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1. INTRODUCTION

TRANSMANGO is a EU funded project focused on the vulnerabilities and resilience of European food systems in a context of socio-economic, agro-ecological, technological, institutional and behavioral change. It aims to enhance understanding of the new challenges and opportunities that the food sector will face in the future and to investigate how transitions to a better and secure food system could take place, both at EU and local level. For this purpose, TRANSMANGO engages with a diverse range of food system stakeholders to develop multi-dimensional scenarios for FNS in Europe, which offered a set of different and challenging future contexts for local case studies.

Local case study: Food assistance in Tuscany

In recent years, financial crisis, austerity policies, unemployment and immigration are putting a strain on food and nutrition security in high income countries, where a growing number of people, also from those segments of population once considered secure, seek food assistance. In response to this, emergency food initiatives expanded, provided by a diverse range of actors through various instruments and approaches.

Alongside the traditional difficulties of this sector – lack of control over donation, inability to ensure nutritional requirements, stigmatization, dependency on volunteer work – new issues are arising from budget cuts to welfare expenditures, the reorganization of EU funds for the most deprived (FEAD) and from the spreading of surplus food recovery practices.

Our local case study focuses on food assistance in Tuscany region and aims at exploring it as a “system of practices”. We aim to identify consolidated and innovative practices, implemented to address food poverty at the local level. Key research questions are:

- How do food assistance practices address FNS vulnerabilities, in terms of competences, values and resources?
- How is food assistance re-thinking its role to deal with the challenges posed by the current context of change?

In order to address the second RQ, the two local workshops are organized in collaboration with Caritas¹, that is a key actor of food assistance in Tuscany and is now reconsidering its role and capacity to contribute to the right to food. Caritas’ main features are advocacy, widespread presence on the territory and direct contact with recipients; it relies mostly on voluntary resources, both human and material.

Caritas will take the opportunity offered by the TRANSMANGO workshops to lay the ground for a territorial “Alliance for food”, a vision and a plan which has been thought of in abstract terms but has not be reflected into its concrete application yet. Through two local workshops, in fact, TRANSMANGO engages with the key players of food assistance in Tuscany, in order to elaborate plans to achieve a shared set of objectives (first workshop), test these plans and strategies and verify their robustness in a range of multiple plausible futures (second workshop).

¹ Caritas is the Pastoral Body of the Italian Episcopal Conference to promote charity.
2. Workshop 1

The first workshop was held on the 1st of February 2016 in Florence. After a set of preliminary interviews, on-site visits and attendances to public events, we selected around 20 participants from Caritas and its Emporia of solidarity, as well as social public sector employees, experts of the food system, representatives of the large-retail sector and of the regional Food Bank. The name of participants and affiliations in each group are indicated in the Annex.

2.1. Methods and outline

The workshop entailed the following main parts:

- **Visioning exercise and Identification of macro-themes**
- **Back-casting for each macro-theme**
- **Downscaling of European scenarios at local level**
- **Causal mapping within each scenario**

The detailed agenda is available in the Annex.

2.1.1. Visioning

This visioning exercise has two parts: 1) brainstorming and 2) clustering of the elements of the vision. Participants are invited to reflect in pairs (5 minutes speed meets repeated three times) on the features of a desirable future for food assistance in Tuscany. We asked them: “What are the elements of a desirable future to ensure access to healthy food, good and nutritious for everybody in Tuscany? And, specifically, what it is the ideal future for food assistance in Tuscany?”. 2030 was chosen as a suitable time horizon to allow long term strategies and change, with reference to Caritas activities. The post-its are then grouped (collectively) into macro-areas, which constitute the vision.

2.1.2. Back-casting

Back-casting is a systematic process for working backwards from a desirable future to identify the steps required that connect the future to the present. At each step we ask the question “if we want to attain [current step] what would we need to do/have in place for that to be possible?” This question is over and over again asked until the present situation is reached. These steps can then be implemented from where they are now successively to achieve their desired future. People think like this all the time, for example, “if I want to be at work by 9am, I will need to catch the bus at 8:30, which means I will need to leave the house at 8am, which means I will need to finish breakfast and be packed by 8am, which means I need to be out of the shower by 7:30am” and so forth. We are all familiar with the process of stepping backwards from a desired outcome to work out what would need to happen in a step-by-step fashion.

2.1.3. Downscaling European scenarios

The goal of the first exercise was to create a clear image of the local scenario at the end of the chosen time horizon (2030). The emphasis was on the reintroduction of the scenarios and adapting them and making them coherent to the specific context of the case. This meant that a new, local story was invented, where the European scenarios were used as an inspiration.

In practice, this step involves immersing the participants in the European scenarios.
**Scenario 1: Fed Up Europe.** Fed Up Europe is a story of inertia in the food system under global pressures. Practices and business models leading to unhealthy diets and negative environmental impacts continue. The power of EU and national policy makers to change these trends decreases over time with a combination of decreasing funds and decreasing popular support. There is a lack of leadership in the face of climate and migration crises. Consumers’ incomes are enough to avoid food insecurity, but many lack the knowledge, incentives or budgets for healthy lifestyles. In governments and in the private sector, there are minorities interested in changing the trend, but they are fighting an uphill battle.

**Scenario 2: Retrotopia.** In Retrotopia, waves of immigration, terrorist threats and increasing impacts of climate change trigger social movements and policies that aim to keep global problems out of Europe, along with a nostalgia-fueled sense of natural heritage and rural custodianship. Racism becomes more accepted; migrants are kept out, creating employment problems in greying societies, which are partly solved by robotization of work; fear of migration from Europe’s south to northern countries due to climate change prompts European policy makers to help make Mediterranean countries more climate-resilient. Environmental concerns drive down consumption of animal products; otherwise, the improvement of diets is not a priority amid concerns of European security and self-reliance.

**Scenario 3: The Protein Union.** The Protein Union is a story of a highly proactive response by the EU and its member countries, led by governments but supported by the private sector and civil society, to the challenge of changing European diets and modes of production. The focus is on creating new sources of protein, including mainstreaming insect consumption and the production of artificial quasi-meats, supported by new, more integrated means of food production and processing, at the expense of the livelihoods of smaller farmers. This is combined with strong action on reducing sugar closer to 2050, which nevertheless cannot avoid the legacy of unhealthier diets in earlier times.

**Scenario 4: The Price of Health.** The Price of Health is a story that sees many Europeans returning to rural lives, out of necessity due to global pressures, because of changing social norms, and facilitated by technological advances in communications. These changes are supported by strong government policies regarding self-reliance and sustainability. Not everyone, however, is happy to be returning to the land – and the wealthiest do not have to follow suit.

