



Metrics Models and Foresight
for European **SUS**tainable **F**ood and **N**utrition **S**ecurity

Plenary Project Meeting
11-12 October 2017
Paris

MINUTES





Table of Content

Table of Content.....	2
1. Welcome & objectives.....	3
3. Break out session - Social Media Lab.....	8
Workshop on achieving project impact with the SUSFANS Toolbox	8
Session 1: Toolbox Europe Tour to CZ, DK, FR, IT and Brussels.	12
Session 2: Foresight and Policy.....	12
KEY European Policy Topics within SUSFANS focus	12
Panel discussion with the PAB on the policy challenges beyond SUSFANS	12
Appendix I: Powerpoints of the Plenary Project Meeting	17
Appendix II: Program Plenary Project Meeting 11-12 October 2017 Paris	18

Report Plenary Project Meeting

1. Welcome & objectives

(by Thom Achterbosch)



The main objective of the meeting is to define a roadmap towards the intended Impact with the SUSFANS Toolbox i.e. the metrics, the modelling tools and foresight on EU sustainable food and nutrition security. The project coordinator Tom Achterbosch gives a project overview, state of the project and aim of the meeting,

- Diet can be seen as a tool to discuss SUSFANS in Europe, to understand how diets link up with the sustainability of food systems and to improve the impacts on society.
- The project tries to perform a pathway for transforming negative externalities into positive ones.
- The gap to be filled with the project is delivering analytical tools to assess FNS.
- There are still many opportunities to incorporate insights from pillar I when shaping the other pillars.
- Pillar I is most easily summarized with the spider diagram. Good feedbacks from stakeholders on metrics and the spider diagram have been received.
- Pillar II focuses on the models in the toolbox: SUSFANS is about the linkages between the models.
- Pillar III is about foresight. Questions to be asked are 1) where is the diet going? 2) How to overcome trade-offs between health and environmental goals? 3) Where can policies go? 4) Which policy arenas are the most fruitful to make our stance in?
- Spin-off: How can the methods and insights developed in the project be used further on?
- Objective of the meeting: Getting insights on what tools are, which policy questions fit most to be answered with these tools, which platforms should be chosen for dissemination, defining a roadmap towards the intended impact with the SUSFANS Toolbox.

2. Brief review of main achievements of project pillars

(By pillar leaders)

Brief review of main achievements of the project pillars, including a preview about how these achievements will contribute to the overall project goals and the SUSFANS Toolbox.

Pillar I (WP1-4): Assessing sustainable food and nutrition security

(by Louis George Soler)

2.  **PowerPoint**

- Consumers are more conscious about the economic viewpoint than about the social or environmental one. They have a positive attitude and a neutral interest towards sustainable consumption. Price is the main criteria for consumers in their food choice. Information about health has more impact than information about sustainability.
- There are common trends in the European countries but there is also variability between the countries.
- It is suggested to focus on more precise leading questions. E.g. how could a 10% decrease in beef consumption affect the policy goals that can be informed by the different deliverables?

Discussion

- Upcoming leading questions should be answered by the deliverables.
- Referring to the beef example in the presentations, it is stated that other types of meat replacements are equally interesting. However, the case of beef should only serve as an example to underline the need for specific questions to be asked and answered. Possible leading questions shall be the outcome of the workshop later in the programme.
- It is asked whether the Euro will be affected by the transition of the food system. This will be partly addressed in a current deliverable.
- It is discussed whether the example question is rather a pillar II question than a question that should be addressed in pillar I. It is argued that pillar I is more about monitoring and the state of the art. This should be reflected by leading questions referring to pillar I. In contrast to that, it is stated that asking questions like in the example is important for assessing gaps between the state of the art and the future and to see if metrics and indicators work. Thus, regarding pillar I it is not about the (quantitative) results but this type of questions can help to assess indicators and metrics.
- It is suggested to better formulate pillar I leading question like: How to change the diet to reach a certain result? However, it is argued that this formulation would make room for (too) many options.

