - - -> regime	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 1 / p2/3 (blue)*
Madrid	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
- Bolster / Promote Marketing of patents - innovation brokers (New technologies) - Open access to publications (research outcomes) - Informational publications ("translate" scientific language into common	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 2 / p2/3 (red)*
Madrid	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
- Faster - Cheaper	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 3 / p2/3 (green)*
Vienna	*Best case: Exploitation of Results*
public accessible well prepared [for presentation]	Delegates: 8 NPO *Worst „Nonprofit“/ p1/2 NPO*

Copenhagen	*Best case: Exploitation of Results added: Communication*
* ”The good story” * Dissemination to the target group	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 BUS 1 BUS/ENT 2 *** *p8: mixed group 1*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results / added: Communication*
* Closed/isolated * Not goal-oriented * Unprofessional	Delegates: 7 PUB, *p2: Homog. group 1, „Public“*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results added: Communication*
* Over interpret without reservations * Single result out of context * ”My” result without connections * That the project can save the world	Delegates: 4 BUS, 1 ENT *p4: Homog. group 2, „Business“*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Exploitation of Results added: Communication*
* Not only communication in the elitist and narrow media * Confusion * Partial- out of context * Closed fora * Complicated * Only expert to expert	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 2 OTH, *p6: Homog. group 3, „Nonprofit“*

Table 35: Best case on the exploitation of results

Evaluation

This topic was understood as evaluation of research proposals and research programmes. **Independence of evaluators/reviewers** – no conflict of interest, etc. – was a point raised several times (2 public sector, 4 mixed groups, 1 private sector, 1 civil society group in 6 workshops). Some stakeholders demanded **clear evaluation criteria** (4 mixed groups, 1 public sector, 1 civil society group in 4 workshops) and the **involvement of stakeholders** in evaluation processes (3 mixed groups, 1 private sector, 1 civil society group in 5 workshops). Most demands and suggestions were made only twice or once, covering a spectra from indicators, less administration tasks, research integrity, and criticism of today’s quantitative evaluation schemes.

Worst case

Athens	*Worst case: Evaluation*
government institutions	Delegates: 8NPO, 1 BUS, *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit“/ p2*
Athens	*Worst case: Evaluation*
Evaluation: Partiality in the results (bias). Evaluation based on cost	Delegates: 7PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public“/ p2*
Paris	*Worst case: Evaluation*
no evaluation criteria - over -rating over -evaluation	Delegates: 9PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p7*
Paris	*Worst case: Evaluation*

evaluation [based] on non -scientific criteria - not taking into account side criteria (technical, etc.) - interesting but impossible to evaluate criteria - conflicts of interests cut and fake results	Delegates: 9PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public"/ p7*
Paris	*Worst case: Evaluation*
Evaluation on a non -representative panel	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit"/ p4*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Evaluation*
E. Favourism (different criteria for different workplaces) Customer Results are not applicable	Delegates: 9PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public"/ p4 (n.2.3)*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Evaluation*
E.Insufficient	Delegates: 8BUS, *Homog. group 3 „Business" / p5 (n.3.5)*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Evaluation*
Funding provider – post evaluation Outcomes of post evaluation should be taken into account for the following funding	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 3 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p3 (n.6.3)*
Porto	*Worst case: Evaluation*
The absence of articulation between the criteria (economic, social, financial and environmental)	Delegates: 5 BUS *Homog. group 3 „Business" / p5 (notes)*
London	*Worst case: Evaluation*
Peer review (not just in -house) Evaluation of results Rash of judgments Media spin on findings making them more impressive than what they really are Consumer beliefs guided by media/lack of education of consumer	Delegates: 2 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public"/ p3 (fig. 3)*
London	*Worst case: Evaluation*
Researcher does evaluation Is an after-thought No clear aims & objectives of research/intervention so nothing to evaluate against Re-inventing evaluation methodology each time (lack of comparability)	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 *** *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit"/ p5 (fig. 9)*
London	*Worst case: Evaluation*
Single interests Significance/relative value (subpopn) Generalization	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 *** *Homog. group 3 „Business" / p4 (fig. 14)*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Evaluation*
* Economic administration * Organisation * Short term impact (economy)	Delegates: 7 PUB, *p2: Homog. group 1, „Public"*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Evaluation*
* Milestones * Reporting for the sake of reporting	Delegates: 4 BUS, 1 ENT *p4: Homog. group 2, „Business"*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Evaluation*
a. For analysis' paralysis, b. Not only 'smart' criteria should apply. c. No reputation led d. No data engineering in black box; e. No avoidance of negative research publication (s)	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 2 / p1*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Evaluation*
a. Assessment of research by one or two stakeholders.	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Worst case: Evaluation*
* oriented towards outcomes [suitable] for journals * negative results are ignored (4)	Delegates: 7 PUB *Worst „Public"/ p2/2 PUB*

Vienna	*Worst case: Evaluation*
* no (wrong) output criteria (in applied research)	Delegates: 7 PUB *Worst „Public“/ p2/2 PUB*
Vienna	*Worst case: Evaluation*
- before the decision on funds, research objectives remain unaccounted for - after research, the practical use of the results is not investigated - no independent experts are consulted - only "detail analytical" research remains possible	Delegates: 9 BUS *Worst „Business“ / p2/2 BUS*
Vienna	*Worst case: Evaluation*
no evaluation at all or only internal evaluation somebody with conflict of interest	Delegates: 8 NPO *Worst „Nonprofit“/ p2/2 NPO*
Porto	*Worst case: Evaluation/Criteria*
Without mixed panels, homogeneous (industrial vision, academic vision, ...). No defined scheduling of the calls; No commitment to the defined schedule of the calls, and the time for their evaluation; Bad definition of the evaluation criteria in a quantitative evaluation; Economic, social and financial impact of the results; Sustainability.	Delegates: *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p5 (notes)*

Table 36: Worst case on evaluation

Best case

Athens	*Best case: Evaluation*
The results should be evaluated objectively by a group of experts and implemented regardless of cost	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Athens	*Best case: Evaluation*
Use of pilot studies, quantitative indicators that concern the interest of the wider population	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Porto	*Best case: Evaluation*
Have a calendar of evaluation; Criteria; Transparent and well defined criteria. Environmental sustainability; Welfare and health; Economic added -value; social / economic impact.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 1 (notes Tab10*
Porto	*Best case: Evaluation*
Measurable and iniquivocable criteria. Market opportunity and alignment with the predefined strategy.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 2 BUS, *Mixed group 2 (notes Tab12*
Porto	*Best case: Evaluation*
Transparency of criteria, which should be objective; Rigorous schedule; Evaluators listen to the project proponents; possibility of public appeal; 2 phases (similar to the European projects). A good project will address a specific problem; blind evaluation (evaluate the content of the project).	Delegates: 4 PUB, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 3 (notes Tab14*
London	*Best case: Evaluation*
-diverse panel/experts assessment (list pros/cons) -multi contexts (production, industry, consumer/user, environment, cost/benefit) -wider benefits Long term impact	Delegates: 1 PUB, 1 BUS, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p3 (fig 17)*
London	*Best case: Evaluation*
Evaluation – Constant (via internet) Followup research Creat new research from above Central tool kit Data base parameters	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 *** *Mixed group 2 / p2 (fig 19)*

Regional/National/International Incentives Taxing	
Copenhagen	*Best case: Evaluation*
* Focus on learning * Evaluation of output * Independent evaluation	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 BUS 1 BUS/ENT 2 *** *p8: mixed group 1*
Maastricht	*Best case: Evaluation*
criteria b. Independent reviews: Independent reviewers	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Maastricht	*Best case: Evaluation*
macro politicians (society/science/industry/citizens)	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Evaluation*
* long term studies * controlling the execution of objectives	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p2*
Vienna	*Best case: Evaluation*
independent *, critical [i.e. discerning] on the basis of meaningful criteria * to a great extent independent experts "IMPACT"?	Delegates: 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p2*
Vienna	*Best case: Evaluation*
Acknowledgement of negative results, resp. not desired results Option to end projects [prematurely]	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Vienna	*Best case: Evaluation*
- target/actual comparison [should be / is comparison] but not with overboarding burocracy ----> learning for the future - controlling [impartially overseeing] ---> during the project	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 4 / p2*
Madrid	*Best case: Evalutation*
The "unwritten" criteria in calls must be clear to everyone	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 1 / p3/3 (blue)*
Madrid	*Best case: Evalutation*
- Multidisciplinary, participatory and transparent assessment - Greater assessment of the outcome, final assessment. mayor evaluaciòn de los resultados, eval final	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 2 / p2/3 (red)*
Madrid	*Best case: Evalutation*
- scientific quality: the project and Groups [wherein participated] - actual potential for exploitation (company) and dissemination real - - -> actual - Economically viable	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 3 / p3/3 (green)*
Vienna	*Best case: Evaluation*
independent criteria (1)	Delegates: 8 NPO *Worst „Nonprofit"/ p2/2 NPO*
Athens	*Best case: Example*
Freedom in research proposals for the solution in the above subject (to accept all proposals without prejudice or guidance/predefined subject areas) Freedom in research proposals to deal with the above needs Funding Institutions: Local chambers of commerce Consumer organizations Judging the main question/hypotheses of research. Judging the technical prerequisites* (*defined by a committee of specialized scientists) of research proposals that come to address challenges and hypotheses. Who uses and owns the results of each research? The profits made by each research must be distributed according to the participation degree of each organization To ensure the reasonable and ethical (fair) use of research results, to avoid limiting them to private interest or to contradict public needs and interests.	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 3 / p1*

Table 37: Best case on evaluation

Project design

This topic was not a dominating one in the discussions, and common topics are hard to find. Under this theme several points were raised which concern other aspects of research programming such as the exploitation of results and quality criteria. Several times a suggestion was made to **reduce project administration** (2 public sector groups, 1 mixed group in two workshops). From the input it cannot be said if this demand applies to national projects and/or projects funded under a European programme. Participants also saw a need for **sufficient funding** (2 mixed, 2 public sector groups in 2 workshops), good **project management** (1 mixed, 1 public sector group in 2 workshops), **project monitoring** (2 mixed groups in 2 workshops) and **flexibility in conducting a project** (2 mixed groups, 1 public sector group in two workshops).

Worst case

Athens	*Worst case: Research design*
private companies	Delegates: 8NPO, 1 BUS, *Homog. group 1 „Nonprofit“/ p2*
Athens	*Worst case: Research design*
Design: based on the needs of a small number of stakeholders of private interests	Delegates: 7PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public“/ p2*
Paris	*Worst case: Research design*
weigh of administration - weigh of evaluation weigh of lobbies - lack of administrative means	Delegates: 9PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p7*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Research design*
F.1. Scientific criteria are sustaining	Delegates: 8BUS, *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p4 (n.3.4)*
London	*Worst case: Research design*
Cost/no funding Finding/outcome forget the rest: fall off Lack support food industry – they are the driver, not open to change Lack of ideas, drive, innovation Company hierarchy	Delegates: 2 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public“/ p4 (fig. 4)*
London	*Worst case: Research design*
Hidden agendas of individuals or funders Projects getting too big & diverse Losing sight of original aim Losing quality Poor relationships within project team Lack of access to previous research Expensive/patented technologies IP of methodologies eg questionnaire design	Delegates: 1 NPO, 1 *** *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p6 (fig. 10)*
London	*Worst case: Research design*
Barriers: £ Availability Fashion Political Interests Power Awareness/knowledge relative value	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 *** *Homog. group 3 „Business“ / p4 (fig. 14)*

Copenhagen	*Worst case: Research design*
* Zero error culture * Narrow-minded * Missing flexibility * Missing project management	Delegates: 7PUB, *p2: Homog. group 1, „Public“*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Research design*
* Intimate research group * Involve non-important stakeholders	Delegates: 4 BUS, 1 ENT *p4: Homog. group 2, „Business“*
Copenhagen	*Worst case: Research design*
* Not only focus on the problems/barriers- also opportunities best practice	Delegates: 1 NPO, 2 BUS, 2 OTH, *p6: Homog. group 3, „Nonprofit“*
Vienna	*Worst case: Research design*
* high administrative requirements 5)	Delegates: 7 PUB *Worst „Public“/ p2/2 PUB*
Vienna	*Worst case: Research design*
* overheads are not acknowledged	Delegates: 7 PUB *Worst „Public“/ p2/2 PUB*
Vienna	*Worst case: Research design*
- too poor integration of "values" (holistic approach) - research should be strengthened that goes across branches / enterprises / thematic fields ===> INNOVATION by COOPERATION - Implementation and marketability should get more attention	Delegates: 9 BUS *Worst „Business“ / p2/2 BUS*
Vienna	*Worst case: Research design*
“underhand manoeuvres” by economy + research tied to business 2) difficult access or access only for "big, established institutions" (3) methods not transparent methods questionable in terms of data protection laws methods inappropriate (a 24 page questionnaire for school children)	Delegates: 8 NPO *Worst „Nonprofit“/ p2/2 NPO*
Paris	*Worst case: Research design*
Lobbying Fashion effects	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit“/ p4*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Research design*
F. Complicated outline of project (mainly for practice – submitter)	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public“/ p4 (n.2.3)*
Vienna	*Worst case: Research design*
Ethics committee easier access diversity of methods also innovative, participative, qualitative (4)	Delegates: 8NPO *Worst „Nonprofit“/ p2/2 NPO*