The workshop participants are split up into groups of roughly five people, each with a diverse mix of participant types, and each group is assigned one scenario. Preferably 20 people are present so that all 4 scenarios can be covered. Within each group, each participant reads the scenario they have been assigned individually and this is followed by an open, imaginative conversation about what the scenario could mean for their decision context. This conversation starts by each group member working in silence, thinking and writing down individual thoughts about what this scenario (as an end state) would look like for the initiative’s context. This is done to ensure people have time to develop their own thinking before group work starts, ensuring a diversity of views is taken into account. Then, one by one around the circle participants share their imaginings. The whole group discusses these individual views and develops a coherent image of the scenario end state, which will be developed in further detail through the following activities. The participants in each scenario group discuss what the scenario means for the list of elements, to ensure that the scenario is elaborated in terms of the elements seen as relevant for the decision context of the initiative. The outcome is a narrative description of the scenario end state.

2.1.4. Causal mapping

Participants within their scenario groups were asked to explore the chains of cause and effect amongst the discussed aspects. Influence, or causal, mapping was used, [1]. Causal mapping requires participants to draw arrows between concepts, and assign a plus (+) or minus (-) to the arrow. A (+) indicates an increase, for example “an increase in the number of people interested in short food chains results in an increase in social cohesion and social capital”. A (-) indicates an inverse relationship, for example “an increase in the number of recurrent animal diseases reduces trust in food”. Consensus on adding
concepts, drawing arrows, and assigning sign to the arrows was reached by group discussion within scenario groups.

The influence diagrams are the participants’ view, in their scenario, of the complex way in which the poor will require food assistance. They also show what change in the number of people requiring food assistance will causes. It should be remembered that this exercise was conducted with limited time in a one day workshop, and the maps are not comprehensive nor systemic pictures of food and nutrition security now or in the futures represented by the scenarios. They do provide a snapshot of the immediate and plural causal structures within the minds of, and discussed by, participants.

Figure 1 Graph showing relationships between concepts C1, C2 and C3

In practice, the following steps are followed. Firstly, the group determines the key elements of the system. These elements must be variable concepts (things that can increase or decrease, so “social unrest” rather than “society”, “climate change” rather than “climate”). In order to generate the key elements the participants can look to the list of variables they generated for inspiration, however they are not limited to those elements. They will choose 10-15 elements at most to include in the graph. Each element is written on a separate post-it note or card. These notes can be moved around on a large sheet of paper to allow participants to draw lines between the elements where they see a link between them. Arrowheads are used to represent the direction of causality – which element exerts causation on another element. A + or – sign can be used to indicate the direction of the relationship (does one thing cause an increase or a decrease in the other).

2.2. Results

2.2.1. Visioning

The macro-themes are macro-ideal targets. Once macro-themes were identified, each participant had max 8 stickers to vote for the most important themes. Each one could vote based on preference (no explicit rules were given for voting). The following themes were elaborated and scored:

- rights (13 points);
- governance (23 points) and networks (16 points) – these two themes were joined;
- person-centered approach (17 points);
- education (25 points);
- monitoring (12) – this was considered as a cross cutting issue;
- food waste (11 points);
- food quality (11 points).

After the voting session, three themes were chosen as priority goals for “rich picture” and “back-casting” exercise.

1. Governance and network
2. Education
3. Person’s centered approach
2.2.2. Backcasting

During back-casting, participants tried to work backwards from the desirable future to the present, identifying all the steps and actions needed, overcoming the limitations and constraints of the present. This turned out to be a challenging task, because of the difficulties not only in imagining long term ideal goals, but also coming down to concrete actions, that should take place in the medium and short terms.
1. Governance and networks

Sub objective | Actions (2016–2030)
--- | ---
1. Integrated and coordinated policies for FNS (2030) | 1.1: creation of a “promoters group” active on a regional level, in charge of the direction of actions, responsible for brokering among regional and local actors. This “promoters group” works towards raising awareness of regional stakeholders.
1.2a: The promoters group identifies local institutional actors to be involved in the coordination of FNS in Tuscany
1.2b: The promoters group addresses social health districts, which must coordinate and interact.
1.3: The promoters group engages with municipalities and “third sector” actors in network building activities.
1.4a: Based on the network built and the knowledge exchanged, the creation of an ad-hoc Regional Committee on FNS is established.
1.4b: The third sector network is made in charge within the promoters group to involve actors of the supply chain (producers and retailers) and stimulate a debate on food and nutrition security.
1.5a: The committee activates a monitoring of food insecurity on the territory, and supports project development.
1.5b: The third sector develops a self reflection on its inner functioning. They try to find common aims and synergic solutions (example on food drives, volunteer pooling, University training/stage, voucher...) and develop fundraising actions.
1.6a: The committee elaborates incentives for SMEs and retailers to encourage CSR and donations, tax relief measures. Universities and retailers can also be involved.
1.6b: The committee puts pressure on public authorities to develop tendering process that award points based on the recovery of food in public canteens (needs regulation, Green Public Procurement that is also social).
1.7: The committee lobbies at the European level to ensure FEAD continuity planning.

2. Developing a Food and Nutrition Security action plan adopting a prevention approach | 2.1: creation of a regional board for the coordination of actions towards food security (same committee as above). Actor: Tuscany Region department
2.2: Confronting with local actors (see first column). Actors involved: Tuscany region dept + regional committee + local health district. Providing support to innovative projects existing on the territory, by Tuscany Region, RDP resources, Municipalities, in interaction with Bank Foundations, Universities
2.3: Developing a regional Plan for FNS in Tuscany. Actor: Tuscany Region Department dedicated to Social Policies

2. Education

Sub objective | Actions (2016–2030)
--- | ---
1 increase awareness on resources available and production processes | 1.1a Retailers favor food surplus recovery
1.2a Emphasize the cost reduction and the possible reinvestment
1.3a Change promotion strategies by retailers (do not encourage buying beyond effective needs)
1.4a Indicators on food waste and increase efficiency in resource use.
1.5.a Make explicit and communicate overall convenience (not only economic advantage) at all levels
1.1.b GDO increases sale of local products
1.2.b GDO supply with local producers: alliance with GDO
1.3.b Promotion of territory and local productions
1.1.c Enhance project skills and planning as a specific competence
1.2.c Educating the human resources to project design and programming to improve project planning capacity
1.3.c The food assistance actors promote collaboration in order to exploit public-private synergies
1.4.c The food assistance actors activate fundraising strategies

2. cultural change, lifestyles
2.1.a Work on training priests and religion teachers
2.2.a Educate parishioners. Educational training agencies packages
2.1.b Training teachers
2.2.b Laboratories and trainings in schools
2.1.c Create and animate debates in public meetings, encourage the use of social media, promote spaces for aggregation and collective activities (example, food classes)