- The performance of one country in comparison to other countries could be addressed with the spider diagram, also to identify hot spots. However, it is questioned whether data is sufficiently available for this exercise as many tasks in pillar I are focused on drivers rather than on data.
- The exemplary question can help starting a discussion on the conceptual framework: How would the food system respond hypothetically? This could be an interesting paper as outcome of the first pillar (introducing the framework, showing how the food system works, qualitative thinking of hypotheses how the spider diagram would change). There is a need to think about some questions to be asked to the conceptual framework.
- It is suggested to use the case studies to answer this kind of high-level, broad leading questions. In contrast to that, it is argued that the case studies are a testing ground for the toolbox. Asking the leading questions in pillar I and empirical questions in WP5 could be regarded as complementary activities.
- The purpose of the metrics is to assess the state of the art and to identify research gaps and needs. The question is raised if one can be critical enough about the conceptual framework to do this task and to identify what is missing.

Pillar II (WP7-9): Modelling sustainable FNS **3 PowerPoint**

(by Marijke Kuiper)

-
- Models are only rough approximations of the reality. There is a loss of detail and one should keep in mind that there is more in reality than what the model states.
 - Modelling work can be complemented by the other work e.g. in assessing non-price drivers of actor behaviour. Non-price drivers of consumer decisions are to some extent contained in price elasticities. Producer behaviour is only captured in the form of profit-maximizing. The supply chain is represented only roughly. Supply chain actors, if they are represented at all, are assumed to act technology-driven. In addition, there is a lack of data regarding the transformation of primary to processed products. One needs to be aware of these shortcomings.
 - It needs to be seen how the model results can be represented by the spider diagram.
 - It needs to be discussed how to proceed in the case that overlapping models show different (and maybe contradictory) results. Even if scenarios and key future drivers are aligned, the models react differently to shocks.
 - With respect to the consumption side, the level of detail is not so high and the products contained in the aggregated groups vary between the models.
 - The results shown for fish and aquaculture are not based on the new fish modules (WP9).

- Food supply shown refers to available food at household level including consumption and waste.
- The gap between the economic/ production models starting from the supply side and national level data to the SHARP model which starts with individual intake data needs to be bridged.
- Preliminary SHARP results are shown for the Dutch population. (legend: F = Females, M= Males, 1= 20-40 years old, 2= 40-50 years old, 3= over 50 years old)
- There is a high heterogeneity at nutritional and population level. The difficulty is that the models operate on highly aggregated levels and lots of data is not captured. There is only one representative consumer of a country in the model.
- There is the need to find a way how to defend suggestions and recommendations like e.g. people should eat less meat. In fact, diets and recommendations are really diverse and depend on age, sex et cetera.
- It is pointed out that one needs to be careful about what is actually compared and to be aware of the model assumptions.

Discussion

- SHARP results may change as soon as environmental considerations are included.
- In SHARP it is not assumed that people consume completely new diets. The NRD is used to compare different diets. For example “total sugars” is one dimension of this indicator which sometimes leads to the suggestion that fruit consumption should be reduced.
- It is stated that the European Parliament will likely address the question what will be the impact on farmers as these are an important group of voters. Agri-farm incomes and prices are captured by the models. It is clarified, that the models cannot estimate how a (specific) farmer that engages in sustainable production will be affected. Except for CAPRI, the models capture farms only at national level. CAPRI aggregates farms at regional level. However, in the models, farmers are not included as decision making entity; they are treated as profit maximizers.
- It is suggested to address farmers’ vulnerability in the equity section of the metrics and to make clear that this is not one of the standard model outputs.
- Based on the stakeholder feedback, food safety should be included as well as issues like animal welfare. Food safety is seen rather on the system level. Furthermore, it is regarded as a major issue in the governance of the food system and health, especially at the European level. The question is raised whether transparency, trust and food safety should be included in the spider diagram.
- Food safety inclusion is difficult as it is not part of marketing mix and not relevant for the consumers’ choice. The impact of stronger food safety regulations is expected to mainly affect prices but not the interaction with consumers in principle. However, in southern countries for consumers food safety is a reason to choose organic products.



- It is asked whether food losses and waste are defined based on a sustainability or food security perspective.
- The question is raised whether there is more harmonization needed between the models. It however is a challenge to understand why the models are different. Their differences can be seen as strength or weakness. More discussion is needed on whether and how uncertainty should be included. The results of the different models could also be weighed based on their specific capabilities.
- It is warned that from a policy maker's point of view diverging results could be a reason not to act. It is argued for coming out with a single statement. Nevertheless, uncertainty needs to be reported which also increases credibility. Including uncertainty into the spider gram will give direction.
- Even though the models differ to some extent, the impacts of policies and innovations estimated by the models have been rather similar in the past.

