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1. **Scope and Objectives**

This event was part of a series of four workshops aimed at gathering evidence in the context of the impact assessment on modernising and simplifying the **Common Agricultural Policy** (CAP). This workshop provided an opportunity to discuss, with external experts/stakeholders and with interested staff of various Directorates General of the Commission, challenges for addressing **food-related issues within the CAP**.

This workshop was organised by the Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development (DG AGRI) in cooperation with DG Health and Food Safety (SANTE), DG Research and Innovation (RTD) and the Joint Research Centre (JRC).

1.1. **Context**

Up to now, food has been abundantly available in the EU, nevertheless problems of **Food and Nutrition Security** (FNS) remain. Today the triple burden of under-nutrition, over-nutrition and micro-nutrient deficiency is the main FNS challenge for the EU. Social inequality is a key driver of diet and lifestyle. The heavy cost of the health problems associated with poor diet has led to growing calls for the CAP to better address the issue of nutrition.

The concept of "food policy" embraces all steps of the food supply chain and looks at how food is produced, processed, distributed, purchased and consumed in a holistic way. All actors in the food supply chain have a part to play. Farmers play an important role in the sustainable provision of primary production and also food, especially in cases where they engage closely with consumers via short supply chains and local food systems.

At the EU level, there are elements of various policies which relate to food. The **CAP** works in tandem with **legislation** on food safety, labelling and initiatives to promote healthy diets (e.g. DG AGRI's school food scheme and SANTE's Member State and stakeholder groups on diet and nutrition) and also on food waste. It also complements other policies including fiscal measures introduced by a number of Member States to curb consumption of certain food items, which may lead to unhealthy diets if overly consumed.

The CAP has a focus on important aspects of food policy in that it aims to secure supplies of safe food, produced sustainably. It contributes to the UN **Sustainable Development Goals**, particularly SDG 2 on food security, nutrition and agriculture, as well as SDG 12 on sustainable production and consumption (which includes targets on food waste) and SDG3 (contributing to healthy lives).

Elements of nutrition and healthy lifestyle have been introduced in the CAP: food safety rules have to be strictly respected by EU farmers and some aspects are covered by cross-compliance. Furthermore, appropriate nutrition information is provided by EU rules on food labelling and is part of the CAPs promotion policy and the CAP school schemes support healthy dietary habits. The development of policies (such as geographical indications and organic production) enhances consumer choice and awareness of how food is produced and where it comes from thus enabling them to make better informed choices.

1.2. **Scope of the workshop**

The workshop was constructed in two sessions, with presentations from external experts/stakeholders as well as the Commission services. The morning session provided various cross-cutting elements of food policy, including perspectives up to 2030/2050
and Research and Innovation approaches. This was followed by a panel discussion outlining recent developments in society, citizens and consumer expectations concerning food and related health issues. The afternoon session focused on: i) the sustainability implications of policies for procurement, food quality and short supply chain, ii) public health focus on Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and iii) concrete implications of a common agricultural and food policy.

The workshop was organised around questions on how these issues can be addressed in a modernised and simplified CAP as well as by research and innovation.

1. **Behavioural insights:**
   a) What are the "biases" that promote unhealthy diets (especially the excessive consumption of calories, sugar, fat and salt)?
   b) What are the main consumer-related challenges facing agriculture e.g. diet related illnesses, antimicrobial resistance?
   c) What is the role of farmers to better address consumers' expectations?

2. How to make the best out of research, innovation and advice?

3. How to modernise the CAP in order to adapt to changes in consumer behaviour/expectations?
   Possible questions include:
   a) What are the relevant CAP instruments to better respond to growing problems with antimicrobial resistance?
   b) Whether CAP can encourage production which is better for the environment and health;
   c) Increasing market orientation, (e.g. with implementation of the end of sugar quota);
   d) How local food, short supply chains, quality labels can contribute to improved nutrition;
   e) The role of the School Food scheme in boosting nutrition and educating young people;
   f) Other: Encouraging an increase in fruit and vegetables consumption. E.g. the role of public procurement.

4. Should regulatory requirements be reinforced or incentives offered for voluntary measures to make the policy simpler and more effective?