Table 38: Worst case on project design

Best case

Athens	*Best case: Research design*
The design should be in line with the demands of the general society and the modern way of life The design of each research should take under consideration the immediate needs of the final receivers	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Athens	*Best case: Research design*
Greater social, geographic and scientific representation	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 *** *Mixed group 2 / p1*
London	*Best case: Research design*
quality control/checks milestones/project adjustment if needed peer review/scrutiny eg. Report to expert panel advising panel/steering committee -bounce/s -liasion	Delegates: 1 PUB, 1 BUS, 1 *** *Mixed group 1 / p3 (fig 17)*
London	*Best Case: Research design*
Population basis Money not problem	Delegates: 2 PUB, 2 *** *Mixed group 2 / p2 (fig 19)*

Copenhagen	*Best case: Research design*
* Templates * Interdisciplinary * Original	Delegates: 2 PUB, 1 BUS 1 BUS/ENT 2 *** *p8: mixed group 1*
Vienna	*Best case: Research design*
* long term projects > 3 years * robust "end points" versus surrogates * allow for flexible consortium decisions * clear, short guidelines for proposals.	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p2*
Vienna	*Best case: Research design*
clear definition of project, clear objectives holistic approach marketable implementation / implementation of innovation	Delegates: 3 BUS, 2 NPO, 1 PUB *Mixed group 2 / p2*
Vienna	*Best case: Research design*
transparent call little bureaucracy Acknowledgement of overheads quicker decision making	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Vienna	*Best case: Research design*
- transparency - taking into account flexibility and risk	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 4 / p2*
Madrid	*Best case: Research design*
Prior agreement on the scope of the project amongst the consortium partners	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 1 / p3/3 (blue)*
Madrid	*Best case: Research design*
- Role of technological platforms to Promote Public - Private partnerships - greater participation in technology platforms of the sector mayor - main, bigger major, largest ... - greater consensus on the national scale mayor - main, bigger major, largest ... - Further Training to submit professional projects (different drafts) memorias - - -> drafts? - SOST Training Courses (few seats) coursos de capacitacion SOST - Information about expert entities in project preparations Certification entities - Sign agreements with consortium at the commencement of projects	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 2 / p3/3 (red)*
Madrid	*Best case: Research design*
- Networked - Synergies	*Delegates: diverse* *Mixed group 3 / p3/3 (green)*

Table 39: Best case on project design

And this is important, too

Also input on the last guiding topic for discussion saw a large diversity. Almost all input on this has been mentioned only once. Altogether, as expected, there was not very much input on this topic, from some groups even none. Some of it mirrors input on other discussion topics, especially the discussions on project design and quality criteria. Across the stakeholder categories, participants listed under this topic what they consider as **very basic conditions** – money (3 public sector groups, 1 private sector, 1 mixed group in 4 workshops) and time (1 private sector, 1 mixed group in 2 workshops). Participants in a working group in the Paris workshop dedicated this theme to the development of a set of criteria

"characterising sustainable, fair and transparent innovation and research programmes on food and health".

Worst case

Paris	*Worst case: Other issues*
palm oil Aspartam/synthetic sweeteners Preservatives (E …) Vegetable or animal oil? Animal flour Animal feed => what happens in the human body?	Delegates: 6 NPO *Homog. group 2 „Nonprofit"/ p2*
Bratislava	*Worst case: Other issues*
G. Rewarding researcher undersized funding consequently (after the excellence centres) incorrectly set workplace conditions = formal solution! lack of personnel + material provision	Delegates: 9 PUB, *Homog. group 2 „Public"/ p5 (n.2.4)*
London	*Worst case: Other issues*
Need to increase funding in food/health area Adequate funding	Delegates: 2 PUB, *Homog. group 1 „Public"/ p4 (fig. 4)*
London	*Worst case: Other issues*
Imbalance Advertising/marketing	Delegates: 2 BUS, 1 *** *Homog. group 3 „Business" / p4 (fig. 14)*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Other issues*
Ad-random establishment of programme	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 3 / p1*
Maastricht	*Worst case: Other issues*
a. Focus on a closed small group of large players	Delegates: diverse *Homog. group 3 / p1*
Vienna	*Worst case: Other issues*
* size of European research funding	Delegates: 7 PUB *Worst „Public"/ p2/2 PUB*
Vienna	*Worst case: Other issues*
- "endless" proposal phase - unreliable and slow flow of payments - drown research by "over-administration", suffocation, hamper beforehand, discourage, etc.	Delegates: 9 BUS *Worst „Business" / p2/2 BUS*
Vienna	*Worst case: Other issues*
rarely research projects are repeated (time dimension, who does the research)	Delegates: 8 NPO *Worst „Nonprofit"/ p2/2 NPO*

Table 40: Worst case on other important issues

Best case

Athens	*Best case: Other Issue - idea*
Elimination of uncontrollable commercials that target children and influence their nutritional habits Supporting and reinforcing traditional, local characteristics that have developed based on the actual needs of the population and are in line with the geographical qualities, with the participation of all consumers. Ex., to investigate the quality of the aquifer Decision making processes should take under consideration the opinions and positions of the local communities affected, represented in committees formed by lottery and of one year service without possibility to be re-elected, and their positions should be subject of public negotiation	Delegates: 2 NPO, 1 PUB, 1 *** *Mixed group 4 / p1*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*

Criteria characterising sustainable (A), fair (B) and transparent (C) innovation and research programmes on food and health B: collaborative (several teams) B: transdisciplinary (sociologists, doctors) B,C: public -private partnerships A: large and regular budgets A: simple administrative procedures C: publication of evaluation procedures B,C: independent evaluators A: flexibility (pilot project and large project) A: possibility to implement again a pilot project, at another time and/or another place B,C: large dissemination of programmes (communication)	Delegates: 4 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 1 / p1*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
B, C: reasonable deadlines for answering the calls for projects A: follow-up of the projects and evaluation C: involvement of [stakeholders] {actors} from the civil society within the programming and {the} selection [processes] A: fractionated payments, depending on the results of the milestones A: fractionated payments, depending on the reports on project etapes B: counselling for project holders (administrative and scientific) A, B, C: confidentiality A, B, C: trust relationship between financers and project holder (dialogue, availability) A, B, C: UNREADABLE = ethics	Delegates: 4 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 1 / p2*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
scientific relevancy- market demand (enterprises)- societal demand- public authorities demand competence/skills of the project holder: scientific management communication project planning complementary financial [sources] collaborations with third parties (legal, scientific, industrial, associations, etc.)	Delegates: 4 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 1 / p3*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
Sustainability: - credibility - 3 x 3 years themes: food & nutrition - 2 x 3 years specific topics - Structure of the consortium	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
Fostering -> European Commission coming from a national programme - Flexibility but rigour in the deadlines for implementation and provision of the results	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
Avoid “sprinkling”,	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
finance large research programmes but // also financially support emerging projects (fairness) allow re -orientation at mi -term for a programme, depending on the results - fairness/equity for project selection: choice of foreign experts conflicts of interests scientific evaluation	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 2 / p2*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
provide arguments when a project is rejected, together with advice	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS,

	Mixed group 2 / p3
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
common rules for all the stakeholders Financing amounts Knowledge of the international state of the art in the sector for radical innovation => referees	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 2 / p3*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
Sharing the results ((-)).	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 2 / p3*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
Transdisciplinary,	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 2 / p4*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
match between: public health needs	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 2 / p4*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
Potential tensions between basic research and applied research.	Delegates: 3 PUB, 1 NPO, 1 BUS, *Mixed group 2 / p4*
Paris	*Best case: Other issues*
1) sustainability, equity, transparency- collective approach - translational approach - sustainability: 3 pillars = social & societal + economic + environmental (e.g. waste limitation, environmental cost, impact of projects and results) None of the 3 pillars must be neglected, even if their time scales are different. Societal expectation/acceptation/consultation: to be considered - consortium agreement - confidentiality agreement (potentially) - dissemination of the results reasonable timeframe of the programmes, depending on the subject financial means: fair contributions win-win arrangements-	Delegates: 3 PUB, 2 NPO, *Mixed group 3 / p1*
Maastricht	*Best case: Other issues*
fundamental and applied broader 'standards' and 'facts'	Delegates: diverse *Mixed group 2 / p1*
Vienna	*Best case: Other issues*
* quick administration of funding * offer open themes	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p2*
Vienna	*Best case: Other issues*
* social science perspectives * natural sciences * representatives of consumers * professional associations (concerned) * socio-political	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 1 / p3*
Vienna	*Best case: Other issues*
amount of funds.	Delegates: 2 BUS, 2 NPO, 2 PUB, *Mixed group 3 / p2*
Vienna	*Best case: Other issues*
repetition of research projects	Delegates: 8 NPO *Worst „Nonprofit"/ p2/2 NPO*

Table 41: Best case on other important issues

Second approach: Analysis across discussion themes

In this section we present the outcomes according to the second approach (analysis 2). The references on which this analysis is based on are listed after this text. List names are marked by an arrow before the name.

When stakeholders are invited to discuss research programming, it comes with no surprise that the participants consider it as crucial to **→involve stakeholders in research programming**. No topic was more often mentioned than this one (26 mixed, 4 civil society, 4 private sector groups, 4 public sector group in 11 workshops). Across all stakeholder categories stakeholders suggested that they should be involved in the whole chain of research programming: in decisions on research topics, in decisions on funding, in research project, in the evaluation of projects and research programmes and in the exploitation or dissemination of research results. Often it was not further specified, what stakeholders are to be involved. Some working groups mentioned "those who are interested", "multiple", the public or even "all", some working groups were more specific and mentioned a triangle of civil society organizations, enterprises and public entities, others named industry, consumers, researchers and civil society organizations or the government, consumers, industry and research institutions or simply consumers, enterprises, professional associations or civil society organizations. Mentioning one kind of stakeholder does not imply that only a specific stakeholder or group of stakeholders is to be involved, it can also mean that there is a perception that this specific group is not sufficiently represented in decision-making. It can be concluded that stakeholders prefer decision-making that includes more than one organisation or, mostly, more than one or a few additional stakeholders, may it be it industry or funders. Some stakeholders prefer broad stakeholder panels instead (3 mixed, two public sector, 2 private sector, 2 NPO groups in 6 workshops). This is true for stakeholders of all categories. Working groups mentioned that for involving stakeholders consultation methods have to be developed or, in particular under the theme *Decisions on topics and research areas*, discussed schemes on how to involve stakeholders. Suggestions include panels which are representative of the population – one working group suggested to make participation dependent on sortition -, panels representing a diversity of stakeholders or stakeholders from multiple contexts, public hearings and broad engagement processes which involve society at large. Some working groups considered it to be appropriate to look for an **→interdisciplinary representation of scientists and researchers or a transdiciplinary**

representation on such panels (10 mixed, 1 private sector, 1 public sector, 1 civil society group in 8 workshops). There might have been a difference between the private sector and other categories: Broad participation was demanded by mixed and civil society groups, while the private sector groups asked for including "important" stakeholders and setting up panels of researchers/scientists and private sector representatives. – Research funding increasingly launches calls on specific topics instead of funding proposals on topics suggested by researchers and/or companies alone. This new governance of research was a topic in a few working groups. There participants demanded **→free choice of research topics and areas** instead (3 mixed groups, 1 civil society group in 4 workshops).

There is a strong preference for involving stakeholders in decision-making, but how shall decisions be made? What are the desired basic conditions for decision-making in research programming and funding? Working groups demanded **→objective decision making** (4 public sector, 4 mixed groups, 1 civil society group in 6 workshops): **→impartiality** – in some working groups also in respect to economic or political interests -, **independence** (13 mixed, 2 NPO, 3 public sector, 2 private sector groups in 9 workshops) in decision-making based on sufficient and **→clear criteria and rules** (11 mixed, 3 private sector, 3 public sector groups, 1 civil society group in 7 workshops) and decisions made by **→competent reviewers** (12 mixed, 5 public sector, 3 private sector groups in 7 workshops) instead of **→buddy systems** (2 public sector groups, 1 civil society group in 3 workshops) and reviewers with **→conflicts of interest** (6 mixed, 4 public sector, 3 civil society, 2 private sector groups in 4 workshops). They demanded **→transparency** in the whole chain of research programming (15 mixed, 2 civil society groups, 1 private sector, 1 public sector group in 8 workshops). This goes together with a critical view on **→lobbying** (4 private sector, 3 public sector groups, 1 civil society group, 4 mixed groups in 7 workshops), in particular lobbying by industry. Only private sector groups, but not all of them, had some positive words about lobbying. Other working groups considered it as untransparent or even limiting the freedom of research.

Some working groups named general criteria to be fulfilled by research programmes and/or projects. They should support **→environmental sustainability**, e.g. (10 mixed groups, 4 private sector, 2 civil society groups, 1 public sector group in 7 workshops). In the Paris workshop a mixed working group drafted a set of criteria for (environmentally) sustainable, fair and transparent research programming on food and health. In general a lot of working groups agreed that public research funding should promote **→the public's interest** (9 mixed,

3 civil society, 3 public sector groups, 1 private sector group in 7 workshops) or have a **→social benefit** (12 mixed, 2 private sector groups, 1 public sector group in 8 workshops). There is almost no overlapping between working groups here, thus, taking these demands together, they have been made by 27 working groups (17 mixed, 4 public sector, 3 private sector, 3 civil society groups in 9 workshops). It is striking that the Madrid workshop, which had mostly participants from the private sector, did not make this demand (as the only one of the workshops compared in this analysis). Working groups mentioned that publicly funded research should not be driven by private interests, but, at best, improve the quality of life of society at large. Another aspect mentioned here and there was to **→take local and regional aspects into account** (7 mixed, 2 public sector groups, 1 civil society group in 7 workshops). Subsidiarity was considered as important to make research and science policy work.