Pillar III (WP5,6,10,11); Foresight and policy guidance 4. PowerPoint

(by Pieter van 't Veer)

Aim of pillar III:

- Foresight
- Impact: Long-term challenges to FNS

Food system transition:

1. Scientific backbone: metrics, models, foresights
2. Innovative pathways: based on evidence (models) and narratives (scenarios)
3. Decision makers: addressing the right decision makers
4. Impact on society

Foresights (WP10):

- scenario's
- innovation pathways
 - Agriculture: intensification, circularity
 - Food industry: food reformulation, technology
 - Public health: education, access, affordability
 - Consumers: appreciation, Fair trade,
 - Policy: integrated policies, intersectoral
- Stakeholder workshops
 - Public
 - Private
 - Civil society



- Foresight on sustainable FNS: policy options for food system change
 - Pick the policy domains with large modelled impact and ability to change

Question:

How to position the consumer in this? Maybe ask stakeholders what their assumptions/knowledge of the consumer are. Consider consumer segments. Citizen vs consumer. Not only economic perspective. The consumer is more than that.

Discussion

- It is asked how the power of the consumers regarding what is offered in the supermarkets can be captured in the narratives, how the consumers can be positioned and addressed. The supply side has knowledge about the consumers. However, what consumers demand is influenced by what they are used to and what is offered.
- It is suggested to bring this issue close to the point of choice as e.g. income is a barrier of consuming healthy and sustainably.
- Furthermore, the consumer should also be regarded in its role as a citizen.
- It is stated that these issues are covered by the qualitative scenarios. The stories exist already. It is now about the question how to bring this in.
- Also evidence from social science should be taken into account.

3. Break out session - Social Media Lab

5. **PowerPoint**

(by Alma van der Veen and Sebastian Eckert)

A workshop about preparing soundbites on SUSFANS and presenting SUSFANS results on social media

Workshop on achieving project impact with the SUSFANS

Toolbox

(by Hans van Meijl)

6. **PowerPoint**

Multi-disciplinary discussion tables, discussing the subject of how to achieve synergy between the SUSFANS research strategy and the impact pathways and how to achieve these impacts applying the SUSFANS Toolbox. What is the general purpose of the Toolbox for policy makers?



What will the users expect to get as a result? What is the Toolbox, what does it look like and how will it be visualized? What results will be shown and how will we assemble the data needed? What will be the user groups and what will be their questions that the Toolbox will answer?

Workshop 1: Policy Group CZ/ IT

(Three policy pillars have been discussed: consumers and health, producers, supply chain)

In CZ the consumption fruits and vegetables is low whereas the consumption of meat products is high. Furthermore, too much salt and fat are consumed. In the discussion it was asked whether beverages are part of the project to cover the high beer consumption in CZ. In IT the dietary recommendations include one glass of wine per day. In general, subsidies in the member states are not equally distributed, such that there is a competition between domestic products and imported ones in CZ. The production side in CZ suffers from droughts. This problem is among the priorities of government action. With respect to the supply chain, there are some quality differences of brand products sold in different member states. The diversity of food products in the market is exponentially growing. In IT there are surprisingly the same dietary issues (too less vegetables, too much meat), but less severe than in CZ. Furthermore, there is a gradient from the South to the North in IT as in the South the rate of obesity is higher although there are more vegetables produced. Education programmes in schools are in place and there is a strong policy support to get back to the Mediterranean diet. The offer of exotic fruits is increasing as well as fish production. The spider diagram could be used to give holistic information about the sustainability of products.

Workshop 2: Policy Group FR, DK, Taiwan

(Policies have been discussed at three levels (national, EU, industry))

At national level in DK there is an excessive consumption of meat but a public debate on this topic has been triggered by the ethical council focusing on climate impacts. SUSFANS could potentially look at a similar scenario as proposed with the beef example and see if there are synergies between different dimensions of SUSFANS. There are developments towards the "new-Nordic diet" – an environmentally friendly and healthy diet, complementary to the Mediterranean diet but incorporating cultural aspects of the Nordic region. SUSFANS could be used to investigate the impacts of these diet approaches. In French supply chains retailers become too powerful which threatens producers. There is a need for regulations which could lead to higher prices. Possible implications of this could be addressed in the project. General implications of the adoption of organic diets could also be assessed as consumers think that these are more sustainable. In Taiwan the key issues are related to health, the aging population, strict food safety standards and the organisation of the supply chain. Entry is overweight and sweet/sugar. Health and ageing (care for elderly) and population decline is starting point. Food safety issue (chicken eggs pesticides, zero tolerance). Health and safety key entries,

very strict rules (relevant to export & imports, they are a net importing country). Taiwan focuses on production, not on chain and downstream users yet.