3. coordination
3.1 Sharing of information among relevant actors
3.2.a Board on Education
3.2.b Board on Food and Nutrition security
3.3.a Charter of shared principles among all stakeholders of the education system (social actors, media ...)
3.3.b Civic food project: join together restaurants and producers in a local network, focusing on local productions

3. Person’s centred approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub objective</th>
<th>Actions (2016→2030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Finding multiple and integrated responses to the food poverty</td>
<td>1.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator 1.2 Map opportunities. The Region facilitating the process 1.3 Use of IT technology to create networks for food recovery. GDO, collective catering and producers of food. 1.4 Evaluate the available amount of food. Ex. Recovery and redistribution of surplus food. 1.5 Involvement of local producers networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 effective identification of needs</td>
<td>2.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator 2.2 Identify the “witnesses” of food poverty: pediatrician, school teachers, priests, health and social services and pharmacies 2.3 Creation of an observatory on food and nutrition in security needs, coordinated by social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 safe and active Neighborhoods | 3.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. This should be led by neighborhoods  
3.2 Involvement of schools to develop food culture and social relations. The municipality is in charge.  
3.3 Identify and recover available neighborhood spaces for interaction. The neighborhood and municipality should interact on this action  
3.4.a Create community centers aiming at developing initiatives around food related themes. Interaction between municipality and neighborhood.  
3.4.b Municipalities allow neighborhoods to use available green spaces (municipal regulations). Predisposition of equipment, cleaning, checking safety conditions (ex. children playground). The neighborhood creates food production spaces, (such as urban gardens).  
3.5 Organize local fairs, street food occasions to include migrant communities, neighborhood dinners. Organized with the help of Caritas and third sector actors. |
| 4 Recipients as protagonists | 4.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator  
4.2 Set up a direction for the recognition of the right to food. Mayors, Health services ... (cover multiple territorial levels)  
4.3 Place the food aid within the individual social support path  
4.4 Decrease and gradual substitution of food parcels with Emporia (i.e. social markets) establishment. Caritas and NGOs should be leading actors. |
| 5 Food quality | 5.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator  
5.2 Approve the law to promote food recovery and reduce waste  
5.3 Simplify legislation and on product expiration dates  
5.4 Alignment of national legislation on the territories  
These actions should be led by agriculture and health ministries. Lobbying by NGOs. |
2.2.3. Downscaling European scenarios

European scenarios from the TRANSMANGO consortium had been downscaled by the four groups of participants by imagining “What would the (EU) scenario mean for the food assistance system of Tuscany?”.

Analyzing the four downscaled scenarios in the period between the two workshops, we realized that there were two key variables within the scenarios, that allow to compare them. The first is way of intervention by Government, which may entail the State adopting an emergency approach (i.e., the State responds from time to time to social emergencies, when they arise) or a strategic approach (i.e., the state anticipates social emergencies by adopting a proactive approach). The second variable relates to the openness of society towards societal problems, such as immigration (i.e., civil society demonstrates an open or a closed attitude).

Beautiful cartoons represented the main features of the four diverse but plausible context for Tuscany in 2030:

“Fed up Europe” ➞ “Tuscany in 3D” (top-right): the “right to food” enters fully into the political debate: food assistance is conceived as a strategic task that allows to tackle bigger problems and needs. Public authorities develop a strategic approach to achieve closer collaboration between all players in the food system. Citizens are willing to contribute with voluntary work. The role of civil society associations is viewed by government as a resource for survival and functioning of the welfare system. The narrative of the scenario comprises the following key points:

- The crisis escalates. Inequality and social conflict are increasing. migratory waves exert strong pressure on food assistance systems. Public health is deteriorating because of inadequate eating habits.
- The food system is concentrated in a few large companies. They reduce the surplus because they become more efficient and therefore greater attention is put to avoid waste. To justify itself, businesses engage in social responsibility projects. Growing public pressure on big companies to help the solutions.
- The welfare state is in crisis. People are seeking new answers and customized to emerging needs. The right to food enters fully into the political debate: food assistance is conceived as a strategic task that allows you to tackle larger problems and needs. Public authorities develop a strategic approach that aims to achieve closer collaboration between all players in the food system.
- An increasing number of citizens are willing to contribute with voluntary work. The role of civil society associations and is viewed by government as a resource for survival and functioning of the welfare system.
“It could be better” (bottom-right): the pressure on the national health care system – due to rising incommunicable diseases derived from years of poor diet – brings a reduction to public expenditure on social services. A reactive public management approach and poor coordination between services prevail. Social actors must find a way to cope with the increased (food) poverty. The narrative of the scenario comprises the following key points:

- The crisis persists: the middle class impoverishes, the need of assistance, including food, increases. Social conflict has become worse in part because of the stronger migration flows. The deterioration of lifestyles generates a deterioration of food styles and this has impacts on health.

- The food system is concentrated in the hands of a few large industries who invest in technological development and product innovation (eg. new proteins and quasi-meat). They reduce the surplus because there is more efficiency and therefore greater attention to waste. To justify itself, businesses engage in social responsibility projects.

- Welfare spending is further compressed, also challenged by the pressure on the national health care system because of diseases related to years of poor diet.

- Public resources to manage food poverty are increasingly scarce. At the State and Regional government levels a management approach continues to prevail, together with the emergency containment and poor coordination between policies, instruments and practices. Social actors are having to cope with the increased demand for social services, and in particular food assistance.
“Solidarity in half” (top-left): Italian government adopts a restrictive welfare strategy, by supporting “eligible” citizens with minimum incomes, exacerbating the differences with the most vulnerable groups. Civil society is very closed and uninterested to social problems. The narrative of the scenario comprises the following key points:

- The political environment is becoming more and more closed and racism and xenophobia are widespread. With the slowdown of the crisis and the economic upturn, the resident population improves living conditions and expects better food and environmental quality.

- Public authorities adopt a strategy of restricting welfare to Italian citizens (e.g. introduction of minimum income), exacerbating the differences with the most vulnerable groups.

- The food system is oriented towards quality production and there is a tighter supply chain coordination. Larger companies develop social responsibility projects mainly in the environmental field.

- There is growing public attention to the environment, both at European and national levels, restrictive public measures are adopted for environmental protection and sustainable agriculture. The agricultural system is geared towards the recovery of land for agricultural purposes. The overall production is falling in terms of quantity and increases in value. The food prices are very high; due to greater efficiency in the food system, surpluses and waste along the chain are minimized.