The general demand of social benefit and public interest can be in conflict with a demand-supply model of research and innovation. Some stakeholders mentioned that they want to see research programmes and projects having a long-term **→impact**, follow-up perspectives and uptake perspectives (9 mixed, 4 public sector, 3 private sector groups in 9 workshops). A potential impact is the **→applicability** of research results for products or policy solutions. (8 mixed, 4 private sector, 4 public sector groups, 1 civil society group in 7 workshops). The application potential of research and innovation was also framed as desired **→marketability** of research and innovation (9 mixed, 3 private sector groups, 1 public sector group, 1 civil society group in 9 workshops). Again, in the Madrid workshop, which had many participants from large industry, universities were considered as some kind of service providers to industries, which do not provide sufficient supply for demands. – There is a potential tension between public interest and industry demand for applied research. A few working groups (4 mixed groups, 1 public sector group in 3 workshops) warned of neglecting **basic research** in favour of applied research. And there might be a tension between industry demand and present practices of evaluating researchers and scientists. Representatives of the public sector (which includes public universities) and the private sector pointed out the fact that measuring the impact of research and innovation by **→bibliometric indicators** negatively impacts on technology transfer to industry (2 public sector groups, 1 private sector, 1 mixed group in 3 workshops). And indeed, being evaluated by the number of publications in high impact journals promotes career strategies of fitting into a mainstream of research or, as

some working groups put it, of concentrating on research **→fashions** (2 public sector, 2 civil society groups, 1 mixed, 1 private sector group in 4 workshops).

The **→availability of results** of publicly funded research and innovation was discussed not only in regard to supply (17 mixed, 6 public sector, 2 civil society groups, 1 private sector group in 11 workshops). On this topic there was more input from civil society organizations than on applicability of research and innovation. Stakeholders demanded easier access to research and innovation (not only for organizations with more resources than small ones), but also for a wider public (4 mixed groups, 1 civil society group in 3 workshops), open access was mentioned here and there (2 mixed groups, 1 public sector, 1 NPO group; workshops). The full picture of the scientific state of the art is heavily distorted, if mostly positive results are published as presently often happens. Several working groups saw it as a problem that negative, neutral, unpopular or otherwise not desired results are seldom published. If they remain unavailable they can bias the whole spectre of scientific evidence. Participants demanded **→non-selective, full publication of results** (5 mixed, 2 civil society groups, 1 public sector group in 4 workshops). There was also concern that results might be **→distorted** by jumping to conclusions, exaggerations, subjective presentations, over-promising, cherry picking and generalizations going too far (4 public sector groups, 1 private sector, 1 civil society group, 3 mixed groups in 5 workshops). In several working groups participants considered it to be important to make research findings public beyond closed (academic) circles. Communication within and between scientific communities is different from communication with a wider public. A one-size-fits-all approach is not expected to work here. As far as this has been discussed in workshops, participants agreed that special efforts are needed for better **→targeted dissemination** and to make outcomes public in an intelligible way (7 mixed, 3 public sector groups, 1 civil society, 1 private sector group in 6 workshops). - In the discussions on how to exploit research findings, intellectual property rights were an issue, mostly in regard how to handle them within a project consortium, but also too weak and too strong **→intellectual property rights (IPR)** were discussed (9 mixed, 3 private sector groups, 1 public sector group in 8 workshops).

The **administration of research projects** was an issue in many workshops. Stakeholders demanded **→less administration for projects** (6 mixed, 5 public sector, 3 private sector groups in 9 workshops), in particular less reporting and reliable payments of funds. There might be a tension with what working groups discussed about **→project monitoring** (6

mixed groups, 1 public sector, 1 private sector group in 8 workshops), but the input partly could also be read as on improving monitoring for less project administration tasks. Stakeholders stressed the importance of another, often neglected task: a **→final assessment (ex-post evaluation) of projects** to learn for the future (8 mixed, 2 public sector groups, 1 private sector group in 6 workshops). **→Funds** were a topic in many workshops; they were discussed in regard to size, fairness and reliability (8 mixed, 5 public sector, 4 private sector groups in 7 workshops). Another issue raised that pertains to success and failure of projects was **→time** (10 mixed, 4 private sector groups, 1 NPO, 1 public sector group in 8 workshops). Participants see it as crucial not to have time pressure and to have time for long-term studies, but also to have the opportunity to end a project prematurely. In other regards the issue of time was raised in regard to administrative issues (no delay in the transfer of funds, quicker decisions). A related topic having conjured up in all three workshop series was **→continuity**. In Series 1 it came up in regard to the financing of research programmes, opportunities for follow-up projects and, last but not least, long-term visions on research funding in the area of food and health (3 mixed groups, 1 private sector, 1 public sector group in 4 workshops).

In Series 2, in which smaller organizations participated than in Series 1, in some workshops better access of small organizations, SMEs and smaller consortia to research and research funding was discussed. Participants pointed out the need of funding schemes tailored to them. In Series 1 here and there participants called for less "duplications" of organizations, less projects and networks of clusters, but there were also warnings of **→cumulating effects** (5 mixed, 3 public sector groups, 1 civil society group in 8 workshops).

Across all three categories stakeholders had similarly critical views on **→politics** (6 mixed, 3 public sector, 2 civil society groups, 2 public sector groups in 8 workshops). They mentioned that policy makers should not be the only ones to decide (this goes together with the demand for more stakeholder involvement), that decisions should not be based on substantial political criteria (apparently this is considered as a condition for impartiality), or that research results should not be twisted by politicians. In one working group it was demanded that an independent organisation should decide on research topics. Some working groups saw a policy maker's role as setting strategic priorities, others as organizing an engagement process involving as many stakeholders as possible to work out a **→research strategy** on food and health (9 mixed, 2 public sector groups, 1 private sector group in 8

workshops). But interventions on a lower level were considered as political interference in the independence of research. This objection against political influence that goes beyond general strategic priorities has a parallel in the rejection of strong business dominance. It is an open question as to how this rather limited role of politics goes together with safeguarding public interest. There seems to be a common perception even discontent that politics does not fulfil all its obligations to ensure social benefit by research and innovation; it does not live up to the demands imposed on it by a wider public. Does stakeholder involvement help here? And if so, what kind of involvement, when and by whom? The answers given by stakeholders in the workshops conflict on these points, but indicate an option for policy to take stakeholder involvement seriously and preparing a basis for it, which makes it transparent, inclusive and legitimate.

Involve stakeholders in research programming

GR_EASW1/with the active participation of all interested parties and organizations/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/To be defined by the final receivers of the research results/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/Participation of consumers and producers in the decision making processes, as well as of relevant local institutions/MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
GR_EASW1/Decision making processes should take under consideration the opinions and positions of the local communities affected, represented in committees formed by lottery and of one year service, without possibility to be re-elected, and their positions should be subject of public negotiation/MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
GR_EASW1/Banning of the ministerial immunity of prosecution and establishing specific fines to the politicians who do not take under consideration the positions of local communities/MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
FR_EASW1/civil society [stakeholders] {actors}/Ho2 p3/Worst case, 6NPO
FR_EASW1/public institutions -/Ho2 p3/Worst case, 6NPO
FR_EASW1/enterprises/Ho2 p3/Worst case, 6NPO
FR_EASW1/Evaluation on a non -representative panel/Ho2 p4/Worst case, 6NPO
FR_EASW1/collaborations with third parties/MX1 p3/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
SK_EASW1/A.1. Politicians, should decide about the topics./Ho1 p2 (n.1.1)/Best Case, 4NPO
SK_EASW1/Experts groups from different EU countries/Ho1 p2 (n.1.1)/Best Case, 4NPO
SK_EASW1/2. Consumers and patient groups should participate, 3rd. Sector (it´s not like that today)/Ho1 p2 (n.1.1)/Best Case, 4NPO
SK_EASW1/3. Actors express their opinions in the process of project selection, throughout its execution and at the end asses results and inform actors/Ho1 p2 (n.1.1)/Best Case, 4NPO
SK_EASW1/2. Topics based on the public expert discussion A2/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/5. Through public discussion (in cooperation with HE institutions) A5/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Medial communication (professional) A5/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/2. Involvement of private sector under the more preferable conditions determined by state/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/To involve consumer directly (he/she is not only observer!)·/MX3 p1 (n.6.1)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Medialisation·/MX3 p1 (n.6.1)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Involving general public, club, social networks/MX3 p1 (n.6.1)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/– voting, expressing opinion/MX3 p1 (n.6.1)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/participative processes with monitoring and audition/Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/The active participation of the different actors favours researching the unknown./Ho2 p3 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/Because we all have a contribution of knowledge./Ho2 p3 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/2. Decisions should be taken after evaluation of sharing knowledge./Ho2 p3 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO

PT_EASW1/3. Can and should be involved in decisions, taking into account that these decisions will have to be a result of an evaluation of representatives of the civil society and not only the political view./Ho2 p3 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/Have an approach that doesn't include all stakeholders;/Ho3 p4 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/- not consult the stakeholders/Ho3 p4 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/Without mixed panels, homogeneous (industrial vision, academic vision, ...)./Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/Different social actors:/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/ministries, government, producers of knowledge, RTD organizations, companies, end -users./MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Involving all the social actors./MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Direct multisectorial consultation./MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Knowledge of the target population;/MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/The different elements with interest/action; All the stakeholders./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Based on a methodology of consultation of all the elements of the value chain./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Should be involved in the planning, monitoring and evaluation./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Ensure the communication between different partners (potential partners, stakeholders)./MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Stakeholders (universities, clusters, companies,...);/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Concerted actions among different partners; Dialogue between all areas./MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Equal to all stakeholders;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/diversified (from the Business environment if there is the creation of a product)./MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
UK_EASW1/= -no ONE on their own/Ho2 p2 (fig. 6)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/-engaging general public/layperson (move beyond pure scientific input)/MX1 p1 (fig 15)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/-diverse panel/experts assessment (list pros/cons)/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/-multi contexts (production, industry, consumer/user, environment, cost/benefit)/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/2. Decision makers decided by Framework/MX2 p1 (fig 18)/Best case, 2PUB 2***
UK_EASW1/– contains all relevant experts including/MX2 p1 (fig 18)/Best case, 2PUB 2***
UK_EASW1/laypersons- normal common sense persons/MX2 p1 (fig 18)/Best case, 2PUB 2***
DK_EASW1/* Involve non-important stakeholders/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
DK_EASW1/* Not only the researcher should decide upon the topics/areas/themes for research/p6: Ho3/Worst case should, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
DK_EASW1/* The decisions should not solely be taken by one stakeholder/p6: Ho3/Worst case should, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
DK_EASW1/* Consumers/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
DK_EASW1/* Public hearing/p8: MX1/Best case, 2PUB 1BUS 1BUS/ENT 2***
DK_EASW1/* Multiple representatives/p8: MX1/Best case, 2PUB 1BUS 1BUS/ENT 2***
NL_EASW1/a. Multidisciplinary stakeholders, (i) government; (ii) consumers; (iii) industry and (iv) science:/Ho3 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/a. Who decides for the research themes/topics: the scientists, the politicians, the industry and the citizens (society/science/industry/citizens)/MX2 p1/Best case, diverse
AT_EASW1/* [Involving} clearing panels (research + production = practice) before decision is made, is an absolute must: representatives of consumers, professional associations (concerned)/MX1 p3/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/suggestions in the consultation process of the Framework Programme decision on subventions/MX2 p1/Best case, 3BUS 2NPO 1PUB
AT_EASW1/national level: analogous panels ensure that all relevant sections of the population are taken into account/MX2 p1/Best case, 3BUS 2NPO 1PUB
AT_EASW1/panel of industry, consumers, research, NGOs. Funder ---> advisory role/MX3 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
ES_EASW1/- the assessment system of projects is not participatory./Ho3 p2 (green)/Worst case, 4BUS
ES_EASW1/- the consultations of the European Commission do not manage representative participation/Ho3 p2 (green)/Worst case, 4BUS
ES_EASW1/1) Research areas/topics/MX3 1/3 (green)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- All in general those involved in the chain/MX3 1/3 (green)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- Weight based on the position in the chain/MX3 1/3 (green)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/End user Inclusion sustainability?/MX2 1/3 (red)/Best case,