At the EU level it could be assessed whether the EU regulations are too strict and what the impacts on national food systems are. Therefore, it would be useful to look at how different regulations are implemented in different countries and how this may distort competition. EU level issues are mostly related to the CAP and environmental policies as there is a lack of EU nutritional or health policies.

Regarding the industry, a harmonization of policies could facilitate businesses. The industry is aware of sustainability issues and they see a difficulty to communicate this to consumers.

Unilever: Policies implemented differently in countries is difficult. Harmonization would be helpful (that would reduce costs). Adapts to local regulations that tend to be more strict. For health: Partnership vs regulatory policies, partnerships preferred. Safety is prereq (standardized EU is OK), Challenge is connecting sust to the other aspects (health). SUSFANS: Hopes that SHARP adds here by modelling diets. Still difficult to link it to env sust (sourcing etc). Palm oil certificates, certified fish. Tax policy is national debate (sugar tax models --> what is it substituted with, where in the food chain). Unilever: anti-processed food & local food movement, is an opportunity or a threat?

The SHARP model can highlight some gaps e.g. where it is difficult to meet dietary targets. Furthermore, it should be discussed how to bring environmental considerations into dietary recommendation formulations. Also the reduction of waste along the food chain, SDGs and EU targets should receive further attention.

Workshop 3: Visualization

(What to put into visualization?)

- Demo sheets (concrete examples, few policies or interventions)
- What is in there? Action, interventions (Shown with the conceptual framework)
- What are the consequences? (Shown with the spider diagram)
- What to display? Current/ future situation, different time periods, initial/ final situation (depending on policy intervention)
- Which part of the policy package causes which development? (Disaggregation in the spider diagram)
- How to display uncertainty? By colour (intensity), confidence intervals in spider web e.g. by shape of the lines;
- Aggregation weights for indicators should be chosen (being explicit), one should maybe be able to adjust the weights, decomposition should be possible (also with respect to drivers)

Workshop 4: Branding/ storytelling

(Where to focus on and what will the toolbox contribute to the target audience?)

- One should be clear on the limitations of the toolbox.
- To be discussed more in depth: The combination of health and sustainability, how to engage stakeholders more. A demonstrator or toy model to play with would help to get familiar with the toolbox. How could industries integrate the toolbox into the product development?
- It is important to be aware which audience are we referring to.
- An integrated platform should be the outcome.
- What are upcoming research questions and gaps? Is the toolbox able to fill these? (E.g. the integration of training and education, a new focus on a consumer-driven supply chain).

Discussion

Connecting to and learning from other projects is also important, as well as establishing networks, getting new people on board (also from other domains e.g. social sciences), organizing meetings also after the end of the project. The European field in the health and sustainability domain is still quite open. One should keep in mind the slogan “from project to platform” which had been formulated already at an earlier stage. There is a need to embed outcomes into practice. Updates should follow when research communities define new projects.

5. Parallel Sessions on how to achieve impact on stakeholders

Session 1: Toolbox Europe Tour to CZ, DK, FR, IT and Brussels.

How to organize and execute the SUSFANS Toolbox tour (WP 11)

(by Karin Zimmermann)

7.  **PowerPoint**

Session 2: Foresight and Policy

8.  **PowerPoint**

How to achieve the objectives of WP 10 (provide foresight on future development of FNS in the EU) and how should the outcomes of other work packages support this?

(by Petr Havlík (chair) and Monika Zurek (moderator))

KEY European Policy Topics within SUSFANS focus

Parallel workshops to prioritize policy perspectives in the foresight exercise on sustainable food and nutrition security in EU

By Petr Havlík and Thom Achterbosch

9.  **PowerPoint** is missing

Workshop I: Paris climate commitments and policy reform on agriculture (CAP) and fisheries (CFP) led by Petr Havlík, Thomas Heckeley (by video connection)
Brief introductions and discussion on possible policy changes (climate action, nitrogen balances, CFP, CAP, etc.) with transformative impact on EU sustainable food production

Workshop 2: Food, Nutrition and Health policies, led by Thom Achterbosch.
Discussion on possible policy changes (food-based dietary guidelines, sugar/fat taxes) with transformative impact on EU sustainable food consumption

Panel discussion with the PAB on the policy challenges beyond SUSFANS

(By Thom Achterbosch)

FOOD 2030 agenda, Sustainable Development Goals

Jacqueline Broerse (VU)

System innovation: health-environment-enterprise



Not just system thinking when it comes about food. Also system innovation. Linking health-environment-enterprise is so novel.