- Civil society is very closed and uninterested to social problems.
“Do I want to go to live in the countryside?” (bottom-left): the government decides budget cuts on social measures, considering these not as a priority. Food assistance support is limited to transferring European resources to social parties. The food assistance actors must intercept surplus of small producers and retailers, which are most resilient in the regional context, but this has become more complicated. Society is very closed, therefore human resources, ie volunteers are also scarce. The narrative of the scenario comprises the following key points:

- The economy is stagnating. The cost of living in the cities becomes unaffordable for most citizens, who move to rural areas but especially in the peri-urban areas, where poverty and vulnerable groups are concentrated. The greater poverty also leads to a divergence between the dietary habits of the poor, which worsen, and those of the rich, that enhance and sustain the demand for high quality products.

- The food scandals undermine consumer confidence in the largest agro-food industry and retailing. The small and medium enterprises reveals to be the most flexible, resilient to the crisis and able to better respond to an increasing attention to the relationship between diet and health and between power supply and local identity. Tuscany leverages its local industry tradition and supports small and medium enterprises. The local product is represented as the alternative to a healthy and sustainable globalization of food “taste”.

- Large retailers are trying to adapt to the new situation in an articulated manner: a part of them meets the demand for local products and high quality, and another pushes on lowering prices and standardization.

- Public opinion is very sensitive to health, safety and the environment, but not very sensitive to societal problems. The government, faced with cuts in spending on social measures, doesn’t consider food assistance as a priority. They merely manage European resources.

- Intercepting surplus of small producers and retailers has become more complicated for food assistance actors. Moreover there is a lack of volunteers.
2.2.4. Causal mapping

Causal map for Tuscany in 3D

In “Tuscany in 3D” the focus concept was “people in need”. Social damage and environmental damage were seen as the main consequences from a complex system of factors around the demand for food assistance. A potential economic upturn formed a key nexus in a series of complex cycles involving social...
inequality and food waste. Firstly, in a triple cycle economic upturn increased food welfare and healthcare resources, whilst simultaneously reducing the number of people in need. Social inequality would be reduced, and in turn social damage, increasing the potential for further economic upturn. This virtuous cycle is reversed into a damaging cycle in an economic downturn. Environmental damage was identified as a key negative driver of the economy. Participant examined the roles that food waste played in particular, which could mitigate social damage if turned into welfare through food recycling, or it could create environmental damage through unnecessary waste of resources. Awareness of citizens and corporations, the availability of volunteers and donations, and trust and cooperation among politicians and institutions were see as key drivers and enablers of a positive and mitigating role for food waste.

Causal map for “It could be better”

In “It could be better” the focus concept was “poor demand food assistance”. Social conflict and risk of relying on charity were seen as the main consequences from a complex system of factors around the demand for food assistance. The poor demanding food assistance was viewed as a driver of the consequences, and education as mitigation. Participants saw two main feedback dynamics that had the potential to drive the consequences, or mitigate them. A long cycle of education, including food education, would result in different food styles or choices. In turn this could lower health risk, healthcare expenditure, decrease the use of social protection measures for food, which could free up more resources for education. This virtuous cycle could drive mitigation of the consequences of relying on charity and social conflict. A shorter loop interacting with the longer virtuous cycle. While education might free social protection resources, the need of the poor demanding food assistance could increase health risk, increasing health
expenditure and in turn absorb social protection resources. Which would dominate in the interaction of these two cycles and their competing effects on the consequences depends on the factors driving these two cycles. Participants saw centralizing production and mechanisation as a key driver of the cycles, which through biodiversity loss, polarization and unemployment could ultimately have a negative effect, increasing the demand of the poor for food assistance and interrupting the effect of the establishment and strength of the virtuous education cycle.

Causal map for “Solidarity in half”

In “Solidarity in half: between bridges and barriers” the focus concept was “number of people in need”. Food related diseases and healthcare costs were seen as the main consequences from a complex system of factors around the number of people in need and their needs not being met by the third sector. There were no significant feedback loops identified by the participants. Instead they identified a linear but complex picture of an ageing population, immigration, and food education, food prices and food waste directly increasing the number of people in need and through additional factors driving food related disease and healthcare costs. An ageing population reduces volunteers and increase general demand on healthcare. Immigrants introduce greater and more complex needs. Food education was the only mitigating driver identified, which could decrease food related disease such as diabetes, and which could also reduce food waste – some portion of which could be diverted to food donations.

Causal map for “Do I want to go to live in the countryside?”
In “Do I want to go to live in the countryside” the focus concept was “demand for volunteer work”. This demand was seen as the key consequence. Two factors were seen to directly increase the demand, the number of rural inhabitants in need and the number of the inhabitants receiving help. One factor could help reduce the demand; the efficiency of a central collection and distribution system, by directly reducing the volunteer workload and increasing the availability of financial and food resources. The availability of volunteers was a key driver on demand through addressing the existing need. Availability was seen to be influenced by free time and pension protection. Participants saw public and private sector co-ordination of welfare as a key overall driver and, given the scenario’s focus on a return to rural production, what proportion of those who might require need could produce food for their own consumption, alleviating the demand on welfare. The only feedback loop involved the efficiency of a central collection and distribution system, which saw continual improvement in this factor freeing resources for charity to respond to other dimensions of need, reducing the overall demand, allowing resources to be further diverted into system improvements including central collection and distribution. This, if established, is a virtuous infrastructure cycle allowing charity to mitigate the demand for volunteer work through improved availability of financial, food, and welfare resources.
3. **WORKSHOP 2**

The second workshop was held on the 3rd of May, 2016 in Florence. The same participants as in the first workshop were invited; although some of them dropped at last moment, new participants from the regional administration asked to take part, thus we managed to reach 12 participants overall. The name of participants and affiliation is available in the Annex. During a brief introduction, the results of the first workshop and the outline of the second workshop’s objectives, methods and agenda were presented.

3.1. **Methods and outline**

The workshop entailed four main parts. The detailed agenda is available in the Annex.

![Diagram showing the sequence of parts: Re-immersion in the scenarios, Scenario-based review of plans, Plans across scenario: matrix, Review of plans](image)

3.1.1. **Re-immersion in the scenarios**

Each scenario group reconvenes. Everyone reads the digitized local scenario and accompanying materials, such as insights from the causal map and the drawings representing the main features of the scenarios. A short round of conversation happens to make sure everyone understands the scenario. Any missing elements are written down on post-its and collected/clustered. Participants were asked to refer, in particular, to some specific variables that are relevant for food assistance, such as:

- surplus food availability,
- public resources,
- food assistance demand,
- vulnerable groups,
- volunteer work.