BE_EASW1/ Stakeholder involvement in … ?/Ho1 p1/Worst case, 4PUB 1***
BE_EASW1/Involve industry/MX1 p1/Best case, 3 delegates
BE_EASW1/objective Stakeholder involvement/MX2 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/ balance stakeholders, sound, neutral/MX2 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
TK_EASW1/Policy making of NPOs are prevented/Ho1 p4/5/Worst case, 4NPO 2OTH
TK_EASW1/Continuous dialogue/trialogue between/among NPO, public and academia: Innovation - Investment - Sustainability/MX3 p1/1/Best case,
TK_EASW1/In parallel with the needs of the community, and according to the policy research outcomes, determining the scientific R&D project priorities./MX3 p1/1/Best case,
AT_EASW1/broad collection of topics to work out a research strategy (using the existing infra structure - FFG!) + NGOs/MX2 p1/Best case, 3BUS 2NPO 1PUB
FR_EASW1/C: involvement of [stakeholders] {actors} from the civil society within the programming and {the} selection [processes]/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
ES_EASW1/- Multidisciplinary, participatory and transparent assessment/MX2 2/3 (red)/Best case,
AT_EASW1/broadly conceived structures or procedures for finding topics (example: rural development), example: media, internet/MX4 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
SK_EASW1/Various experts – medical doctors, philosophers, nutrition specialists, general public, state, 3rd. Sector·: FOOD, physical activity (certification) – psycho, psycho A1/MX2 p1 (n.5.1)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/…. Level of Government Plenipotentiary A1/MX2 p1 (n.5.1)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Expert opinions – prevention· A1/MX2 p1 (n.5.1)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
UK_EASW1/-committee/expert panel/stakeholder: needs assessment/gap analysis/MX1 p1 (fig 15)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* Narrow forum/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
NL_EASW1/a. Assessment of research by one or two stakeholders./Ho3 p1/Worst case, diverse
AT_EASW1/– decision by [big] industry only/HoBUS p1/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/few [people], not participation orientated/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/internal decision of a few - without consultation/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/broad panel/committee that decides on criteria for research projects/HoNPO p1/positive, 8NPO
DK_EASW1/* A few operators/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* Closed fora/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
UK_EASW1/-shouldn't be the case of who shouts loudest or just one individual making decision/Ho2 p2 (fig. 6)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/= - not made by ONE person/Ho2 p2 (fig. 6)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/Any single voice/Ho3 p3 (fig. 13)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* Isolated/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* No one/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* Not solely the funding sources/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
AT_EASW1/– decision by single person/a single office/HoBUS p1/Worst case, 9BUS
SK_EASW1/1A Slovak Research and Development Agency negatively evaluates/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Only one agency – not enough!/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Who decides about topic? Experts?·/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Foreign vs SR?/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Submitter – what is their role?/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Someone should determine topics – general./Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/„Wildcart" in SRDA (Slovak Research and Development Agency)/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Irrelevant evaluators/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Objectivisation of topics proposed/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Umbrella organisation – expert centre for healthy lifestyle and prevention · A1/MX2 p1 (n.5.1)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/National level – interdepartmental · A1/MX2 p1 (n.5.1)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/The funding agency alone;/Ho3 p4 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO

Interdisciplinarity

FR_EASW1/Transdisciplinary,/MX2 p4/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
SK_EASW1/Various experts – medical doctors, philosophers, nutrition specialists, general pub, state, 3rd. Sector·: FOOD, physical activity (certification) - Psycho A1/MX2 p1 (n.5.1)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/…. Level of Government Plenipotentiary A1/MX2 p1 (n.5.1)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Expert opinions – prevention· A1/MX2 p1 (n.5.1)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/5. Reviewers should be selected taking into account different areas of intervention of food and health./Ho2 p3 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/mixed panels – transversal to the sector./MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
DK_EASW1/* Interdisciplinary/p8: MX1/Best case, 2PUB 1BUS 1BUS/ENT 2***

NL_EASW1/b. No mono-disciplinary research./Ho3 p1/Worst case, diverse
AT_EASW1/* interdisciplinary proposals are not funded/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/- research should be strengthened that goes across branches/enterprises/thematic fields/HoBUS p2/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/* mix of experts/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/* interdisciplinary/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
ES_EASW1/- Multidisciplinary assessment committees (CE)/MX1 p1/(red)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- "Complete" multidisciplinary assessment groups evaluacion/MX1 p1/(blue)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- Mono -disciplinary committees in the assessment of projects./Ho1 p2 (blue)/Worst case, 4BUS 1OTH
NL_EASW1/a. Multidisciplinary stakeholders,/Ho3 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/(i) government; (ii) consumers; (iii) industry and (iv) science:/Ho3 p1/Best case, diverse
ES_EASW1/- Multidisciplinary, participatory and transparent assessment/MX2 2/3 (red)/Best case,
GR_EASW1/Greater social, geographic and scientific representation/MX2 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
FR_EASW1/B: transdisciplinary (sociologists, doctors)/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS

Free choice of research topics and areas

GR_EASW1/Freedom in research proposals for the solution in the above subject/MX3 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/(to accept all proposals without prejudice or guidance/predefined subject areas)/MX3 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/Freedom in research proposals to deal with the above needs/MX3 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
SK_EASW1/Authors, those who carry out the project/Ho1 p2 (n.1.1)/Best Case, 4NPO
UK_EASW1/-open calls + specific call/MX1 p1 (fig 15)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
AT_EASW1/* offer open themes/MX1 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB

Objective decision making

GR_EASW1/The results should be evaluated objectively by a group of experts/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/and implemented regardless of cost/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
SK_EASW1/(foreign evaluates +)·/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/A. 1. Depoliticised public institution in cooperation with Higher Education institutions. A1/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/4. Depoliticised public institution A4/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/3 = > and more , Increased objectivity·/MX3 p2 (n.6.2)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/Decisions on financing should be taken with prejudice/Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/The idea/project should be audited. Not evaluate the idea/project but only the CV./Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/Politics done through the evaluation of projects/Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/(the politics should be independent and previously defined;/Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/this way, institutions that didn't have approved projects have a chance to have them approved);/Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/Objectivity in the evaluation, with possibility of contesting the results./MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
UK_EASW1/Peer review (not just in -house)/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
DK_EASW1/* Not anonymous reviewers/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
FR_EASW1/Give both positive and negative sides/Ho2 p4/Worst case, 6NPO

Impartial and independent decision making

GR_EASW1/Evaluation: Partiality in the results (bias). Evaluation based on cost/Ho2 p2/Worst case, 7PUB
FR_EASW1/missionary/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/decision made by one big company/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/economical interests -/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/political interests -/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/Impartial and with knowledge of the area, and demonstrated merit./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
DK_EASW1/* Not only select "the friends" for review (act of friendship)/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
ES_EASW1/Partiality of assessors/Ho1 p2 (blue)/Worst case, 4BUS2 1OTH
FR_EASW1/non independent expertise for the programme -/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/independent evaluation commission: -/Ho2 p3/Worst case, 6NPO
PT_EASW1/Not rewarding reviewers of projects with demonstrated merit and not using independent reviewers./Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
UK_EASW1/= -reviewers chosen by independent person/Ho2 p2 (fig. 6)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***

UK_EASW1/funder demands input into reports before they are published/Ho2 p4 (fig. 8)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/-peer review/independent process/MX1 p1 (fig 15)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* Independent evaluation/p8: MX1/Best case, 2PUB 1BUS 1BUS/ENT 2***
AT_EASW1/- no independent experts are consulted/HoBUS p2/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/independent research institutions/HoNPO p1/Worst case (positive), 8NPO
AT_EASW1/independent panels/HoNPO p1/Worst case (positive), 8NPO
AT_EASW1/independent/ HoNPO p1/Worst case (positive), 8NPO
AT_EASW1/* independent panels/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/* detached from lobbyism/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/* independent commissions of experts/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/independent *, critical [i.e. discerning]/MX2 p2/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/* to a great extent independent experts/MX2 p2/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
TK_EASW1/Interest groups are dominating the researches/Ho1 p5/5/Worst case, 4NPO 2OTH
TK_EASW1/In order to make "healthy nutrition as a never ending process",/Ho2 p1/1/Worst case, 4BUS
TK_EASW1/independent authorities (i.e. EFSA) in needed issues and/Ho2 p1/1/Worst case, 4BUS
TK_EASW1/producing of outcomes depending evidence based researches are lacking./Ho2 p1/1/Worst case, 4BUS
TK_EASW1/An independent institution which will make healthy nutrition researches. This institution should also raise awareness among the community and make risk assessment/MX1 p1/1/Best case,
TK_EASW1/* Independent authority/MX2 p1/1/Best case,
TK_EASW1/Founding a similar organization like EFSA (European Food Safety Authority)/MX3 p1/1/MX3/Best case,
NL_EASW1/b. Independent reviews: Independent reviewers/MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
FR_EASW1/B,C: independent evaluators/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS

Clear criteria and rules

FR_EASW1/no evaluation grid/model,/Ho1 p5/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/criteria for the quality of financing: -/Ho1 p5/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/no evaluation criteria -/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/Criteria characterising sustainable (A), fair (B) and transparent (C) innovation and research programmes on food and health/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B: collaborative (several teams)/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B: transdisciplinary (sociologists, doctors)/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B,C: public -private partnerships/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: large and regular budgets/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: simple administrative procedures/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/C: publication of evaluation procedures/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B,C: independent evaluators/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: flexibility (pilot project and large project)/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: possibility to implement again a pilot project, at another time and/or another place/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B,C: large dissemination of programmes (communication)/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B, C: reasonable deadlines for answering the calls for projects/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: follow-up of the projects and evaluation/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/C: involvement of [stakeholders] {actors} from the civil society within the programming and {the} selection [processes]/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: fractionated payments, depending on the results of the milestones/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: fractionated payments, depending on the reports on project etapes/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B: counselling for project holders (administrative and scientific)/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A, B, C: confidentiality/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A, B, C: trust relationship between financers and project holder (dialogue, availability)/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A, B, C: UNREADABLE = ethics/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
SK_EASW1/= - Specific criteria are missing (point system)/Ho3 p3 (n.3.3)/Worst case, 8BUS
SK_EASW1/Point assessment + verbal/MX3 p2 (n.6.2)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/Criteria not clear, objective, or public./Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/Not used (they should be applied);/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/Measurable and iniquivocable criteria./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Transparency of criteria, which should be objective;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
UK_EASW1/Can't use just one criteria on its own/Ho2 p3 (fig. 7)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/-clear criteria/protocol/MX1 p1 (fig 15)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
NL_EASW1/c. No mentioning of sustainable criteria/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse

NL_EASW1/b. Not only 'smart' criteria should apply./Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
NL_EASW1/c. Determining objective criteria/MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/balance between novelty, feasibility, success and sustainability./MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
AT_EASW1/no criteria/ HoNPO p1/Worst case (positive), 8NPO
AT_EASW1/criteria (1)/ HoNPO p2/Worst case (positive), 8NPO
AT_EASW1/on the basis of meaningful criteria/MX2 p2/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
FR_EASW1/and/or too many criteria -/Ho1 p5/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/over -rating/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/over -evaluation/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/common rules for all the stakeholders/MX2 p3/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
AT_EASW1/broad panel/committee that decides on criteria for research projects/HoNPO p1/Worst case (positive), 8NPO
SK_EASW1/1A Slovak Research and Development Agency negatively evaluates/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Only one agency – not enough!/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Who decides about topic? Experts?·/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Best case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/not taking into account side criteria (technical, etc.) -/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
DK_EASW1/* Few criteria/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
PT_EASW1/Bad definition of the evaluation criteria in a quantitative evaluation;/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case,
PT_EASW1/The absence of articulation between the criteria/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/(economic, social, financial and environmental)/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/Criteria; Transparent and well defined criteria./MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Be differentiated;/MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS

Competent reviewers and researchers

FR_EASW1/examined by expert who is not specialised on the topic/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/examining expert with no expertise in the topic -/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/decision made by a ministry alone, with no consultation of scientists -/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/competence/skills of the project holder:/MX1 p3/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/scientific/MX1 p3/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/management/MX1 p3/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/communication/MX1 p3/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/Knowledge of the international state of the art/MX2 p3/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/=> referees/MX2 p3/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
SK_EASW1/B4. Bad (poor) evaluator/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Wrong criteria from the beginning/Ho2 p3 (n.2.2)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/1 Experts (council of government) A/MX3 p2 (n.6.2)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/2 (other) Scientists - (data collection) A/MX3 p2 (n.6.2)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/expertness of people involved in projects/MX3 p2 (n.6.2)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Expert councils – asses the reviews/MX3 p2 (n.6.2)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/Match the evaluation to scientific areas./Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/Without a relevant CV, without training,/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/Experts in the area;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Revisions with a panel of experts, without concern for competition in their areas;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Scientific and professional competence (relevant CV);/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/panel with a minimum of 3 experts,/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
UK_EASW1/Education/experience (lack of) in food production/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/no knowledge base (avoid fad)/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/no track record or prior research/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/Not fit evidence to do research/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/Not understand/care/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/= -reviewers not with appropriate expertise/range of expertise to cover whole project/range of areas represented e.g. lay input/Ho2 p2 (fig. 6)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/-accreditation/confidence in abilities/MX1 p2 (fig 16)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/-team or person with expertise/MX1 p2 (fig 16)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* Not academic competent/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* Past performance/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* "State of the art" not included/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
DK_EASW1/* Without literature review/background information/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
AT_EASW1/– without qualified expertises/HoBUS/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/qualification of institutions conducting research/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/- distinction between qualification of the proposer/MX4 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB

TK_EASW1/The ones those are existing are bad in terms of competency/Ho1 p2/5/Worst case, 4NPO 2OTH
PT_EASW1/Impartial and with knowledge of the area, and demonstrated merit./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Not rewarding reviewers of projects with demonstrated merit and not using independent reviewers./Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
UK_EASW1/= -expertise of research team/Ho2 p3 (fig. 7)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***

No buddy systems

GR_EASW1/Funding: to be based on power structures (based on status position/'good connections')/Ho2 p2/Worst case, 7PUB
SK_EASW1/Favoursim and corruption·/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/No (financial) means planned for opponents/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/E. Favourism (different criteria for different workplaces)·/Ho2 p4 (n.2.3)/Worst case, 9PUB
AT_EASW1/"buddy system"/HoNPO p1/Worst case (positive), 8NPO
AT_EASW1/"underhand manoeuvres" by economy + research tied to Business 2)/HoNPO p2/Worst case (positive), 8NPO