Incorporating stakeholders (NGO's, civil society in general). Models from environmental side and models that are more micro-economic working together. Same we see with policies.

So, things in this product are a system innovation endeavour. This model might be useful Model: you are trying to change a regime (dominant structure, culture and practice of system). This is very hard, because you are up against routines and invested interest. From the landscape and niches there is a pressure on the regime to change.

System innovations come about by niche experiments. The innovative experiments that look at alternative options. SUSFANS can be seen as a niche experiment.

Involving stakeholders

Managing system innovation. How can you support system innovation through these niches?

Transition arena: They say, start with a transition arena Find ambassadors in science and different societal pockets. Perhaps stakeholder groups could be more tailored towards the change-oriented people.

Shared vision: It is important to link the different niches, that are also experimenting at this level. Try to strategize together and linking up to other groups/projects that try to do similar things. Create a kind of movement.

Transition experiment: local pilot projects involving many disciplines and many stakeholders.

Monitoring and evaluation: reflection and learning. Outcomes of SUSFANS will also be the lessons that you learn from experimenting in this process of transition.

Finally a lot of attention is going into detail (problems with linking the models). More attention is needed for a broader reflection, where the advisory board also plays a role in.

Focus is on willingness to change instead of barriers of change. There is concern on inequity. The ones willing to change are more likely to be high SES. Answer: not necessarily.



Monique Raats (University of Surrey)

Perspective of nutrition and consumer behaviour.

Science, knowledge of governance and global trends, needs to be drawn on for the models.

Model helps to understand policy diversity.

SUSFANS helps to have a tool to explore these things

What are the policy options that we have? And they are very diverse. It would be useful to update this kind of thinking for the case studies.

It would be nice to have the tools to explain why and what works and what not.

Looking at linkage with industry. Different sorts of strategies. Choices that are being made in different countries and cultural differences. Using same strategy to analyse that to see if the behaviour in different countries makes sense.

Qualitative analysis, talking with stakeholders. Do some models to test this. Find the mismatch between rhetoric of policy. This is where SUSFANS is making big changes. There will be big challenges. Some communities will be more open than others. Risk assessment is defined biologically. That limits the set of evidence you are looking at.

Changing behaviour. We need to be aware of the different disciplines in social sciences, and how they look at science. Psychologists for example look at the individual and talk about behaviour.

Mechanisms of behaviour change

Mechanisms affecting belief formation --> mechanisms of intentions formation --> mechanisms related to adopting and maintaining behaviour --> habits and routines.

Balance in how much evidence you have to underpin your ideas is important.

Thinking about foods to feed your baby. You can do that through materials (food, condiments), competences and meanings (what does it mean to you).

Reasons for alignment of nutrition policy. We see converging of some policy areas, because some things are very similar between countries (health outcomes, commercial forces).

Karen from Nestle (Mariska from Unilever presents)

FRESH = Food Reform for Sustainability & Health

In FRESH program there is more focus on the business side. 'What can we as businesses do to make ... better?' More than in SUSFANS.



FRESH is also very much collaborating with the EAT foundation. EAT-Lancet commission.

SUSFANS might have to create a society that does not exist yet.

EAT-Lancet Commission:

- What is a healthy diet?
- What is a sustainable food system?
- What shapes today's food system?
- Achieving healthy diets from sustainable food systems
- Solutions and policy recommendations

Work packages in FRESH

- Healthy and sustainable diets
What is a sustainable diet? What countries already take sustainability into account with gap-analysis. What are the main gaps in all the countries? Also at segmentation level. What are the most important gaps we should start the focus on with scenario analysis.
- Food production
- Food consumption
- Food loss and waste
- Performance measurements and exporting

The consumer is at the centre.

Possibilities for collaboration: SUSFANS can come with solutions. And FRESH with business.

Perhaps SUSFANS can fill some of the data-gaps in FRESH.