3.1.2. **Scenario-based review of plans**

Everyone stays in the scenario groups, where each scenario group receives all the plans from the first workshop’s morning session. The facilitators have digital forms to work through for each of these plans. For every aspect of the plan, the group asks – is this action/strategy/etc. possible in this scenario, or not? If not, what could be recommended (concretely) to make the plan better able to work in this scenario?

3.1.3. **Plans across scenarios: the matrix**

Participants stay in their scenario groups. Each group briefly presents their scenario so all are reminded of the key assumptions and changes in that scenario world. Facilitators, make sure that your group has a succinct, 3 minute presentation of the scenario (for instance using the first paragraph of the digitized scenario with any highlights or changes suggested on the day).

Then, a plenary discussion proceeds by discussing each plan in turn. So, comments on group 1’s plan are described by scenario group A, then the comment on group 1’s plan by scenario group b; then comments on group 1’s plan by scenario group c. Scenario groups have prepared their comments so that they can
present what they thought were the main strengths and weaknesses of the plan in their scenario, and what their main recommendations would be to make the plan work better in their scenario.

The facilitator writes down these comments in a table organized per group plan (horizontal) and per scenario (vertical), but as an additional way of capturing the discussion, before the review discussion starts, members of the plan’s group are also told to write down notes on these comments for later integration.

3.1.4. Review of plans
The plan groups from the morning of workshop 1 reconvene (along with additional/new group members). Aided by the digitized copies of the plans, and their notes of the comments of the scenario groups, they discuss how to integrate these comments and improve the plans further. Which of the scenario-based comments and recommendations occurred across all of the different scenarios, and therefore highlight key strengths, weaknesses and potential improvements to make the plans work better regardless of the scenario, essentially making them more robust? Which recommendations are scenario-specific but worth considering as an option to make the plan more flexible in case a certain scenarios comes about? The group each writes down these improvements, both on a flip-chart and in more detailed form on a computer, so they can easily be integrated in their plan.

3.2. Results
3.2.1. Re-immersion in the scenarios: additions made to Workshop 1 scenarios

**Tuscany in 3D**

- Difficult aspects of public authorities are not well stressed. Institutional and non-institutional actors do not collaborate, the network is weak. Public oversight is needed but it must be quicker in taking decisions and more effective in managing appropriate responses.
- Bureaucracy: public authorities slow down the network activities. More flexible procedures are needed.
- Lack of awareness among public authorities’ staff on food poverty as well as on the need of simplified procedures.
- Even politics is not aware of poverty extent: Caritas could have an important role in addressing this lack of awareness and knowledge.

**It could be better**

- While talking about “crisis”, the specificity of Tuscany social and economic fabric must be taken into account in this scenario. It is not plausible to say that in Tuscany only a few large corporations will prevail. This means analyzing specific local contexts in the cities or in other geographically limited areas, in relations to food need. It is important to see the interrelationships with local factors.
- For example, the presence and the ties with local companies. The current fragmentation represents a limit but also a potential for the economic development and welfare in the region.
- Tuscany farms can prove to be resilient in the longer term and this must be taken into account. For example, organic food districts are moving towards "good" food, considering also the social inclusion potential. Organic food districts may consolidate and become stronger in the longer term.
- In relations to social commitment of agriculture in Tuscany, there is a dialogue or a conflict for example, with the COOP. Agricultural firms are a positive elements also from a social point of view. Tuscany region has laid the foundations to create a production system that can help the vulnerable people.
- In the scenario, Caritas may encounter problems in terms of representativeness. The migration flows remain a big problem. However in relations to migration flows Tuscany has made the choice to welcome migrants in small groups, because they are a potential.
● Migration leads to the emergence of different food needs. The challenge is in meeting the dietary and cultural preferences.
● Epidemiological Problems and diseases / due to not fully adequate food. Young generations encounter most health problems. Beyond quantitative availability, care must be put in achieving food quality.

Solidarity in half

● The mass of “invisible” people is putting some pressures on European countries, which are more and more closed and where nationalisms have strengthened
● Lack of social mobility: immigrants are not integrated within the society and they still represent the most vulnerable groups
● Minor role of volunteer work, solidarity attitude is failing
● The gap between eligible citizens and the most vulnerable groups has widened
● Ageing population in relation to immigration: they don’t see immigration as an opportunity and as a resource
● Labor market: immigrant workforce could be integrated in agricultural and food production. Price reduction opportunities to be promoted among the general public.
● Top-down approach with a central authority controlling on agricultural resources through the CAP first pillar; restrictions to agricultural imports.
● Market has proved its effectiveness in providing food security for those “inside” the system: high food prices guarantee the quality of food (externalities)
● Lack of surplus food to redistribute to the poor: food chain efficiency.

Do I want to go to live in the countryside?

● Migrants concentrate in the peripheries. The living style possible in the sub-urban areas poses a set of challenges: little food of low quality is available.
● The State makes a step back. The pressure on local authorities and voluntary sector is strong. Few people can afford to have entertainments, go out for dinner etc.. the “grey zone” is becoming thicker. Risk of increased social unrest.
● However there is a lack of voluntary workers: ageing people without adequate social security or family farmers who are busy working the land.
● Intercepting surplus food is hard and costly: there would be need for a public intervention.
● Tuscany in this scenario is quite unrealistic in the way “a return” to land was described in workshop 1. Because the land is very expensive, access is not so simple, strong rigidity of the land system. Moving to the countryside is possible for richer people. Destinations for new farmers are only marginal areas. Only those who live in the countryside already have the possibility to bring value to existing land.

3.2.2. Scenario-based review of plans

3.2.2.1. Tuscany in 3D

Person’s centered approach

Being a rather positive scenario, Tuscany in 3D offers a fertile context to the plan, where some objectives, such as Emporia in place of food parcels, have already been achieved. However, a redefinition of priorities is needed. The Effective identification of needs on the territory has been recognized as a cross-cutting objective to be immediately pursued, in order to lay the knowledge bases required for the implementation of the strategic plan. According to this scenario group, the centrality of the person should be intended as creating conditions under which all people can provide for themselves and the root causes of food poverty have been eradicated.
Education

The plan has been reformulated to better fit for the desirable context offered by the scenario: here, again, Tuscany in 3D represents a rather positive context. A distinction has been made between more substantial objective and those intended as tools suitable for wider purposes, such as coordination and communication among the actors of the system and training courses and education, which shall be addressed to all segments of population, at any age. Goals of lifestyles change and education to gift and generosity have been identified as being more related to an individual dimension and as priority goals. A new entry in the plan is Creating awareness on the right to food/on food as a right: the political dimension of the right to food is explicitly recognized and the use of media and social media should be encouraged in order to create a fruitful debate.