5. How to avoid unintended consequences such as a possible redirection of supply from internal sources to imports?

6. What would a Common Food and Agriculture Policy mean?

The wrap up session addressed the implications of these questions/answers for the CAP. The rapporteur communicated conclusions of the workshop to the Stakeholders conference on Modernising and Simplifying the CAP (7 July 2017, Brussels).

The detailed agenda in enclosed in the Annex.

Around 80 participants attended the workshop.
2. **SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS**

The workshop enabled to identify possible answers to the above-mentioned questions.

Detailed conclusions of the rapporteur are outlined in the last section of the report.

Main messages can be summarised as follows.

**Behavioural insights**: considering the complexity of nutrition related concerns, a mix of interventions is needed. In addition to efforts to enhance education, promising options include nudging initiatives (gently pushing towards healthier choices). Promotional activities aimed at increasing the consumption of some foodstuffs may contrast to a certain extent with dietary recommendations.

**Research & Innovation, Advise** are important: policy priorities and end-user needs could be better linked.

**Modernising and Simplifying the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP):**

The current CAP is already well aligned with food safety standards, but the sense of urgency related to the anti-microbial resistance (AMR) warrants increased attention to the use of antimicrobials in agriculture. For this, best practices should be exchanged and applied. The Farm Advisory Service (FAS) could play an important role in synergy with national reduction plans. Farmers should be incentivised to record the use of anti-microbials and develop farm health plans.

The CAP promotes healthy diets through the CAP promotion policy and the school schemes. Also food quality and short food supply chains initiatives have the potential to foster behavioural change. A particularly promising option is public procurement, but such schemes need to be complemented with awareness raising and education activities.

Parts of possible Common Agricultural and Food Policy were discussed: sustainability schemes, environmental accounting. Beyond regulatory requirements, EU policies should not be too prescriptive on what to produce and what to eat.

The question remains to what extent the CAP sufficiently facilitates farmers’ adaptation to new trends in general and changed consumer patterns in particular.

In **conclusion**, the food system needs to fulfill multiple economic, social and environmental functions and objectives. Some of these objectives are aligned, but others may conflict with each other. Hence, governing the food system requires a coordinated approach that fosters the potential synergies between policy domains, but that also manages the unavoidable trade-offs, taking into account the interests of the most vulnerable actors in the food system, i.e., farmers and consumers.
3. INTRODUCTION

Chair: Flavio Coturni, Head of Unit (HoU) AGRI C1, Policy perspectives

Flavio Coturni quoted the Commission Work Programme for 2017 which refers to the “Simplification and modernisation of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)”. The Commission will take forward work and consult widely on simplification and modernisation of the CAP to maximise its contribution to the Commission’s ten priorities and to the Sustainable Development Goals. He outlined the new policy context and the main challenges facing EU agriculture: foster resilience, enhance sustainability and strengthen the socio-economic fabric of rural areas, including generational renewal.

The process involves a first phase of consultation, where the challenges and objectives need to be identified, and which leads to the definition of the policy options and their assessment. The consultation takes into account the opinion of the REFIT platform, the results of a Public Consultation, and of a series of thematic workshops.

Florence Buchholzer, Advisor on foresight and impact assessment in DG AGRI, explained the scope of the four thematic workshops, covering the following topics:

1. Best Environmental & Climate Practices
2. Risk Management
3. Food-related issues
4. Jobs and Growth

Participants in the Food workshop included experts ad personam from academia, expert organisations, stakeholders and Commission services (Inter-Service Group). A Rapporteur will present the outcomes of each workshop to stakeholders at the conference on future CAP on July 7th, 2017. In the workshop on Food related issues the Rapporteur role is held by Professor Erik Mathijs (KU Leuven).

4. STATE OF PLAY/ISSUES

4.1. NUTRITION, FOOD COMPOSITION AND INFORMATION

Alexandra Nikolakopoulou – HoU SANTE E1 Nutrition, food composition and information

Alexandra Nikolakopoulou outlined the following issues of relevance to the CAP.