No conflicts of interest

FR_EASW1/conflicts of interests/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/An industry manager must not decide on its own/Ho2 p3/Worst case, 6NPO
FR_EASW1/Expertise criteria (conflicts of interests)/Ho2 p3/Worst case, 6NPO
SK_EASW1/6. Develop the software (computer aided system)/Ho1 p2 (n.1.1)/Best case, 4NPO
SK_EASW1/for tackling of conflicts of interests/Ho1 p2 (n.1.1)/Best case, 4NPO
SK_EASW1/6. conflict of interests exist/Ho3 p3 (n.3.3)/Worst case, 8BUS
SK_EASW1/6 Conflict of interests = > Foreign A/MX3 p2 (n.6.2)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/Absence of conflict of interests/Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/The reviewers shouldn't propose projects in the areas they are reviewing/Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/Reviewers with conflict of interests;/Ho3 p4 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/Exempted/without conflict of interests;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/without conflict of interests./MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/The earliest possible; conflict of interests (disclosure of who they are);/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
UK_EASW1/Personal interest/stakeholders/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/= - decision-makers/reviewers not conflicted/Ho2 p2 (fig. 6)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
NL_EASW1/independency (no conflict of interests)/MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
AT_EASW1/somebody with conflict of interest/HoNPO p2/Worst case, 8NPO
BE_EASW1/ Conflicts of interest (fear, risk)/Ho1 p1/Worst case, 4PUB 1***
BE_EASW1/€€€ Private Conflict of Interest/Ho1 p1/Worst case, 4PUB 1***
BE_EASW1/Conflict of interest Transparency innovation/MX2 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
FR_EASW1/conflicts of interests/MX2 p2/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS

Transparency

FR_EASW1/Lack of transparency/Ho2 p4/Worst case, 6NPO
SK_EASW1/5. It is not always transparent/Ho3 p3 (n.3.3)/Worst case, 8BUS
SK_EASW1/1. We don´t know the rules/Ho3 p4 (n.3.4)/Worst case, 8BUS
SK_EASW1/There are no clear rules/Ho3 p4 (n.3.4)/Worst case, 8BUS
PT_EASW1/Transparency;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Transparency;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Reply within the schedule foreseen; Transparent;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
UK_EASW1/Hidden agendas of individuals or funders/Ho2 p6 (fig. 10)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/-how doing/transparent/MX1 p1 (fig 15)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
NL_EASW1/a. No transparent criteria/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
NL_EASW1/b. If research statistics [do not exist then the research will]/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
NL_EASW1/neither be transparent nor reproducible/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
NL_EASW1/e. Transparency:/MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/(1) selection criteria for stakeholders;/MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/(2) selection criteria for decision-makers;/MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/(3) selection criteria for decision-making./MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/a. Transparency in decision-making:/MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/a. [There needs to be] transparency in:/MX2 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/(i) financing; (ii) outcomes; (iii) interests, (iv) ecetera:/MX2 p1/Best case, diverse

AT_EASW1/non-transparent use of (shallow) buzzwords/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/transparency/ HoNPO p1/Worst case (positive), 8NPO
AT_EASW1/methods not transparent/HoNPO p2/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/* transparency + justification/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/feasibility, sustainability, transparency,/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/transparent call/MX3 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/- transparent procedure/MX4 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/- transparency/MX4 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
ES_EASW1/- Multidisciplinary, participatory and transparent assessment/MX2 2/3 (red)/Best case,
PT_EASW1/Criteria; Transparent and well defined criteria./MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
UK_EASW1/data souces behind results not made available/Ho2 p4 (fig. 8)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
AT_EASW1/data protection as excuse/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/“underhand manoeuvres” by economy + research tied to Business 2)/HoNPO p2/Worst case, 8NPO
BE_EASW1/Conflict of interest Transparency innovation/MX2 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
PT_EASW1/Criteria not clear, objective, or public./Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/Transparency of criteria, which should be objective;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
FR_EASW1/provide arguments when a project is rejected/MX2 p3/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/, together with advice/MX2 p3/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/C: publication of evaluation procedures/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS

Lobbying

SK_EASW1/A1 Lobbying – Ministry of Agriculture -/- also positive -/Ho3 p3 (n.3.3)/Worst case, 8BUS
SK_EASW1/. Lobbing influence of big firms/Ho3 p5 (n.3.5)/Worst case, 8BUS
PT_EASW1/Lobbies;/Ho3 p4 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/Lobbies;/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case
UK_EASW1/Companies’ (own interest) initiative/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
AT_EASW1/* lobbying (one-sided) <--> freedom of research/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
ES_EASW1/- Low participation in lobbying of European projects./Ho2 p2 (red)/Worst case, 4BUS
BE_EASW1/ And lobbying/Ho1 p1/Worst case, 4PUB 1***
BE_EASW1/Lobbying/MX2 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/ Private - Lobby’s/MX2 p2/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/European platform/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Exchange of data and study plan/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/National platform/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/€ -> contribution of federation (ex FEVIA)/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/+ federal contribution/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Large and long term vision for study choice by federal authorities/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Europe/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Europe/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Marketing/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Multidisciplinary communication/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Decides with the platform to whom communicate/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/journalists/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Industry public authorities/MX3 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
FR_EASW1/connexions with or belonging to pressure groups/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/weigh of lobbies -/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/Lobbying/Ho2 p4/Worst case, 6NPO
AT_EASW1/* detached from lobbyism/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
PT_EASW1/Lobbies;/Ho3 p4 (notes)/Worst case

Sustainability

GR_EASW1/Elimination of environmental damage/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
FR_EASW1/1) sustainability, equity, transparency-/MX3 p1/Best case, 3PUB 2NPO
FR_EASW1/sustainability: 3 pillars = social & societal + economic + environmental/MX3 p1/Best case, 3PUB 2NPO
FR_EASW1/(e.g. waste limitation, environmental cost, impact of projects and results)/MX3 p1/Best case, 3PUB 2NPO
FR_EASW1/None of the 3 pillars must be neglected,/MX3 p1/Best case, 3PUB 2NPO
FR_EASW1/even if their time scales are different./MX3 p1/Best case, 3PUB 2NPO
PT_EASW1/*Sustainability, traceability (Sustainability)//Worst case,
PT_EASW1/Take into account the ecological footprint/sustainability;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Environmental sustainability;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS

PT_EASW1/Environmental sustainability;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
UK_EASW1/Sustainability/Ho2 p3 (fig. 7)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/= -impact on environment/Ho2 p3 (fig. 7)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/= -environmental ethics approval/Ho2 p3 (fig. 7)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/Nat. resources/Ho3 p3 (fig. 13)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
AT_EASW1/- sustainability taken into account/HoBUS p1/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/- environmental impact/HoBUS p1/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/* sustainability (environment, health, ~)/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
TK_EASW1/Research projects aiming sustainable environment and renewable energy policies/MX1 p1/1/Best case,
TK_EASW1/Giving priority to the efficient use of Soil, Water, and Energy Resources (i.e. waste management, recycling, bio fuel, etc.)./MX3 p1/1/Best case,
IT_EASW1/* increased productivity with less land/Ho1 p1 (fig. 1)/Best case, 5BUS
IT_EASW1/* to improve the quality (health impact) on agricultural land/Ho2 p1 (fig. 2)/Topics, 5NPO 1OTH
IT_EASW1/- sustainable production/Ho2 p1 (fig. 2)/Topics, 5NPO 1OTH
IT_EASW1/* attention to seasonal products/Ho2 p1 (fig. 2)/Best case, 5NPO 1OTH
IT_EASW1/1) Recycling overproduction/Ho3 p1 (fig. 3)/Best case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/feasibility, sustainability, transparency,/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
FR_EASW1/palm oil/Ho2 p2/Worst case, 6NPO
FR_EASW1/Criteria characterising sustainable (A), fair (B) and transparent (C) innovation and research programmes on food and health/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B: collaborative (several teams)/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B: transdisciplinary (sociologists, doctors)/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B,C: public -private partnerships/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: large and regular budgets/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: simple administrative procedures/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/C: publication of evaluation procedures/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B,C: independent evaluators/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: flexibility (pilot project and large project)/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: possibility to implement again a pilot project, at another time and/or another place/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B,C: large dissemination of programmes (communication)/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B, C: reasonable deadlines for answering the calls for projects/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: follow-up of the projects and evaluation/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/C: involvement of [stakeholders] {actors} from the civil society within the programming and {the} selection [processes]/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: fractionated payments, depending on the results of the milestones/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A: fractionated payments, depending on the reports on project etapes/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/B: counselling for project holders (administrative and scientific)/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A, B, C: confidentiality/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A, B, C: trust relationship between financers and project holder (dialogue, availability)/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/A, B, C: UNREADABLE = ethics/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
AT_EASW1/incl. socio ecological impact/MX3 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB

Public interest

GR_EASW1/To have public interest as a priority/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/To ensure the reasonable and ethical (fair) use of research results, to avoid limiting them to private interest or to contradict public needs and interests./MX3 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
FR_EASW1/connexions with or belonging to pressure groups/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/weigh of lobbies -/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/worst criterion = marketing criterion/Ho2 p3/Worst case, 6NPO
FR_EASW1/Lobbying/Ho2 p4/Worst case, 6NPO
PT_EASW1/7. Ethics, social/public interest, health, needs, direct utility for the individual, innovation./Ho2 p3 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/8. When a project is focused on a particular interest./Ho2 p3 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/9. Not used for own benefit (institutional or political)./Ho2 p4 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/Promotion of jobs and mobility;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Respecting the public interest;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/union between the business and social interest/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS

UK_EASW1/Profit/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/= -food industry/Ho2 p2 (fig. 6)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/Based on jobs/future work/Ho3 p3 (fig. 13)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/Not selected on £ gain or personal interests/Ho3 p3 (fig. 13)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/Personal interests/Ho3 p3 (fig. 13)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/Economic _"_/Ho3 p3 (fig. 13)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/Single interests/Ho3 p4 (fig. 14)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* Industry with commercial interest/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
AT_EASW1/* driven by industry * science driven (1)/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/* driven by industry/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/* by industry or in dependency on industry,/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/laboratories in industrial hand, little research at universities/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/non-profit research/ HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/influenced by economic interest/relations/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/only prospect for profit decides [i.e. decision is only based on a criterion of profitability]/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/the more non-profit orientated the project/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/, the higher the funding/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
TK_EASW1/Commercial concern is in the first place in food production/Ho1 p4/5/Worst case, 4NPO 2OTH
TK_EASW1/Wrong researches are supported and important ones ignored/Ho1 p4/5/Worst case, 4NPO 2OTH
TK_EASW1/* Consumer has the right to reach/MX2 p1/1/Best case,
AT_EASW1/* relevance for citizen (groups of)/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/but also for small groups/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB

Social benefit

GR_EASW1/Improvement of the quality of life/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/To take into consideration the characteristics of the population group/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/that is also the receiver of the results/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/The design should be in line with the demands/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/of the general society and the modern way of life/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/The design of each research should take under/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
GR_EASW1/consideration the immediate needs of the final receivers/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
FR_EASW1/match between: public health needs/MX2 p4/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
SK_EASW1/Range of benefits with regard to the size of target group·/MX2 p2 (n.5.2)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/sense of quality of life of citizens·/MX2 p2 (n.5.2)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Responsibility for health/MX2 p2 (n.5.2)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Socio -economical contribution,/MX3 p2 (n.6.2)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/No emphasis on the consumer well -being./Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/Economic, social and financial impact of the results; Sustainability./Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case,
PT_EASW1/Welfare and health;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
UK_EASW1/-wider benefits/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
NL_EASW1/a. No research which does not specifically/Ho3 p1/Worst case, diverse
NL_EASW1/states the social relevance of the research./Ho3 p1/Worst case, diverse
NL_EASW1/c. Criteria on the use of results/revenues:/MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
AT_EASW1/- consumers' health/HoBUS p1/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/impact on health , consumers' quality of life/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/GREENPEACE " social benefit coefficient/MX4 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
TK_EASW1/Civil society opinion is ignored/Ho1 p2/5/Worst case, 4NPO 2OTH
AT_EASW1/incl. socio ecological impact/MX3 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
PT_EASW1/social/economic impact./MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS

Local and regional aspects are important

PT_EASW1/Local decisions adapted to the culture;/Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
UK_EASW1/-not considering level e.g. Local/national or which decision is being made and what this means (eg resource allocation and needs of different communities/Ho2 p2 (fig. 6)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/Regional/National/International/MX2 p2 (fig 19)/Best case, 2PUB 2***
ES_EASW1/- Influence over decision-making by agencies more localized/MX1 p1/(blue)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/with more direct knowledge of the problem/MX1 p1/(blue)/Best case,
IT_EASW1/* short supply chain model on local production/Ho2 p1 (fig. 2)/Best case, 5NPO 1OTH
IT_EASW1/* attention to the national peculiarity/Ho3 p1 (fig. 3)/Best case, 7PUB

GR_EASW1/Supporting and reinforcing traditional, local characteristics that have developed based on the actual needs of the population and are in line with the geographical qualities, with the participation of all consumers./MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
GR_EASW1/Decision making processes should take under consideration/MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
GR_EASW1/the opinions and positions of the local communities affected,/MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
GR_EASW1/represented in committees formed by lottery and of one year service/MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
GR_EASW1/without possibility to be re-elected,/MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
GR_EASW1/and their positions should be subject of public negotiation/MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
GR_EASW1/Banning of the ministerial immunity of prosecution and establishing specific fines to the politicians who do not take under consideration the positions of local communities/MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
UK_EASW1/Regional Aspects/MX2 p1 (fig 18)/Best case, 2PUB 2***
PT_EASW1/Geographic Region;/Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/What is a strategic priority for the region;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
AT_EASW1/national level: analogous panels ensure that all relevant sections of the population are taken into account/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
SK_EASW1/National level – interdepartmental · A1/MX2 p1 (n.5.1)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB

Impact

GR_EASW1/Long -term impact (the results should be useful for a long period of time)/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
FR_EASW1/no follow -up nor perspectives -/Ho1 p5/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/No continuity at the long term;/Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
UK_EASW1/No scientific gain/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/= -potential to impact/change/Ho2 p3 (fig. 7)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/Impact/Ho3 p3 (fig. 13)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/Insignificance/Ho3 p3 (fig. 13)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/Significance/relative value/Ho3 p4 (fig. 14)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/-talk with sectors who will be impacted by research/MX1 p2 (fig 16)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/Long term impact/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* Only in the project group- society impact/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* Short term impact (economy) tw lesb/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* Impact/uptake/p8: MX1/Best case, 2PUB 1BUS 1BUS/ENT 2***
AT_EASW1/"IMPACT"?/MX2 p2/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
ES_EASW1/Actual impact of the outcome of the project (not just of optimum management) sustainability?/MX1 2/3 (blue)/Best case,
BE_EASW1/ Awards Focus on demonstrated impact/MX1 p1/Best case, 3 delegates
DK_EASW1/* Not relevant for the society nor trade unleserlich/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
AT_EASW1/impact on health , consumers' quality of life/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
PT_EASW1/Economic, social and financial impact of the results; Sustainability./Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case,
AT_EASW1/incl. socio ecological impact/MX3 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
PT_EASW1/social/economic impact./MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS

Applicability of results

GR_EASW1/Guide for the immediate design and implementation of policies/MX2 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
FR_EASW1/no practical applications -/Ho1 p5/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/How can we valorise research?/Ho3 p1/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/Public research -> valorisation is not obvious [for industry managers]/Ho3 p1/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/Collective research/Ho3 p1/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/{research applied by the sector/Ho3 p1/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/(by a group of enterprises from the same sector) -/reported/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/- - > the research is implemented by the whole sector;/reported/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/very applicable results, but no advantage in market competition/reported/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/R&D -> is valorised by the company/Ho3 p1/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/in its sector, as an advantage for market competition/reported/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/{valorisable?}/Ho3 p1/Reflections, 4BUS
SK_EASW1/2. Model of application/Ho1 p2 (n.1.1)/Best Case, 4NPO
SK_EASW1/Customer·/Ho2 p4 (n.2.3)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Results are not applicable/Ho2 p4 (n.2.3)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/Not explored economically./Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case,
PT_EASW1/technology transfer;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS

PT_EASW1/Validation of new products and production technologies;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Address real problems; simple and non -bureaucratic programmes;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Should be used;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
UK_EASW1/No end product food/health/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/Limited population (e.g. obese, metabolic sx)/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/Lack support food industry – they are the driver, not open to change/Ho1 p4 (fig. 4)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/knowledge transfer/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
AT_EASW1/- practicability --->are not sufficiently/HoBUS p1/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/*) innovative solutions remain unused at university [level] or other levels/HoBUS p1/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/*) the focus often lies too much on the number of publications and not enough on utilization/HoBUS p1/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/—→ Implementation and marketability should get more attention/HoBUS p2/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/retrospective investigation of/by putting into practice/MX2 p2/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/marketable implementation/implementation of innovation/MX2 p2/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/- active support of valorisation/MX4 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
ES_EASW1/- Lack of technology transfer/Ho1 p2 (blue)/Worst case, 4BUS 1OTH
ES_EASW1/- Lack of utilisation of research agendas of technological platforms and other agencies/Ho1 p2 (blue)/Worst case, 4BUS 1OTH
ES_EASW1/- Non -efficient OTRIS (Offices for the Transference of Research Results)/Ho2 p2 (red)/Worst case, 5PUB
ES_EASW1/- Lack of capacity for undertaking research in transfer towards companies or its research sector/Ho2 p2 (red)/Worst case, 5PUB
ES_EASW1/Useful research outcome for the sector sustainability?/MX2 1/3 (red)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- projects with participation of companies. sustainability?/MX3 2/3 (green)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- with potential for transfer sustainability?/MX3 2/3 (green)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- Align scientific quality and economic return sustainability?/MX3 2/3 (green)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- actual potential for exploitation (company) and dissemination real - - -> actual/MX3 3/3 (green)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- Economically viable/MX3 3/3 (green)/Best case,

Demand for and marketability of research results

GR_EASW1/Based on the size of the problem/MX2 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
SK_EASW1/Order from practice/Ho2 p3 (n.2.2)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Awareness about practice/Ho2 p3 (n.2.2)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Customer of research/Ho2 p3 (n.2.2)/Worst case, 9PUB
UK_EASW1/-emerging problems/horizon scanning/MX1 p1 (fig 15)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
ES_EASW1/The R&D+i in food does not always bring value to the consumer because it does not meet their demands./Ho2 p2 (red)/Worst case, 4BUS
ES_EASW1/- the R&D+i needs do not always arise from the recipients/Ho3 p2 (green)/Worst case, 4BUS
ES_EASW1/- There is A gap between the scientific community and agro -food sector (double track)/Ho3 p2 (green)/Worst case, 4BUS
ES_EASW1/- based on actual needs of the industry/productive fabric (consumer) tejido productivo - - -> productive tissue, web,:::/MX1 p1/(green)/Best case,
BE_EASW1/Public opinion ? scientific opinion, real needs/MX2 p1/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Research needs *| | legal aspects/MX2 p2/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Research needs *|/MX2 p2/Best case, 4 delegates
BE_EASW1/Results | Research needs *| Society/MX2 p2/Best case, 4 delegates
TK_EASW1/Researches are not interested in contemporary problems/Ho1 p3/5/Worst case, 4NPO 2OTH
TK_EASW1/Wasting the resources unwisely in researches/Ho2 p1/1/Worst case, 4BUS
TK_EASW1/While determining the priority research areas the demands and necessities of the society are ignored/Ho2 p1/1/Worst case, 4BUS
PT_EASW1/Market need;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/7. Ethics, social/public interest, health, needs, direct utility for the individual, innovation./Ho2 p3 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
FR_EASW1/market demand (enterprises)-/MX1 p3/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/societal demand-/MX1 p3/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/public authorities demand/MX1 p3/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/match between: public health needs/MX2 p4/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS

PT_EASW1/Market opportunity and alignment with the predefined strategy./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
AT_EASW1/—→ Implementation and marketability should get more attention/HoBUS p2/Worst case, 9BUS
GR_EASW1/To be defined by the final receivers of the research results/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***

Basic research

FR_EASW1/Potential tensions between basic research and applied research./MX2 p4/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
NL_EASW1/a. No balance between fundamental and applied science:/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
NL_EASW1/c. Direct and indirect relevance:/Ho3 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/fundamental and applied/MX2 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/broader/MX2 p1/Best case, diverse
AT_EASW1/• restriction of knowledge/understanding-oriented research2)/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB

Bibliometric indicators

PT_EASW1/Excessive focus on bibliometrics;/Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
DK_EASW1/* Not only do research because of merit or H-index steht anders/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
DK_EASW1/* Not only produce scientific results because of merit or H-index/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
AT_EASW1/* oriented towards outcomes [suitable] for journals/HoPUB p2/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/* no (wrong) output criteria (in applied research)/HoPUB p2/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/* purely oriented on administrative criteria/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/* orientated towards "sexy" journals (topics) (3)/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/*) the focus often lies too much on the number of publications and not enough on utilization/HoBUS p1/Worst case, 9BUS

Research fashions

FR_EASW1/opportunity or fashion effect -/Ho1 p5/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/Fashion effects/Ho2 p4/Worst case, 6NPO
UK_EASW1/Fashion/Ho3 p4 (fig. 14)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
NL_EASW1/b. Not only uniform research [is wanted] mat multidisciplinarte/Ho2 p1/Worst Case, diverse
AT_EASW1/* orientated towards "sexy" journals (topics) (3)/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/non-transparent use of (shallow) buzzwords/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO

Availability of results

GR_EASW1/The results should be available and accessible to the wider public/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***
FR_EASW1/publication in “confidential” journals -/Ho1 p6/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/Sharing the results ((-))./MX2 p3/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
SK_EASW1/6. -/- and publishing of results A6/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/10. There is no science without sharing knowledge;/Ho2 p4 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/science should be shared; should be defined that the research should share the knowledge created and scientific findings./Ho2 p4 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/Should be applied and disseminated in case it is of public interest./MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
UK_EASW1/open access – not patent (use for all)/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/-only positives, rarely negatives/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/Freedom of information act to company trials/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/-drug trials are public knowledge/released, rarely food/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/High secrecy/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/-dissemination & sharing – openness/Ho2 p3 (fig. 7)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/results shouldn’t be published in paid-for journals/Ho2 p4 (fig. 8)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/negative results shouldn’t be suppressed/Ho2 p4 (fig. 8)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/data sources behind results not made available/Ho2 p4 (fig. 8)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/Lack of access to previous research/Ho2 p6 (fig. 10)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/accessible outcomes/reporting/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* Closed/isolated/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* The results of public research may not be held secret/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
DK_EASW1/(or be taken out a patent)/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
DK_EASW1/* Basic research - secret results/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH

DK_EASW1/* Closed fora/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
DK_EASW1/* Public available ?Companies/society/p8: MX1/Best case, 2PUB 1BUS 1BUS/ENT 2***
DK_EASW1/* Linkage of results ~ society/p8: MX1/Best case, 2PUB 1BUS 1BUS/ENT 2***
NL_EASW1/negative research publications/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
NL_EASW1/e. No avoidance of negative research publication(s)/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
AT_EASW1/* no open access (open data)/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/data protection as excuse/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/gather dust in drawers [shelves]/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/are kept secret (especially if results [are] unpopular)/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/public/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/accessible/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/difficult access or access only for "big, established institutions" (3)/HoNPO p2/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/easier access/HoNPO p2/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/* open access open data/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/* free university research (basic + applied):/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/full public accessibility/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/* commissioned cooperative research:/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/limited accessibility/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/Realization by applicable/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/products, methods, procedures/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
AT_EASW1/open data/MX3 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/NGOs, schools, not only scientific community/MX3 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/- making results public rapidly/MX4 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/- publication of negative/neutral results/MX4 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
ES_EASW1/- innovation brokers (New technologies)/MX2 2/3 (red)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- Open access to publications (research outcomes)/MX2 2/3 (red)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- Informational publications ("translate" scientific language into common/MX2 2/3 (red)/Best case,
BE_EASW1/ No communication/Ho2 p1/Worst case, 3PUB, 1OTH
BE_EASW1/ Public Research Data: free exchange, no direct interest/MX2 p2/Best case, 4 delegates
TK_EASW1/The difficulty of reaching the outcomes of research/Ho2 p1/1/Worst case, 4BUS
TK_EASW1/Scientific data (not available/not in use)/Ho3 p1/2/Worst case, 6PUB
TK_EASW1/Gathering all the research outcomes related to food in a unique database and sharing them with the stakeholders/MX1 p1/1/Best case,
TK_EASW1/* Sharing the outcomes with community/MX2 p1/1/Best case,

Non-selective, full publication of results

FR_EASW1/Give both positive and negative sides/Ho2 p4/Worst case, 6NPO
FR_EASW1/Sharing the results ((-))./MX2 p3/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
UK_EASW1/-only positives, rarely negatives/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/negative results shouldn't be suppressed/Ho2 p4 (fig. 8)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/No cherry picking/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
NL_EASW1/negative research publications/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
NL_EASW1/e. No avoidance of negative research publication(s)/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
AT_EASW1/are kept secret (especially if results [are] unpopular)/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/- publication of negative/neutral results/MX4 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB

No distortion of results

FR_EASW1/wrong use of the results for political or economic objectives -/Ho1 p6/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/distortion of the results for political or economic NOT READABLE/Ho1 p6/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/subjective presentation -/Ho1 p6/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/extrapolation of animal results to human being -/Ho1 p6/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/raise false hopes or worries -/Ho1 p6/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/extreme simplification [leading] to disinformation/Ho1 p6/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/cut and fake results/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
UK_EASW1/Rash of judgments/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/Media spin on findings making them more impressive than what they really are/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/Consumer beliefs guided by media/lack of education of consumer/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/No individual organization allowed to twist results & use as marketing tool/Ho2 p4 (fig. 8)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/not used in isolation from wider results & wider context/Ho2 p4 (fig. 8)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/No cherry picking/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***

UK_EASW1/Not generalize outside original context/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* Unconfirmed by researchers unleserl/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* Over interpret without reservations wahrscheinlich/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
DK_EASW1/* Single result out of context/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
DK_EASW1/* "My" result without connections/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
DK_EASW1/* That the project can save the world/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
DK_EASW1/* Partial- out of context/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
AT_EASW1/medially one-sidedly blown up/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/results presented in a distorted way/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
BE_EASW1/ Bad communication/Ho2 p1/Worst case, 3PUB, 1OTH