Governance and networks

In this scenario group, the objectives of the plan on Governance are merged into one: Integrated and coordinated policy for FNS and development of a preventive approach is the new overall objective for this plan. In order to simplify, the committee has been designed as a unique organization with different branches, representing all the CSOs and institutions engaged in the process. A kind of Civil Protection model for food assistance has been suggested. Political recognition, of the need to protect the most vulnerable groups would be welcome at both local and national level.

A Conference scheduled for 2016 will launch the path: local administrations (first of all, the Tuscany Region) remain the leading actors of the process, along with a network of CSOs working towards shared objectives and constantly strengthening their relationships. The committee starts working in 2019 and gives guidelines to draw up a regional plan on FNS.

3.2.2.2. It could be better

Person’s centered approach

A general weakness of this plan within “It could be better” scenario is that the Region is expected to give input to all the sub objectives and plans. Here, however, there are limited financial resources and these are needed somewhere else, not on food assistance.

It is necessary to find suitable actors to address food poverty and a better co-ordination between them. The region can be involved as a coordinator between actors in the food assistance sector. It is not plausible to expect more than this from the State in such a critical scenario. The social actors must organize in order to lobby and put pressure on public actors: this is even more important in relation to the representativeness of social actors. Caritas representative today. What will be the leading actor that will bring to the attention of the State the interests of civil society? Self-organization and committees can help the lack of the state at all levels.

Education

In this scenario, in relation to resources there are two key actors: on one side the industry manufacturers and “responsible” companies but fragmented; on the other, the large retailers. The priority here by civil society actor is to push for minimum acceptable levels in terms of characteristics of quality and wholesomeness of new productions. Moreover to support small producers and other new ways of intercepting foods. In relations to changing lifestyles: how can we finance training projects related to school if the public does not have a strategy and retrieves? Again, the role of civil society and organizations! many actions and responsibilities are on top of civil society as active participants (risk of overload). In terms of coordinating communication: it should be re-defined at which level this would happen: wider and homogeneous territories, as in the districts should be identified (other than administrative districts).
**Governance and network**

Independently from the scenario, the public should organize itself to integrate the expertise to ensure that the actions are more effective AND the private level should organize and become more integrated.

Objective 1. The main problem in this scenario is that there is some level of conflict. There are two alternatives: a closure between these two spheres or an effort to dialogue (pressure by Caritas to have more public education)

The scenario was thought completely excluding the state from its leadership role in the institution as regards the agri-food sector In this scenario there is more conflict than cooperation among stakeholders: If the public withdraws, who is in charge of food assistance system’s policy?

The private actors should work like an “antenna” capable of capturing the needs and promote actions. There is a growing social movement, and a transition towards civil society which is in charge of managing societal problems (and not the state). It is necessary to act on a revival of the role of the state in this context, in order to prevent the scenario (mitigation) from happening.

3.2.2.3. **Solidarity in half**

**Person’s centered approach**

*Solidarity in half* does not offer the better context for a plan based on the centrality of the person. On the one side, citizens benefit from public support, on the other the existence of a mass of “invisibles”, mainly immigrants and refugees, raises the question “Who is the person whose centrality we want to achieve?”. So, a huge groundwork is needed, in order to make this plan even only conceivable in this context. A number of “enlightened” civil society organizations (third sector, NGOs and Caritas among them) shifts its mission on social inclusion. In this preliminary work phase, advocacy activities and social research should serve as a stimulus for both society and institutions. Civil society organizations identify an emergency phase, which they try to address, and a future regime phase, which should be ruled and managed at the institutional level. Thus, while managing the (food and housing insecurity) emergency, these organizations aim at raising the awareness on the need, for public institutions, to fix the problem and for citizens to overcome narrow-mindedness and cultural barriers.

**Education**

Education has been recognized as the key factor toward wider objectives and the plan on education as a cross-cutting strategy. Educating in the culture of gift and generosity and sharing available knowledge on food and nutrition security, social justice and the right to food are immediate and continuous tasks of this “enlighten” part of the society, in order to inform and raise awareness among citizens.

**Governance and networks**

A major point is that despite the strategic role of public authorities in *Solidarity in half*, they have the limit of taking care only of citizens and leaving those who are not “entitled” outside the welfare system. Understanding the potential hazard linked to marginalized people could break through the symbolic (and material?) walls of society and let the institutions demonstrate a progressive openness towards extended rights. Therefore, while the original version of the plan had assigned the leading role to public (local) actors, in this scenario there should be a role reversal. Civil society and third sector organizations should act as trigger for the creation of a network of actors, in order to draw the attention of public institutions on the emergency under way and to involve them to collaborate and co-design next, wider goals.

3.2.2.4. **Do I want to go to live in the countryside?**

**Person’s centered approach**
In this scenario the main problem is not just a food issue, but a lack of integration. We need to create opportunities for exchange at local level between social and assistance systems. No one has a complete picture of the problem. The network must involve not only the actors of the food system, but all the actors of the social system. Not only food packages, but self-production and territorial policies, collective production policies should be put into place. In the scenario analyzed, everything becomes more complicated because there is lack of financial and active presence of the public actor - therefore more leadership and activism and coordination between private parties is needed. But in a system in which society is closed and careless, it becomes unrealistic.

**Education**

Large retailers are more present in the suburbs. There they have a greater corporate social responsibility. It is not credible that local producers sell to the large distribution in this scenario. But there may be a space for the rich segment, which remains a niche, the bulk retailers sell in the peripheries. It is necessary to understand how and why the retailers recover surplus. There will be quite a tendency to reduce waste, thanks to greater efficiency. Recovery of food works well in times of wealth, where there is stock, and less in the “just-in-time” system. The survival of the Food Bank is linked to FEAD resources. If FEAD stops the Food Bank stops. Today FEAD represents 50% of resources, the rest is fruit and vegetables and retailers surplus recovery. Leveraging on fund raising and targeted projects are the most realistic option in this scenario.

**Governance and networks**

In this scenario it is unrealistic that the public sector manages the governance system. There is a risk that responsibilities are charged on “coordination tables”, hoping that “someone else resolves the problem”. Building “coordination tables” without resources does not solve the problem. Given that the public actor is missing, the very concept of governance falls apart. Who could be the substitute actors? Banking foundations, universities? They could be interested.

It is an interesting idea, in a context of general weakness of the public actor, to coordinate actions coming from different macro policies (example: RDP) and involve different actors. Very concrete actions could be: SMEs incentives, lobby for FEAD - than nationally - for public procurement).

Fund raising? important role of banking foundations, given the crisis of the other subjects. Also more than fund raising -> develop projects: the peri-urban and rural can enter the picture? The problem is to build up networks in less dense environments. The most relevant intermediate entities should be identified.