John Ingram

Policy mapping is important, but to what degree can we in SUSFANS formulate and demonstrate the different kind of policy. Introducing new policy ideas. A lot has to happen on national level. Important to take national workshops very seriously.

A spidergram is a neat trick. Do we have faith in it? User manual has to be important. What can it do and what can't it do? To increase credibility and confidence.

Scenario graphs. I didn't see social trends. Consumer change into it.

Innovativeness is that health-sustainability-enterprise, but I haven't seen the enterprise. To me food chain is nothing but enterprise. If they are going to be changed negatively by an intervention, then it won't happen. It has to be economically sustainable to the enterprise.











Toolbox, that integrates the three major models. What I don't see is the middle. How can we get more activity around the necessary necessities what we are going to have at lunch. A question of debate. When we talk about food system, do we talk about two ends of it, or also at the middle.

A key point in this last phase is thinking about legacy. What is the legacy of all of this? Tool for better policy? How do we embed it in change of practice? Opportunity to use SUSFANS as an educational tool at university and workplace. Build a new cohort of food system thinkers. These people go into the workplace and bring about change where the action is. It's the workplace and food system actors that do stuff (not scientist or policy makers).

Importance of international workshops. How do we translate a project on EU level into the nation? SHARP model will be helpful. P stands for Preference, which is close to the national identity.

Learning in sequencing in these projects. Something as complicated as SUSFANS, we have to accept we can't design it upfront. Keep communicating and work together!

Appendix I: Powerpoints of the Plenary Project Meeting

1.  PowerPoint Achterbosch SUSFANS intro PPM3 20171011.pptx
2.  PowerPoint
3.  PowerPoint Pillar II presentation -20171009_PH.pptx
4.  PowerPoint Pillar III Intro slides PPM3 (PvtV).pptx
5.  PowerPoint SUSFANS_WP 11 Social Media WS.pptx
6.  PowerPoint Hans SUSFANS_fnal_product.pptx
7.  PowerPoint SUSFANS_Europe Tour_Paris 12102017.pptx
8.  PowerPoint Havlik_WP10_presentation_20171012.pptx
9.  PowerPoint Thom_partly presented_breakout session food nutrition health.pptx

Appendix II: Program Plenary Project Meeting 11-12 October 2017 | Paris

DAY 1 - Wednesday October 11		
Time	Subject	Room
9:00 9:15	<p style="text-align: center;">Welcome & objectives <i>by Thom Achterbosch (chair)</i></p> <p>The main objective of the meeting is to define a roadmap towards the intended Impact with the SUSFANS Toolbox i.e. the metrics, the modelling tools and foresight on EU sustainable food and nutrition security</p>	<i>Pasteur</i>
9:15 9:30	Introduction of the members of the Project Advisory Board (PAB)	<i>Pasteur</i>
9:30 10:15	<p style="text-align: center;">Pillar I (WP1-4): Assessing sustainable food and nutrition security (FNS) Brief review of main achievements of the project pillars, including a preview about how these achievements will contribute to the overall project goals and the SUSFANS Toolbox <i>presented by Louis George Soler</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Followed by:</p> <p>A plenary discussion on the key insights and contributions to the SUSFANS toolbox in terms of: balanced diets, environmental protection, competitive agri-food business, equitable outcomes and conditions</p>	<i>Pasteur</i>
-- COFFEE BREAK --		
10:45 12:30	<p style="text-align: center;">Pillar II (WP7-9): Modelling sustainable FNS Brief review of main achievements of the project pillars, including a preview about how these achievements will contribute to the overall project goals and the SUSFANS Toolbox <i>presented by Marijke Kuiper</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Followed by:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Workshop on achieving project impact with the SUSFANS Toolbox <i>led by Hans van Meijl</i></p> <p><i>Multi-disciplinary discussion tables, discussing the subject of how to achieve synergy between the SUSFANS research strategy and the impact pathways and how to achieve these impacts applying the SUSFANS Toolbox. What is the general purpose of the Toolbox for policy makers? What will the users expect to get as a result? What is the Toolbox, what does it look like and how will it be visualized? What results will be shown and how will we assemble the data needed? What will be the user groups and what will be their questions that the Toolbox will answer?</i></p>	<i>Pasteur</i>
-- LUNCH BREAK --		<i>Restaurant</i>
13:30 14:45	<p style="text-align: center;">Plenary discussion Workshops outcome <i>led by Louis George Soler and Hans van Meijl</i></p>	<i>Pasteur</i>