Targeted dissemination activities

SK_EASW1/Expert centre of implementation for target groups ·/MX3 p1 (n.6.1)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
UK_EASW1/no dissemination to relevant people/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/-dissemination/influence plan (who, what, where)/MX1 p2 (fig 16)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/Academic -> layperson/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/-policy/practical application/practitioners/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/-send information/how to use to the mass population/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* Not goal-oriented n l/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* Dissemination to the target group/p8: MX1/Best case, 2PUB 1BUS 1BUS/ENT 2***
AT_EASW1/are not presented in a comprehensible way/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/well prepared [for presentation]/HoNPO p1/Worst case, 8NPO
AT_EASW1/* popular scientifically editing (budget!)/MX1 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/presented in an intelligible way/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
ES_EASW1/Information has to reach the "user": Creating channels of dissemination. ha - - > has to?/MX1 2/3 (blue)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- Faster/MX3 2/3 (green)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- Cheaper/MX3 2/3 (green)/Best case,
BE_EASW1/ Difficulties to translate results to decision makers/Ho1 p1/Worst case, 4PUB 1***
BE_EASW1/Suitable communication/MX1 p1/Best case, 3 delegates
ES_EASW1/- Informational publications ("translate" scientific language into common/MX2 2/3 (red)/Best case,
UK_EASW1/Targeted to right people/Ho1 p2 (fig. 2)/Worst case, 2PUB

IPR

FR_EASW1/Problem about research protection/Ho3 p1/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/in the food sector (return on investment)/Ho3 p1/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/no patent allowed on recipes/reported/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/=> very weak protection system for innovations)/reported/Reflections, 4BUS
SK_EASW1/Owner of innovations/MX3 p3 (n.6.3)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Applicant – cooperation contract –/MX3 p3 (n.6.3)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/agreement with co -partners in project/MX3 p3 (n.6.3)/Best case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/Definition of the rules during the project. Defined in a non -professional way/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/(should include lawyers, offices of technology transfer)/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/define in the beginning./MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
UK_EASW1/Expensive/patented technologies IP of methodologies e.g questionnaire design/Ho2 p6 (fig. 10)/Worst case, 1NPO 1***
UK_EASW1/No one person or organization owns results/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* The results may not be distortion of competition/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
DK_EASW1/* Rights and patents may not limit relevant research topics/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
DK_EASW1/* Disrespect for business investment/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
NL_EASW1/a. Companies are owner their innovations, without revolving funds. /Ho3 p1/Worst case, diverse
NL_EASW1/private ---> xxxx/MX2 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/public ---> "open source"/MX2 p1/Best case, diverse
ES_EASW1/- Lack of intellectual property protection and awareness/Ho1 p2 (blue)/Worst case, 5PUB
ES_EASW1/- Very few patents are made/Ho3 p2 (green)/Worst case, 4BUS
ES_EASW1/Promotion of protection models - regime xxxx - - -> regime/MX1 2/3 (blue)/Best case
ES_EASW1/- Bolster/Promote Marketing of patents commercialisation/MX2 2/3 (red)/Best case
TK_EASW1/Protecting gene resources/MX3 p1/1/MX3/Best case

Less project administration

FR_EASW1/weigh of administration -/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/weigh of evaluation/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/lack of administrative means/Ho1 p7/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/2. Administrative works/Ho3 p3 (n.3.3)/Worst case, 8BUS
DK_EASW1/* Economic administration/p2: Ho1/Worst case, 7PUB
DK_EASW1/* Reporting for the sake of reporting/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
NL_EASW1/Complex and bureaucratic criteria/Ho3 p1/Worst case, diverse
AT_EASW1/* purely oriented on administrative criteria/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/* high administrative requirements 5)/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/- "endless" proposal phase/HoBUS p2/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/- unreliable and slow flow of payments/HoBUS p2/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/- drown research by “over-administration”, suffocation, hamper beforehand, discourage, etc./HoBUS p2/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/* quick administration of funding/MX1 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/little bureaucracy/MX3 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/Acknowledgement of overheads/MX3 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/- unbureaucratic + quick) + content orientated/MX4 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
ES_EASW1/- Excessive bureaucracy/Ho2 p2 (red)/Worst case, 5PUB
TK_EASW1/Commercialization (Legislation) Bureacracy/Ho3 p2/2/Worst case, 6PUB
FR_EASW1/A: simple administrative procedures/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
AT_EASW1/but not with overboarding bureaucracy/MX4 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
PT_EASW1/Address real problems; simple and non-bureaucratic programmes;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS

Project monitoring

SK_EASW1/Monitoring the value added of project!!/MX1 p2 (n.4.2)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Project curse and its results should be controlled by the committee·/MX1 p2 (n.4.2)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/monitoring of those studies (example, public health)./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
UK_EASW1/quality control/checks/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/milestones/project adjustment if needed/MX1 p3 (fig 17)/Best case, 1PUB 1BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* Milestones/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
AT_EASW1/* controlling the execution of objectives/MX1 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/* robust "end points" versus surrogates/MX1 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/- controlling [impartially overseeing] ---> during the project/MX4 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
FR_EASW1/A: fractionated payments, depending on the results of the milestones/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
PT_EASW1/participative processes with monitoring and audition/Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/Should be involved in the planning, monitoring and evaluation./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS

Ex-post evaluation

DK_EASW1/* Evaluation of output/p8: MX1/Best case, 2PUB 1BUS 1BUS/ENT 2***
SK_EASW1/Funding provider – post evaluation/MX3 p3 (n.6.3)/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Outcomes of post evaluation should be taken into account for the following funding/MX3 p3 (n.6.3)/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 3PUB
UK_EASW1/Evaluation of results/Ho1 p3 (fig. 3)/Worst case, 2PUB
AT_EASW1/- after research, the practical use of the results is not investigated/HoBUS p2/Worst case, 9BUS
AT_EASW1/- target/actual comparison [should be/is comparison]/MX4 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/but not with overboarding bureaucracy/MX4 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/----> learning for the future/MX4 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
ES_EASW1/- Greater assessment of the outcome, final assessment. mayor evaluaciòn de los resultados, eval final/MX2 2/3 (red)/Best case,
ES_EASW1/- scientific quality: the project and Groups [wherein participated]/MX3 3/3 (green)/Best case,
TK_EASW1/This institution also should do the follow-up of the effectiveness of these researches./MX1 p1/1/Best case,
TK_EASW1/The system in which the process and outcomes are effectively followed-up and evaluated/MX1 p1/1/MX1/Best case,
TK_EASW1/* Research outcomes are evaluated/MX2 p1/1/Best case,
AT_EASW1/* negative results are ignored (4)/HoPUB p2/Worst case, 7PUB

AT_EASW1/Acknowledgement of negative results,/MX3 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/resp. not desired results/MX3 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB

Funds

FR_EASW1/Tax reduction for researchè/Ho3 p5/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/complementary financial [sources]/MX1 p3/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/finance large research programmes/MX2 p2/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/but/also financially support emerging projects (fairness)/MX2 p2/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/Financing amounts/MX2 p3/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/financial means: fair contributions/MX3 p1/Best case, 3PUB 2NPO
SK_EASW1/Installement delay·/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Undersized funding (project)·/Ho2 p2 (n.2.1)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/undersized funding consequently (after the excellence centres)·/Ho2 p5 (n.2.4)/Worst case, 9PUB
SK_EASW1/Fundraising, lotteries· A1/MX2 p2 (n.5.2)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
SK_EASW1/Funding from EU, Norway (EEAA Grants), tax on alcohol/cigarettes B. A1/MX2 p2 (n.5.2)/Best case, 2NPO 2BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/no financing./Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
UK_EASW1/Cost/no funding/Ho1 p4 (fig. 4)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/Need to increase funding in food/health area/Ho1 p4 (fig. 4)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/Adequate funding/Ho1 p4 (fig. 4)/Worst case, 2PUB
UK_EASW1/Barriers: £ Availability/Ho3 p4 (fig. 14)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
UK_EASW1/Money not problem/MX2 p2 (fig 19)/Best Case, 2PUB 2***
NL_EASW1/b. Budget per research theme:/MX1 p1/Best case, diverse
AT_EASW1/* overheads are not acknowledged/HoPUB p2/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/* size of European research funding/HoPUB p2/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/amount of funds./MX3 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
ES_EASW1/- Poor planning in the funding of projects/Ho1 p2 (blue)/Worst case, 4BUS 1OTH
ES_EASW1/- Inadequate funding throughout the duration of the project/Ho1 p2 (blue)/Worst case, 4BUS 1OTH
ES_EASW1/- Lack of correlation between project funding and execution/Ho1 p2 (blue)/Worst case, 4BUS 1OTH
PT_EASW1/Lack of continuity of the financing./Ho3 p6 (notes)/Worst case
ES_EASW1/- Very long periods to resolve and to fund/Ho1 p2 (blue)/Worst case, 4BUS 1OTH
ES_EASW1/- funding in time according to the project goal. long term vs. short term/MX1 p1/(green)/Best case,
AT_EASW1/- unreliable and slow flow of payments/HoBUS p2/Worst case, 9BUS
FR_EASW1/A: large and regular budgets/MX1 p1/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS

Time

FR_EASW1/Ambiguity in time scales:/Ho3 p2/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/Politic: yesterday/Ho3 p2/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/Consumer: today/Ho3 p2/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/Enterprise: tomorrow/Ho3 p2/Reflections, 4BUS
FR_EASW1/Scientist: the day after tomorrow/Ho3 p3/Reflections, 4BUS
SK_EASW1/possibility to end project prematurely/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/Decisions are taken in a limited time and without the purpose of being an added -value for the area of food and health./Ho2 p3 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/11. The non-financing. In the current Portuguese context, the project grants are given within a limited time, which can be a barrier to the development of sustainable projects./Ho2 p4 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/No defined scheduling of the calls;/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/No commitment to the defined schedule of the calls, and the time for their evaluation;/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case,
PT_EASW1/Development of longitudinal studies in the area of nutritional epidemiology,/MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Give time to provide answers./MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Rigorous schedule;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
AT_EASW1/Option to end projects [prematurely]/MX3 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/quicker decision making/MX3 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
ES_EASW1/- Very long periods to resolve and to fund/Ho1 p2 (blue)/Worst case, 4BUS 1OTH
ES_EASW1/- funding in time according to the project goal. long term vs short term/MX1 p1/(green)/Best case,
AT_EASW1/- making results public rapidly/MX4 p1/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/* long term studies/MX1 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
AT_EASW1/* long term projects > 3 years/MX1 p2/Best case, 2BUS 2NPO 2PUB
GR_EASW1/Long -term impact (the results should be useful for a long period of time)/MX1 p1/Best case, 2PUB 1NPO 1***

FR_EASW1/Flexibility but rigour in the deadlines for implementation and provision of the results/MX2 p1/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
DK_EASW1/* Missing continuity/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
FR_EASW1/B, C: reasonable deadlines for answering the calls for projects/MX1 p2/Best case, 4PUB 1NPO 1BUS
AT_EASW1/• purely short-time topics/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB

Continuity

PT_EASW1/Ensure sustainability of the programme after its end;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Sustainability of financing programmes (projects prolonged in time);/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Integrated,but not volatile programmes./MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Needs more attention in order to ensure future activities are oriented;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
UK_EASW1/Followup research/MX2 p2 (fig 19)/Best case, 2PUB 2***
DK_EASW1/* Missing continuity/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
AT_EASW1/• purely short-time topics/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB
AT_EASW1/* no continuity/HoPUB p1/Worst case, 7PUB

Cumulating effects

FR_EASW1/Structure of the consortium/MX2 p1/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
SK_EASW1/Decrease the number of projects,/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/promote centres of competence;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Increase the demand through networks of clusters;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
DK_EASW1/* Project funding must not be given to the same (known) organisations/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
DK_EASW1/without new consortium compositions/p6: Ho3/Worst case, 1NPO 2BUS 2OTH
NL_EASW1/a. Focus on a closed small group of large players Je richten/Ho3 p1/Worst case, diverse
BE_EASW1/ Fragmentation/Ho1 p1/Worst case, 4PUB 1***
BE_EASW1/€ National Fragmented/Ho1 p1/Worst case, 4PUB 1***
ES_EASW1/- Duplication of groups or centres/Ho2 p2 (red)/Worst case, 5PUB
NL_EASW1/c. No reputation led/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
PT_EASW1/The idea/project should be audited. Not evaluate the idea/project but only the CV./Ho1 p4: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
AT_EASW1/difficult access or access only for "big, established institutions" (3)/HoNPO p2/Worst case, 8NPO

Politics

GR_EASW1/government institutions/Ho1 p2/Worst case, 8NPO 1BUS
GR_EASW1/government institutions/Ho1 p2/Worst case, 8NPO 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Alignment with politics;/MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
UK_EASW1/Political Interests/Ho3 p4 (fig. 14)/Worst case, 2BUS 1***
DK_EASW1/* ”Political compromise”/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
DK_EASW1/* Political basis of distribution/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
DK_EASW1/* By politicians/p4: Ho2/Worst case, 4BUS 1ENT
NL_EASW1/b. Substantial political criteria/Ho2 p1/Worst case, diverse
TK_EASW1/Scientific research outcomes are not reflected to the policies/Ho1 p4/5/Worst case, 4NPO 2OTH
TK_EASW1/The community is being misguided by the ones who are not competent or expert on the food/nutrition/Ho2 p1/1/Worst case, 4BUS
PT_EASW1/Non -alignment of the various public politics over different mandates;/Ho3 p6 (notes)/Worst case
FR_EASW1/decision made by a ministry alone, with no consultation of scientists -/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/political interests -/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
GR_EASW1/Criteria: based on profit, or political gain (from governments)/Ho1 p2/Worst case, 8NPO 1BUS
SK_EASW1/A. 1. Depolitizised public institution in cooperation with Higher Education institutions. A1/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB
PT_EASW1/Politics done through the evaluation of projects/Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/(the politics should be independent and previously defined;/Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
PT_EASW1/this way, institutions that didn’t have approved projects have a chance to have them approved);/Ho1 p5: (notes)/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/wrong use of the results for political or economic objectives -/Ho1 p6/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/distortion of the results for political or economic NOT READABLE/Ho1 p6/Worst case, 9PUB
GR_EASW1/Banning of the ministerial immunity of prosecution and establishing specific fines to the politicians who do not take under consideration the positions of local communities/MX4 p1/Best case, 2NPO 1PUB 1***
SK_EASW1/A.1. Politicians, should decide about the topics./Ho1 p2 (n.1.1)/Best Case, 4NPO