- Fight against antimicrobial resistance
  - Three strategic pillars of the next Commission communication on AMR
  - Making the EU a best practice region on AMR
  - Boosting Research, development and innovation on AMR and
  - Shaping the global agenda on AMR

- Resilience of Agriculture
  - Efficient prevention and eradication of new animal and plant diseases.
  - Reflection on ways to diversify sources of protein feed for livestock

- Health policy/Nutrition Policy
  - Agriculture has links with public health,
  - Opportunities to build stronger bridges between CAP and other policy areas
• Food Waste and Circular Economy
  • Fighting food losses and waste at each stage of the food chain
  • Food waste prevention is an integral part of the Circular Economy package

• Sustainable Use of Pesticides
  • EU legislation is aimed at sustainable use of pesticides and implementation of Integrated Pest Management.
  • Further progress needed to reduce dependency on pesticides

• Animal Welfare
  • Animal welfare measures meet societal demands for sustainable production systems
  • Good practices could be further improved

4.2. FOOD SAFETY 2050

Ladislav Miko - DG SANTE Deputy Director General for food safety

Ladislav Miko presented the results of a foresight study carried out by the Joint Research Centre (JRC) in close collaboration with DG SANTE. Future challenges for food production are well recognised but mostly in terms of production volume and not in terms of food quality and safety. The foresight study aimed at identifying possible future challenges to food safety and nutrition in the EU towards 2050, and to 'future-proof' the current regulatory and policy framework against these challenges. Will there be future trade-offs to be made between producing enough food and producing safe food? Four scenarios were developed to describe plausible, challenging futures, of which three were presented in more detail.

Global food: a continued intensification of global trade goes hand in hand with the development of more and more complex food chains, balancing possible local food shortages due to climate change. Processed, mass produced food high in salt, sugar, fat constitutes the diet of many, contributing to predominantly unhealthy diets. Food safety challenges are linked to e.g. the diverging food safety standards in third countries, and intensified agriculture production which facilitates disease transmission.

Regional food: With the aim to move towards a sustainable and circular economy the EU abandons international trade agreements. Increasing food prices lead many citizens to engage actively in food production using their gardens, backyards, and urban farming possibilities. Challenges are linked to e.g. the greater reliance for food safety on untrained individuals engaged in food production and possible shortages of fresh produce and food poverty in a self-sufficient food system.

Pharma Food: Health develops into a strong motivator for food choice, leading to a thriving European market for functional and pharmaceutical food. European companies are market leaders in a globalised market for personalised 'phoods'. Challenges in this scenario are linked to e.g. the difficulty to perform official food-related controls or to deal with cumulative effects of substances and long-term exposure in risk assessments of 'phoods'.

Indicators were identified for each scenario to determine if the EU would move in the future into the direction of any of the scenarios.
Overall, for food safety the system currently in place seems to be robust and appropriate. However, some strengthening of certain elements and adaptations will be necessary, in particular in the context of nutrition and health, if the EU should move towards any of the scenarios and the respective indicators should be monitored.

4.3. Q & A

- Food security/safety 2050: Currently, in Europe both food safety and food security are ensured together. However, food safety problems cannot be excluded, and in the future there might be growing requirements and challenges for both food security and food safety. Reducing waste would limit the need to increase production, and food safety issues also need to be considered in relation to food waste.
- Dependency on imports of proteins, especially for animal feed: consider new sources of proteins, limit waste.
- There are some inconsistencies between health requirements and policies/practices, e.g. promotion of alcohol.

5. R&I APPROACHES UNDERPINNING FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY

5.1. STRATEGIC APPROACH TO AGRICULTURAL R&I - EIP

Rob Peters – HoU AGRI B2 Research & Innovation

Coping with long-term and systemic challenges facing agriculture (not forgetting the bigger picture) is essential for ensuring long-term FNS through sustainable food systems.

With this in mind DG AGRI recently published a Strategic approach to Agricultural Research and Innovation\(^2\), which is guiding the current H2020 programming and serves as an input to the R&I related discussions in the long run.

This is not possible without sustained investments in research and innovation at national and EU levels, acting now with strategic long-term approaches (time lag of impact of research).

Closing the innovation gap between research and practice is the basis to increase the R&I impact:

- great potential of already existing knowledge; organising and structuring knowledge exchange at regional /national /EU level, Farm Advisory System (FAS)/European Innovation Partnership (EIP)-AGRI/Horizon 2020
- knowledge co-creation (interactive innovation formats) - user ready

CAP and R&I policy are crucial to support transition pathways to sustainable food and FNS.