### 3.2.3. Plans across scenarios: the matrix

The following table presents the main strengths and weaknesses of each plan in the scenarios, and what the main recommendations would be to make the plan work better in their scenario.
## Governance and network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuscany 3D</th>
<th>It could be better</th>
<th>Solidarity in half</th>
<th>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In this scenario the targets fixed for 2030 are achieved, however, to get there you need to start immediately and fill the gaps identified and the delays .&lt;br&gt;• The priority to achieve this scenario is on establishing a governance system: a pact between all the actors that are part of the food assistance system is the first aim, (a pact for integrated policies on FNS) .&lt;br&gt;• In this scenario we can think of two possibilities. The first is &quot;stronger &quot;: in the absence of a proactive state, society becomes self organized , occupies the land, does not recognize the institutions, even opposes the institutions. This raises a problem of representativeness of these actors .&lt;br&gt;• The second hypothesis - softer - is that civil society reorganizes itself trying to mediate between the demands of all, to try to recover a dialogue with the institutions. In this case it is necessary, between now and 2030, to find suitable &quot;spaces&quot; where there are representatives actors that undertake a dialogue around shared objectives .&lt;br&gt;• In this scenario there is no possibility of expenditure: pressing the public actor on not retreating from its coordinating role is the priority.&lt;br&gt;• Given the scarcity of resources , European funds that are available must be used well.</td>
<td>• This scenario is characterized by a technocratic government: a central institution which decides for all individuals who have citizenship (e.g., food security of the citizens is achieved, for example via the introduction of a minimum wage).&lt;br&gt;• Marginalized people represent a risk and a vulnerability: understanding the potential hazard linked to marginalized people could break through the symbolic (and material?) walls of society and let the institutions demonstrate a progressive openness towards extended rights.&lt;br&gt;• While the original version of the plan had assigned the leading role to public (local) actors, in this scenario there should be a role reversal. Third sector should act as a trigger for the creation of a network of actors, in order to draw the attention of public institutions on the ongoing emergency and to involve them to collaborate and co-design further broader goals.&lt;br&gt;• There is need for pervasive and efficient communication flows and information. Civil society aims for the right to food as an entry point to rediscuss and widen social rights and citizenship.</td>
<td>• Our scenario is characterized by a willingness of the public actor to delegate&lt;br&gt;• There is no conflict between social private and public.&lt;br&gt;• Here a preventive approach should be developed to anticipate negative trends . Efforts should be put in creating a network where the public coordinates and experiments with innovative projects involving private resources . This can also help to solve the lack of ability of the food assistance actors to attract resources . These categories of stakeholders should be included within the committees (e.g., potential lenders as banking foundations) .&lt;br&gt;• Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The substantial goals are three: acting on the change of lifestyles, awareness of resources, and the right to food. Two instrumental goals, which are the coordination and education of educators. Educating to better lifestyles starting from school education and private entities, such as the mass distribution. Resources: university courses are not very keen and private entities are the main resource managers. The right to food is related to the political dimension. Media and social media, but also committees at district and national levels, and GAS can raise awareness on these issues. Social media and political campaigns act as “multipliers networks” around the theme of the right to food.

In relation to resources there are two key actors: on one side the industry manufacturers and “responsible and aware” companies, which are nonetheless fragmented; on the other large retailers. The protagonist is the third sector, who should push for minimum acceptable levels in terms of characteristics of quality and wholesomeness of new productions. Moreover it should support small producers and other new ways of intercepting foods. In relations to changing lifestyles: how can we finance education projects related to school if the public does not have a strategy and retrieves? Again, the role of civil society and organizations! many actions and responsibilities are a burden for civil society as active participants. In terms of coordinating communication. It should be re-defined at which level this would happen: wider and homogeneous territories, as in the districts should be identified (other than administrative districts).

Education plays a key role in helping information flows and coordination (“centrality of the person”, who is this person?). In this scenario it is necessary to work on the identification of needs. We are in a scenario with little or zero waste to be recovered, therefore education plays a key role to raise awareness, both towards the community and towards the retailers. Targeted gift to needs should be boosted. Develop care pathways: Caritas encourages education pathways that allow to include without losing own identity.

The critical aspect in this scenario is linked to the absence of the state and a voluntary sector with few resources. In the background the public actor does not intervene in the scenario. Lobbying and specific training which addresses policymakers is necessary: the public actor cannot fail to act as a facilitator of the network. Key role of social services but with a different logic, not transferring resources but helping to develop skills, abilities, etc. Receivers as protagonists: self-production pathways, forms of circular economy and trade. Recovery of surplus: retailers also change their approach, by rethinking in innovative

### Person’s centered approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This scenario provides a rather positive situation. It is necessary to anticipate some objectives and distinguish substance from method and procedure.</th>
<th>In this scenario the region and the institutions are in the backstage, while the actors of self-organized civil society are in the foreground.</th>
<th>Dealing with the centrality of the person is complex, within this scenario, because of the “invisibles”. Who is the “central person”? The invisibles are a mass of people in need.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have assigned a different priority to sub-objectives. Recipients as protagonists becomes the number 1 priority, where one of the first actions identified is to go towards replacing parcels with emporia where possible. The second objective is &quot;multiple responses to poverty&quot;, the third is &quot;quality of food&quot; and the fourth is &quot;safe neighborhoods&quot;.</td>
<td>This gives a (different) priority to the objectives: in the first place, acting to create safe and active neighborhoods by steering community activities, such as urban vegetable gardens.</td>
<td>We have distinguished two steps: managing the emergency and running the regime. During the emergency we see a role for the third sector, that lobbies institutions with the aim of bringing the attention on food right to institutional levels.Caritas moves resources on the assistance of the invisibles (the “existential peripheries”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A crosscutting objective is the “identification of the needs of the territory” which must be dealt with much</td>
<td>Monitoring needs on the territory and also deal with education activities. Again, with the retreat of public actors many of the actions come through the civil society, that is being reorganized. All responsibilities from institutional public entities are now faced by civil society, as well as diversification of activities. The lobby activity towards policy</td>
<td>In the regime it is expected that there will be the reframing of citizenship. Caritas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education plays a prevention role against closing up of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education includes training of operators and institutions. In this scenario training and support to self production should be targeted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need of rethinking the supply of what now comes for free (surplus food).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The consolidation of the networks and relationship with retailers are a necessary consequence of the identification of needs. Safety and nutrition are two fundamental pillars.
• In “safe and active neighborhoods”, the role of parishes to steer the awareness around needs of society is emphasized.

| makers also becomes a priority. | therefore, is a promoter of social inclusion dedicating resources and infrastructure and promotes active citizenship of new included people. | ways the available surplus food system recovery. For example they experiment specific projects linked to groups with special needs (e.g., children). |

- Monitoring of the needs is relevant both in the emergency and regime. The “border operator” is a key figure to grasp the needs of the territory and acts as an intermediary between the two “worlds” (i.e., visible and invisible).
3.2.4. Review of Plans

The final aim of this work is to obtain a final version of the plans enriched by the additions, revisions and comments made during the sessions of the second workshop. This was done during the scenario based review of plans and a last plenary session, during which key recommendations and priorities were indicated by the stakeholders on each plan previously discussed. The table in Annex 4 presents the main strengths and weaknesses of each plan in the scenarios and suggestions for improvement of the plans.