PT_EASW1/3. Can and should be involved in decisions, taking into account that these decisions will have to be a result of an evaluation of representatives of the civil society and not only the political view./Ho2 p3 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
PT_EASW1/9. Not used for own benefit (institutional or political)./Ho2 p4 (notes)/Worst case, 2NPO
SK_EASW1/A.1. Politicians, should decide about the topics./Ho1 p2 (n.1.1)/Best Case, 4NPO
NL_EASW1/a. Who decides for the research themes/topics:/MX2 p1/Best case, diverse
NL_EASW1/the scientists, the politicians, the industry and the citizens/MX2 p1/Best case, diverse
SK_EASW1/4. Depoliticised public institution A4/MX1 p1 (n.4.1)/Best case, 1NPO 3BUS 3PUB

Research strategy

FR_EASW1/no orientation of programme/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/no goal/orientation defined/Ho1 p4/Worst case, 9PUB
FR_EASW1/3 x 3 years themes: food & nutrition -/MX2 p1/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/2 x 3 years specific topics -/MX2 p1/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/Avoid “sprinkling”,/MX2 p1/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
PT_EASW1/Without communication between ministries;/Ho3 p4 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/Without a long term vision./Ho3 p4 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/- Not finance what is strategic;/Ho3 p4 (notes)/Worst case,
PT_EASW1/Lack of strategic vision in the long term;/Ho3 p5 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/Non-alignment of the various public politics over different mandates;/Ho3 p6 (notes)/Worst case
PT_EASW1/Key technologies;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Definition of concrete and objective areas of operation;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/What is a strategic priority for the region;/MX1 (notes Tab10)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/should be aligned with a strategy that includes know -how on the health sector;/MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/aligned with strategies of intervention,/MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Based on a defined strategy, establishing priorities and taking into account financial tools./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Market opportunity and alignment with the predefined strategy./MX2 (notes Tab12)/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 2BUS
PT_EASW1/Integrated in a strategic vision in the long term, with the involvement of all stakeholders;/MX3 (notes Tab14)/Best case, 4PUB 1BUS
DK_EASW1/* Goal oriented/p8: MX1/Best case, 2PUB 1BUS 1BUS/ENT 2***
NL_EASW1/Ad-random establishment of programme/Ho3 p1/Worst case, diverse
AT_EASW1/broad collection of topics to work out a research strategy/(using the existing infra structure - FFG!) + NGOs/MX2 p1/Best case, 3 BUS 2 NPO 1 PUB
ES_EASW1/- Spain: should have positioning in strategic sectors for the country./MX2 1/3 (red)/Best case,
BE_EASW1/NO long term vision (loss of expertise…)/Ho1 p1/Worst case, 4PUB 1***
FR_EASW1/finance large research programmes/MX2 p2/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS
FR_EASW1/but/also financially support emerging projects (fairness)/MX2 p2/Best case, 3PUB 1NPO 1BUS

Lists of common topics

Although the workshop structures, procedures and participant profiles are less homogeneous than originally planned, several common topics appear across this broad variety of workshops. Altogether, stakeholders who participated in the workshops named several research topics and areas. The areas and topics were clustered into 18 more general areas and topics, which address agricultural, economic, medical, natural, social and technical sciences and the humanities. This decision was made for pragmatic reasons in order to provide a better overview of the breadth of the themes under discussion. We are aware that different clusters – more or even less – could have been made. Areas and topics have not been ranked because of methodological concerns. Should clusters be ranked according to the number of workshops, of working groups or the number of participants in the working groups? And how should the number of topics in a cluster be accounted for? And how many "votes" should organizations receive if two or more delegates participated? For fairness, such organizations should not get more than one vote, but because it is not known for all working groups who participated in them, this is not feasible. The issue is further complicated by the fact that necessary re-categorizations of stakeholders made several homogeneous groups become heterogeneous ones. For these reasons, we only mention in how many working groups and workshops, areas topics were suggested.

List of common topics: Research areas/topics*
Affordability of healthy food *(3 civil society, 2 public sector groups; 4 workshops)*
Changing consumer behaviour *(6 public sector groups, 3 civil society, 3 mixed groups; 7 workshops)*
Understanding consumer behaviour *(6 private sector, 3 mixed, 3 civil society groups; 7 workshops)*
Consumer information *(4 civil society, 4 public sector groups, 1 private sector, 1 mixed group (private/public sector); 5 workshops)*
Control & regulation *(4 civil society, 2 private sector, 2 public sector groups, 1 mixed group, 6 workshops)*
Environmental sustainability *(5 public sector, 2 private sector, 2 civil society groups, 1 mixed group; 6 workshops)*
Topics of local/regional/national interest *(3 public sector, 3 NPO, 2 private sector groups; 6 workshops)*
Healthiness of food *(2 public sector groups, 1 civil society, 1 private sector, 1 mixed (private/public), 1 other mixed group; 5 workshops)*
Food ingredients and additives *(3 civil society, 3 public sector, 2 private sector groups, 1 mixed groups; 6 workshops)*
Specific nutrition needs *(4 public sector groups; 4 workshops)*
Food safety *(4 public sector, 2 civil society, 1 private sector, 1 mixed (private/public) group, 1 other mixed group; 5 workshops)*
Food supply availability *(4 public sector, 2 civil society groups; 5 workshops)*
New food products *(4 public sector, 2 private sector, 2 civil society groups, 1 mixed group; 6 workshops)*
Genetically modified organisms *(3 public sector, 2 private sector groups; 5 workshops)*
Food quality *(4 public sector groups, 1 private sector group, 1 mixed group (public/private); 5 workshops)*
Food production *(3 private sector, 2 public sector groups; 4 workshops)*
Food processing *(4 public sector groups, 1 mixed group (public/private); 4 workshops)*
Meta level topics *(3 public sector, 3 private sector groups, 1 civil society group, 2 mixed groups; 7 workshops)*

Table 42: List of common topics: Research areas/topics

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

List of common topics: Research programming – Analysis 1**
Decision making on topics/areas/themes: • Involvement of stakeholders (14 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 7 workshops) • Put public interest first (9 groups with stakeholders mainly from the public sector and civil society groups; 5 workshops)
Decision making on project funding: • Independent, transparent and impartial, without conflicts of interest (15 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 6 workshops) • Knowledgeable reviewers (10 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 5 workshops) • Involve stakeholders (8 with stakeholders of all categories; 7 workshops) • No buddy systems (2 public sector, 1 civil society group; 3 workshops) • Avoid political agendas (3 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 3 workshops)
Quality criteria for funding: • Competent applicants (3 mixed groups, 2 public sector, 1 civil society group; 5 workshops) • Applicability of research results (2 mixed, 2 public sector groups, 1 civil civil society group; 5 workshops) • Environmental sustainability (6 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 4 workshops) • Social benefit (7 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 5 workshops)
Exploitation of results: • Make research results accessible, preferably beyond academia (15 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 6 workshops) • Open access to scientific publications (2 mixed groups, 1 public sector, 1 civil society group; 4 workshops) • Knowledge transfer (6 mixed, 3 private sector groups; 5 workshops) • Publish all results, also negative ones (3 civil society, 2 mixed groups, 1 public sector group; 4 workshops) • No distortion of results (8 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 4 workshops) • Targeted dissemination activities (3 mixed, 2 public sector groups, 1 civil society group; 3 workshops)
Evaluation: • Independence of evaluators/reviewers (8 groups with stakeholder of all categories; 6 workshops) • Clear evaluation criteria (4 mixed groups, 1 civil society, 1 public sector group; 4 workshops) • Involvement of stakeholders (3 mixed, 1 private sector, 1 civil society group; 5 workshops)
Project design: • Less project administration (2 public sector groups, 1 mixed group; 2 workshops) • Sufficient, reliable funding (2 mixed, 2 public sector groups in 2 workshops) • Flexibility in conducting a project (2 mixed groups, 1 public sector group; 2 workshops)

Table 43: List of common topics: Research programming – Analysis 1

List of common topics: Research programming – Analysis 2**
Involve stakeholders in research programming (37 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 11 workshops): Prepare a basis for it, which makes it transparent, inclusive and legitimate.
Objective, transparent decision-making in research programming • Transparency in the whole chain of research programming (19 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 8 workshops) • Impartiality and independence (20 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 9 workshops) • Clear criteria and rules (18 groups with stakeholders of all categories, weak representation of civil society; 7 workshops) • Competent reviewers (20 groups with stakeholders of all categories, weak representation of civil society; 7 workshops) • Avoid buddy systems (2 public sector groups, 1 civil society group; 3 workshops) • Avoid conflicts of interest (15 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 4 workshops) • Avoid lobbying, in particular lobbying by industry (12 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 7 workshops)
General criteria to be fulfilled by research programmes and projects • Environmental sustainability (17 groups with stakeholders of all categories, strong representation of the private sector; 7 workshops) • Public interest and social benefit (27 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 9 workshops) • Local/regional aspects taken into account (10 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 7 workshops)
Impact demanded of research programmes and projects • Social benefit (27 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 9 workshops) • Applicable results (17 groups with stakeholders of all categories, weak representation of civil society; 7 workshops) – *potential tension with social benefit* • Marketability of outcomes (14 groups with stakeholders of all categories, less representation of civil society, strong representation of the private sector; 9 workshops) – *potential tension with social benefit* • Do not neglect basic research in favour of applied research (5 groups with stakeholders of all categories, less representation of civil society; 3 workshops) - *potential tension with social benefit and demand for applicable results* • Reconsider measuring research impact by bibliometric indicators (4 groups with stakeholders of all categories, less representation of civil society; 3 workshops) - *potential tension with social benefit and demand for applicable results* • Avoid mostly promoting mainstream research and research fashions (6 groups with stakeholders of all categories, less representation of the private sector; 4 workshops) - *potential tension with social benefit and demand for applicable results*
Availability of results (25 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 11 workshops) • Non-selective publication of results (8 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 4 workshops) • No distortion of results (9 groups with stakeholders of all categories, strong representation of the public sector; 5 workshops) • Targeted dissemination (12 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 6 workshops)

• Handling of IPR (13 groups with stakeholders of all categories, strong representation of the private sector; 8 workshops)
Administration of research projects • Less project administration (13 groups with stakeholders of all categories, weak presentation of civil society; 9 workshops) – *potential tension with demand for project monitoring* • Project monitoring (8 groups with stakeholders of all categories, weak presentation of civil society; 6 workshops) • Final assessment of projects (ex-post evaluation) (11 groups with stakeholders of all categories, weak presentation of civil society; 6 workshops) • Sufficient funds (17 groups with stakeholders of all categories, weak presentation of civil society; 7 workshops) • Sufficient time (16 groups with stakeholders of all categories, weak presentation of civil society; 8 workshops) • Continuity in research (5 groups with stakeholders of all categories, weak presentation of civil society; 4 workshops)
Warnings of cumulating effects (9 groups with stakeholders of all categories; 8 workshops)
Critical attitude towards politics that sees its tasks as going beyond decisions on research strategy (13 groups with stakeholders of all categories, less representation of civil society; 8 workshops)

Table 44: List of common topics: Research programming – Analysis 2

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

Final remarks

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

and views, which can be known without asking its members. This applies not only to academia, but to other groups as well. Of course it is even more complicated: A person can be a member of academia, a member of a parents association and married to the owner of an SME. They can represent public, social and private economic interests alike. This diversity of interests and views limits the usefulness of such stakeholder involvement if the goal is decision-making, which takes stakeholder interests and concerns of legitimacy into account. The INPROFOOD scenario workshops share this limitation with stakeholder involvement activities in general. And although in INPROFOOD – maybe for the first time - a lot of efforts were made to involve other organizations than those that are part of established networks and/or are known to policy makers or other organizers of stakeholder involvement activities, fundamental questions on the democratic legitimization of such governance instruments are still to be tackled systematically. If the goal is decision-making, there is a certain danger that political decision-making lacks sufficient legitimacy because stakeholder involvement is instrumentalized by those who promote it. If the goal is opening up governance, stakeholder involvement can contribute to it, if its weaknesses, in particular in respect to legitimacy, are closely scrutinized and tackled. Tackling the weaknesses is a process that is never completed, but so is opening up governance. The question is what is the ultimate goal of stakeholder involvement: decision-making or inclusive governance?[22] Also inclusive governance requires decision-making. There is always the question of balancing efficiency and openness, top-down and bottom-up. Irrespective of the decision, the open issues of legitimacy of decision-making based on stakeholder involvement should not be neglected.

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

References

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

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

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

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

Annex: Workshop Reports

C.01: Workshop 1 Ankara
C.02: Workshop 1 Athens
C.03: Workshop 1 Bonn
C.04: Workshop 1 Bratislava
C.05: Workshop 1 Brussels
C.06: Workshop 1 Copenhagen
C.07: Workshop 1 London
C.08: Workshop 1 Maastricht
C.09: Workshop 1 Madrid
C.10: Workshop 1 Paris
C.11: Workshop 1 Porto
C.12: Workshop 1 Rome
C.13: Workshop 1 Vienna

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