Maintaining / reinforcing the links between the R&I policy (H2020,…) and CAP (EIP-AGRI,…) and possibly other policy areas (ESIF, LIFE)

---

5.2. FOOD 2030 - R&I IN FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY, WITHIN A FOOD SYSTEMS APPROACH

Barend Verachtert - HoU RTD F3, Agri-food chain

Policy Drivers for food and nutrition security

- Juncker Priorities, COP 21,
- SDG 2030 goals: making a modernised CAP fit for the SDG age:
  - Reduce food waste by 50%
  - Lower CO\textsubscript{2} production to keep global warming under control
  - Zero hunger.
- The circular economy package includes 3 relevant priorities
  1. food waste: prevention
  2. use of bio-based resources; cascading use of biomass and support for innovation in the bioeconomy
  3. innovation, investment, and other horizontal measures: new technologies, processes, services and business models.

R&I offers solutions for sustainable agri-food systems.

DG RTD has been working on the following approaches:

FOOD 2030
(https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/10102/2016/EN/SWD-2016-319-F1-EN-MAIN.PDF)

- Nutrition and Health
- Climate and Sustainability
- Innovation and Communities
- Circular and Resource Efficiency

Bioeconomy Strategy:
(http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/index.cfm?pg=policy&lib=strategy)

The definition of agri-food systems goes beyond the production and delivery of sufficient food for all (food security). It is circular and as such includes all stakeholders along the cycle.

CAP is the main driver of a sustainable food system, but without the commitment and support of consumers it is not possible to reach the targets.

Beyond the agri-food system there is also the bio-based system, which uses around 25% of agricultural produce for industrial purposes.

Local agri-resources and agri-food waste offer huge potential for recycling and re-use, and for the production of feed, fertilizers, nutrients, bio-energy and bio-based products and are essential for a sustainable and circular bio-economy. The sustainable circular Bioeconomy develops at the local, regional, national and European level, and the regional level is extremely important to ensure alignment and reinforce the others. It uses local and regional resources that are still largely unexploited. For instance, immense quantities of organic waste and residues generated by our societies, our cities, and by our agro-food and forest industries can be used for so called new value chains.
5.3. **Q&A**

Research & Innovation (DGs RTD and AGRI):

- Healthier plants and livestock require better resource management and integrated ecological approaches which form a functional closed cycle to which the social dimension has to be added.
- Reference was made to Food 2030: "A perfect storm" which means that in 2-3 generations the increased global population will demand 60% more food. The question is whether nutritional security might be compromised at the expense of food security.
- Practitioners/end users need to be better involved in the research/innovation design. This is the principle of EIP.
- Bioeconomy is not an end in itself.
- Need to improve transfer of research results into practice - a multiactor approach is used (EIP), H2020 facilitates the use of pilot schemes and demonstration plants. Also citizen engagement (H2020) could help to address any concerns early on in the process.

6. **NUTRITION, HEALTH AND CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR**

*Laura Fernández Celemín - Director General, EUFIC (European Food Information Council)*

Non communicable diseases are the leading cause of death world-wide, and responsible for huge economic losses. They are strongly linked to 4 modifiable risky behaviours, physical inactivity, unhealthy diets, alcohol abuse and tobacco use. Thus, evidence-based strategies for behaviour change are key for the prevention and reversal of those diseases.

Behaviour change at population level is generally best served by a mix of interventions, delivered over a long period of time and adjusted in response to measured impact. Ecological approaches that identify and address the factors influencing behaviour at the individual, social and environmental level, are likely to be most effective.

Consumers nowadays are interested in sustainability, authenticity and responsibility, health and wellness, and personalisation of services. They care about the environmental impact of our food production and want foods that are locally sourced and environmentally sustainable, they want to reduce food waste, they are interested in foods that are natural, honest, traditional, they want convenience but not at the compromise of health or sustainability. Finally they want products that are tailored to them.

These trends happen in and are reinforced by an environment characterised by the digital revolution, where mobile and wearable devices create an immediacy of information that reaches people anywhere at all times, where connections between devices and objects are rapidly expanding. As a consequence consumers become tech savvy, but are confused with the vast amount of information they receive, which is not always from credentialed experts and that can even be fake news.