14:45 15:45	<p align="center">Intermezzo - Social Media Lab</p> <p>A workshop about preparing soundbites on SUSFAN and presenting SUSFANS results on social media</p> <p align="center"><i>Break out session led by Alma van der Veen and Sebastian Eckert</i></p>	<i>Picasso</i>
----------------	---	----------------

DAY 2 - Thursday October 12		
Time	Subject	Room
9:00 9:15	<p align="center">Welcome & Wrap Up day one</p> <p align="center"><i>by Thom Achterbosch (chair)</i></p>	<i>Pasteur</i>
9:15 9:45	<p align="center">Pillar III (WP 5, 6, 10, 11); Foresight and policy guidance</p> <p>Brief review of main achievements of the project pillars, including a preview about how these achievements will contribute to the overall project goals and the SUSFANS Toolbox</p> <p align="center"><i>presented by Pieter van 't Veer</i></p>	<i>Pasteur</i>
9:45 10:15	<p align="center">Feedback from the members of the Project Advisory Board on SUSFANS</p>	<i>Pasteur</i>
-- COFFEE BREAK --		
10:45 12:00	<p align="center">Parallel Sessions on how to achieve impact on stakeholders</p> <p>Session I: Toolbox Europe Tour to CZ, DK, FR, IT and Brussels. How to organize and execute the SUSFANS Toolbox tour (WP 11) <i>by Karin Zimmermann</i></p> <p>Session II: Foresight and Policy How to achieve the objectives of WP 10 (provide foresight on future development of FNS in the EU) and how should the outcomes of other work packages support this? <i>by Petr Havlík (chair) and Monika Zurek (moderator)</i></p>	<i>Picasso</i> <i>Cezanne</i>
12:00 12:30	<p align="center">Plenary discussion on workshops outcome</p> <p align="center">How to build synergy between WP10 + WP11?</p> <p align="center"><i>led by Karin Zimmermann (chair) and Monika Zurek (moderator)</i></p>	<i>Pasteur</i>
-- LUNCH BREAK --		

<p>13.45 14.30</p>	<p align="center">KEY European Policy Topics within SUSFANS focus</p> <p><i>Parallel workshops to prioritize policy perspectives in the foresight exercise on sustainable food and nutrition security in EU:</i></p> <p align="center">Workshop I: Paris climate commitments and policy reform on agriculture (CAP) and fisheries (CFP)</p> <p><i>Brief introductions and discussion on possible policy changes (climate action, nitrogen balances, CFP, CAP, etc.) with transformative impact on EU sustainable food production</i></p> <p align="center"><i>led by Petr Havlík, Thomas Heckelei (by video connection)</i></p> <p align="center">&</p> <p align="center">Workshop II: Food, Nutrition and Health policies</p> <p><i>Discussion on possible policy changes (food-based dietary guidelines, sugar/fat taxes) with transformative impact on EU sustainable food consumption</i></p> <p align="center"><i>led by Thom Achterbosch</i></p> <p align="center"><i>speaker: Louis Georges Soler "SUSDIET" project: a presentation of main results</i></p>	<p align="center"><i>Pasteur</i></p> <p align="center"><i>Picasso</i></p> <p align="center"><i>Cezanne</i></p>
<p>14.30 15.00</p>	<p align="center">Plenary Feedback from workshops</p> <p align="center"><i>Petr Havlík and Thom Achterbosch</i></p> <p align="center">&</p> <p align="center">Wrap Up of Pillar III</p> <p align="center"><i>with reflections based on the 2017 Mansholt Lecture:</i></p> <p align="center"><i>"Towards a common European food and nutrition policy" by P. van 't Veer, L. Fresco and K. Poppe</i></p> <p align="center"><i>by Pieter van 't Veer</i></p>	<p align="center"><i>Pasteur</i></p>
<p>-- COFFEE BREAK --</p>		
<p>15:30 16:15</p>	<p align="center">Panel discussion with the PAB on the policy challenges beyond SUSFANS</p> <p align="center">(FOOD 2030 agenda, Sustainable Development Goals)</p> <p align="center"><i>led by Thom Achterbosch</i></p>	<p align="center"><i>Pasteur</i></p>
<p>16:15 16.30</p>	<p align="center">Summary and closure</p> <p align="center"><i>by Thom Achterbosch</i></p>	<p align="center"><i>Pasteur</i></p>