In that environment, to achieve long lasting behaviour change, we need to have: the psychological and physical ability to enact the behaviour; the motivation to do so; and finally, the opportunity to undertake the desired behaviour, and that happens when the physical and social environment enables us to do so.
There are some promising options to encourage healthier behaviours at population level e.g. nudging initiatives that alter the decision-making context to gently push people towards making healthier choices. Habit-formation behavioural interventions can achieve strong long-term effects at population level. They focus on breaking unhealthy habits, for example through changes in the environment or by making the unhealthy habit difficult to undertake. To promote healthy habits, the reverse action is needed, to make healthy responses salient and incentivise them so that they are repeated. Novel technologies provide an innovative promising method for delivering behaviour change interventions.

7. OPEN DISCUSSION

Consumer issues

- The importance of non-communicable disease was addressed - they are responsible for 63% of global deaths and will reach 89% by 2030. Behaviour factors count: personal, social and environmental factors calling for changes in behaviour. Such change is only possible when capability, motivation and opportunity come together and call for nudging to encourage people to choose the healthy option.
- Emphasis should be on prevention and education of children, as changing habits later is very challenging. However education alone cannot improve nutrition; socio-cultural support also needed for households to bring about change in behaviour e.g. on gender specific consumption patterns.
- The role of advertisement/aggressive marketing campaigns and its (negative) impact might contradict education/policy.
- Consumer trends: Sustainability, authenticity / responsibility, personalisation, health / "wellness". Consumers are interested in production methods and traceability.
- Although consumers spend little time reading nutritional labels in store this does not indicate lack of interest as witnessed by the reaction to the traffic lights labelling introduced so-far only in the UK. The guiding principle has to be that there are no good or bad foods but only bad diets.

Economic issues

- There is a possible clash between jobs & growth and public health since less food intake means lower sales of certain foods.
- The economic aspect of sustainability should not be ignored.
- Concern was expressed about the threat to the single market arising from the tendency for more fragmented national origin labelling policies.

Food policy and food security

- Calls for a more integrated food policy, with climate, environment, agriculture etc.
- The EU’s mission is not to feed the world but firstly to ensure that sustainable global food systems are in place and secondly to feed itself better. It is not healthy food that needs promotion but a healthy diet, as proportions count.
Dr. Angela Tregear, Edinburgh University, Researcher Strenght2food project

This presentation reflected on three areas of policymaking (food quality, short food supply chains and public procurement) in terms of their contribution to sustainability outcomes. In relation to food quality the Protected Food Name scheme is found to promote positive social and economic outcomes, however there are opportunities to incorporate more environmental goals. In terms of short food supply chains, evidence indicates the potential for social and economic gains from policy support, but these may be at the expense of increased transport-related carbon emissions if logistics are not well coordinated. Sustainability goals for public procurement are promoted by Directive 2014/24, however the provisions of this policy need to be matched by support in complementary areas to maximise educational, nutritional and environmental outcomes. The presentation concluded by identifying potential synergies between these policy areas and implications for supporting behavioural change amongst consumers/citizens.

Prof. Simon More, University College Dublin

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in people is an emerging (and urgent) global threat. Although the relative contribution of antimicrobial usage in farmed animals to this problem is uncertain, there is clear evidence of connectivity between antimicrobial usage in farm animals and AMR in people. Internationally, there is consensus on the need to reduce the use of antimicrobials in animals.

This presentation considered lessons learned from several Member States where substantial progress has already been made to reduce antimicrobial usage in farmed animals, and focuses on the recommendations of the RONAFA (Reduction Of the Need for Antimicrobials in Food-producing animals and Alternatives) report recently released by the European Food Safety Authority and the European Medicines Agency.

In Denmark and the Netherlands, where there has been substantial progress at reducing antimicrobial usage in farmed animals, a critical contributor has been the development of systems to objectively measure and benchmark usage both at the level of the farm and the prescribing veterinary practice. There have been a number of other changes, including a shift away from the use of critically important antimicrobials (CIAs) and antimicrobials for preventive use, and the requirement of a single prescribing veterinarian per farm. Internationally, agreement is being reached on technical indicators for usage (including DDDvet and DCDvet, as defined in detail by the European Medicines Agency). Using these technical units, it is now possible to critically compare usage between countries, industries, veterinarians and farms. Several recent scientific studies have highlighted factors associated with farms with low antimicrobial usage, relating to husbandry, management, vaccination and other measures.

The RONAFA opinion highlights the need for a multifaceted, integrated approach, adapted to local conditions. Farm-level recommendations are important, but only if higher-level changes are also in place, including national action plans, reduction targets and increased availability of rapid and reliable diagnostics. Objective measurement of usage is also critical, as highlighted previously. Farm-level recommendations include farm health plans, training and education, and improvement farm husbandry and
management. Farm health plans should include meaningful professional input, interventions guided by measurement and benchmarking, and regular reviews. There may be a need to rethink production systems with unsustainable antimicrobial usage. A comparison of farms with low and high usage offers opportunities to identify effective best-practice. Alternatives to antimicrobials may be valuable, although evidence of efficacy in controlled trials is currently very limited.

10. **TWO SUGGESTIONS FOR A COMMON AGRI-FOOD POLICY**

*Dr. Krijn Poppe - Wageningen Economic Research*

With reference to the essay published in 2016 by Louise Fresco and Krijn Poppe “Towards a Common Agriculture and Food Policy”. K. Poppe argued that 5 challenges should shape the future CAP: Food and nutrition security and safety, Climate change, water and energy, Reducing ecological impacts, Healthy diet for a lifelong healthy lifestyle and Inequality. In addressing public values and market imperfections two target groups stand out for policy: farmers and consumers; both are weak spots in the food chain. At the consumer side public health issues and climate change ask for more or less the same changes in diet and behaviour.

At the farming side environmental costs should be internalised in food prices and the chain should not shift the problems with the environment or farm incomes to the government but help to solve them. Aligning greening measures with the sustainability schemes of food processors and encouraging such schemes could therefore be attractive. An obligation for environmental accounting for larger farms would be a logical follow-up of the 1960s obligation for modernising farms to install management accounting. Food policy will not impact farming much, and agricultural policy does not necessarily improve the diet of consumers, but bundling them in one policy, given the challenge of climate change makes sense: it links city and country side and we should not pretend that farmers can fully mitigate climate change without diet consequences.

11. **OPEN DISCUSSION**

**AMR**

- In relation to cross-compliance which already covers records on veterinary medicines and prescriptions, the question was asked what more could farmers do. Prof. More noted that farm-level recommendations include farm health plans, training and education, and improved farm husbandry and management. More automated recording of antimicrobial use is needed as part of farm health plans, working alongside veterinarians, as in the Netherlands and Denmark, where substantial progress has been made over the past years.

- Should regulation or voluntary incentives be used? First you have to measure antimicrobial use and then you can reduce it. A broader performance framework aimed at reduction of usage is needed with levers in place to nudge producers in the right direction. Farm/vets using low amounts of AM exist alongside these using "manifold" more. The reasons have to be identified before starting reduction strategies. Vaccination and regional animal health policies were specifically mentioned as beneficial.

- The Farm Advisory Service (FAS) could play a role but needs to work with individual farmers and veterinarians.

- Development of new drugs is not a panacea, as resistance will also develop against such new drugs.
Public procurement

- Angela Tregear confirmed that there was evidence of positive effects (e.g. reliability of payments) of public procurement schemes. However, she indicated that public procurement is not necessarily a positive outlet for individual producers as pressure is for delivery at low prices. Producers should try to negotiate with public bodies as part of producer group or through cooperation. Not all market intermediates should be seen as adversarial.

- Public procurement will not be able to make a difference in isolation, but has to be accompanied by awareness raising and education activities.

- The CAP already includes elements such as the school fruit and school milk scheme, organic farming and the protected food name scheme.

- Short supply chains do not work everywhere.

Policy

- Krijn Poppe proposed that sustainability schemes operated by food processors or by producer organisations that are certified and audited by EU could be a way to deliver/replace greening. The respect of environmental requirements needs more flexibility to allow subsidiarity (e.g. water may be a problem in all regions/MS).

- Possible goals for a future CAP: Income support, eco-service, more demand driven, better address the broader societal demands - including health, monitoring performance, research and back-up innovation.

- CAP should facilitate farmers' adaptation to the fact that they are price and trend takers. It should encourage more collaboration between farmers, processors, market intermediaries, consumers.

- Importance of keeping diversity of EU food systems

- There is still a lack in specifications for an integrated food policy. EU policy should not be too prescriptive on what farmers should produce or not or on what consumer can eat.

Market failure

- Farmers and consumers are the weakest parts of the food chain as retailers and industry are stronger (producers of food-products leading to unhealthy diets if consumed over years do not pay for the damage they cause produces a market failure).

- A further market failure in relation to consumers is that the impact of bad diet is felt in the long term so consumers do not get a signal to change their habits in a timely manner. The suggestion was made (Krijn Poppe) that dietary advice could be given for meats along the lines of alcohol consumption guidance (tax- eat prudently).

- Concern was expressed that farmers face the challenge of low prices with high margins being made by the food industry. A further negative signal from the market is that fresh food prices are high in relation to processed foods.

- The food industry includes both big companies and SMEs. There are many initiatives to improve the functioning of the food chain. Some stakeholders however consider that voluntary approaches are not sufficient.
Consumption patterns

• Our food also fits and reflects our lifestyle with less time left for food preparation.
• Importance of up-grading cooking skills of consumers to enable them to change their behaviour and use food in a healthier manner and appreciate food quality/pleasure.

12. CONCLUSIONS BY RAPPORTEUR

Prof. Erik Mathijs, KU Leuven, Member of SCAR, and Coordinator of Transmango project

Food is produced, distributed and consumed in systems that are designed to deliver food and nutrition security for all citizens. However, our society faces important food-related public health issues that undermine food and nutrition security. These issues can be chiefly clustered into two clusters: food safety and nutrition-related health problems. The key question of this workshop is to what extent the CAP can and should be adapted to better address food safety and nutrition concerns. Food safety concerns relate to how farmers deal with pests and diseases, and can be tackled rather directly e.g. by regulating the use of antibiotics. Nutrition-related concerns, however, are much complex, due to the complexity of consumer behaviour.

To analyse these concerns in the framework of modernising and simplifying the CAP requires answering the following questions:

• What influences food consumption and how can consumption patterns be changed?
• What may changes in food consumption mean for agriculture?
• How can the CAP help? Is a Common Food and Agriculture Policy needed?

Food consumption is influenced by individual factors (cognitions, skills, biology, demographics) and factors that relate to the social (family, friends, peers), physical (home, work, restaurant, shops) and macro-level (norms, industry, media, marketing, policies) environment in which consumption decisions take place. In order to change food consumption a mix of interventions aimed both at the individual consumer and these environments, is required. In addition to long-term efforts to enhance education, promising options include interventions in the physical environment, such as nudging initiatives (gently pushing people towards healthier choices) and the use of novel technologies to support consumers in their efforts to change behaviour.

The link between agriculture and food consumption is rather complex, as most agricultural practices and policies affect food consumption environments only in an indirect way. A notable exception is food marketing, as promotional activities aimed at increasing the consumption of some foodstuffs may contrast to a certain extent with dietary recommendations.

In reverse, changes in food consumption do have implications for agriculture. For instance, increased consumption of fruit and vegetables and decreased meat consumption (particularly beef) influence the further development of these sub-sectors.

---

The current CAP is already well aligned with food safety standards, but the sense of urgency related to the anti-microbial resistance warrants increased attention to the use of antimicrobials in agriculture. For this, best practices should be exchanged and applied in the framework of higher level changes at national level. This means that the farm advisory service could play an important role in synergy with national reduction plans. Farmers should be incentivised to record electronically the use of anti-microbials and develop farm health plans.

The CAP promotes healthy diets through the CAP promotion policy and the school schemes. Also food quality and short food supply chains initiatives have the potential to foster behavioural change. A particularly promising option is public procurement, but, as mentioned before, a mix of interventions is needed for lasting change, so such schemes need to be complemented with awareness raising and education activities.

The question remains to what extent the CAP sufficiently facilitates farmers’ adaptation to new trends in general and changed consumer patterns in particular. To earn a sufficient income is key to a resilient farming community.

In conclusion, the food system needs to fulfill multiple economic, social and environmental functions and objectives. Some of these objectives are aligned, but others may conflict with each other. Hence, governing the food system requires a coordinated approach that fosters the potential synergies between policy domains, but that also manages the unavoidable trade-offs, taking into account the interests of the most vulnerable actors in the food system, i.e., farmers and consumers.

***