We can distinguish two levels of elaboration of the plans: revisions and additions to the plans which are valid across all scenarios, therefore can be considered robust, and revisions and comments which are scenario specific, therefore suitable in case of contingent events happening in different scenarios. In the following, the overall elaboration of each plan and a set of contingency options are reported.

A plan for governance and network towards FNS

The plan for Governance and network consist of two main goals: development of an integrated and coordinated network for FNS and development of a FNS policy adopting a prevention approach.

The integrated network for FNS starts from the creation of a promoters’ group, as a first step of the process. In the original version of the plan, the initiative comes from Tuscany Region representatives. However, this leading role of the Tuscany Region is not plausible under all the different scenarios: this led to introduce in the plan the possibility for other actors/network of actors to play a leading role in this process.

The promoters group should be active on a regional level, in charge of the direction of actions, responsible for brokering and raising awareness among regional and local actors. It should also identify local institutional actors to be involved in the coordination of FNS in Tuscany, addressing among others social health districts, which must coordinate and interact. The promoters group engages with municipalities and third sector actors in network building activities. Based on the network built and the knowledge exchanged, an ad-hoc Regional Committee on FNS is established. A fundamental step is the activation, by the Committee, of monitoring activities of food insecurity on the territory. Within the promoters’ group stands the third sector network, which is made in charge of involving actors of the supply chain (producers and retailers). Inside this network, the third sector organizations develop a self reflection on inner functioning, in order to find common aims and synergic solutions (e.g. on food drives, volunteer pooling, University training/stage, voucher, etc.) and develop fundraising actions. The Committee elaborates incentives for SMEs and retailers to encourage corporate social responsibility and donations (e.g. tax relief measures) and, at the same time, puts pressure on public authorities to develop tendering process that award recovery of food projects in public canteens (i.e., a Green Public Procurement that is also social). Universities and retailers should also be involved in this process. In addition, the Committee lobbies at the European level to ensure FEAD continuity.

The development of a FNS policy and action plan adopting a prevention approach relates primarily to the creation of a dedicated Board for the coordination of actions towards FNS within the Tuscany Region Departments. The networking process described in the previous paragraph should have been already activated. This means that an initial phase of dialogue should have been started with local actors, involving Tuscany Region departments, local health districts and the Committee (see sub-obj.1). The ultimate goal is to develop a Regional Plan for FNS in Tuscany.

Some key points were highlighted by stakeholders in relation to governance and network:

- The immediate goals are to organize a meeting/seminar with the main actors of the food assistance system. Moreover, a mailing list or a or an online platform for sharing experiences within on UNIPI local case study should be activated. A video could also represent a useful instrument for dissemination.
• The set up of the Committee (sub-objective 1) represents an intermediary objective, functional to achieve the second sub-objective.

• The governance model must include higher levels beyond the Municipality, which is too small. Governance should take into account homogeneous territorial levels, also beyond institutional borders. This could help to understand and interpret local specificities.

• The governance approach adopted by the Civil Protection in Italy represents a good model to follow (in which the third sector has an explicit and recognized role). This approach could also allow to redefine roles between public and private.

Contingency plan for “governance and network”: what happens if...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil society is open</th>
<th>Strategic role of the government</th>
<th>The government retreats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Favorable conditions and relationships: the objectives could be merged into one in order to save time and resources;</td>
<td>• Take the opportunity to recover food from public canteens: due to the health issue, hospital food will be abundant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promotion of social responsibility for Public Administration;</td>
<td>• As a remedy to some level of conflict, effort to dialogue and pressure by Caritas to have more public education/training;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creation of opportunities of cross coordination;</td>
<td>• Reliance on EU funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promotion of the committee by the Region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil society is closed</th>
<th>Strategic role of the government</th>
<th>The government retreats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Initiative must come from civil society organizations instead of institutional actors;</td>
<td>• The problem is building a network in a less dense environment: the most relevant intermediate entities should be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An initial emergency phase guided by CSO is followed by a regime phase, where institutions take the lead.</td>
<td>• Considering bank foundations for fundraising campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FNS should be included into a social integration policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A plan for education towards FNS

The plan elaborated for education for FNS in Tuscany develops around three main goals, which are interconnected and reinforcing one another: i. increasing awareness on available resources and production processes; ii. educating to cultural change towards healthier lifestyles; iii. achieving coordination and sharing of information on relevant themes.

A key issue concerns the definition of a role for private food system actors (i.e., retailers and food). Those who recognize their social responsibility represent an asset and a strength to aim for quality and healthy food. To this aim, it is necessary to work on increasing awareness on the cost savings linked to surplus recovery and the reduction of waste and the possibilities for reinvestment. They should be strongly involved in education activities (the extent depends on the scenario). For example by adopting new promotion strategies that do not encourage consumers from buying too much with respect to their needs. In order to achieve increased awareness, the monitoring activity and the quantification of indicators on food surplus, waste and (hopefully) increased efficiency, plays a key role. This will facilitate communication on the overall convenience at all levels (economic, social, environmental).

Another specific point on resources was made with regard to the development of relations between local producers and retailers, adapting their supplying strategies to valorize local productions. Another example was made in relation to “civic food projects”, that link restaurants and producers in a local network, relying on local productions. Moreover, enhancing project skills and planning as a specific competence of food assistance actors can open new avenues to food recovery. This concerns training to project design and
programming, exploiting public-private synergies and activating food assistance actors. This objective links to education/training, which is also related to cultural change. Third sector should work through projects to encourage donations: develop targeted gift in place of surplus recovery.

Among relevant recommendations, the “education of educators”, i.e. those who have an educational responsibility must be trained on the specificities of food and nutrition security related issues: education processes must involve and be addressed to institutional, food system and food assistance actors. The third sector should play a supportive role to those who deliver education (e.g., alternating schooling and working). Also the University system should be involved in these education and training processes. For example, within religious communities, priests and religious teachers who are responsible for educating parishioners, i.e., citizens, at young ages. Or school teachers, who can raise students awareness on food, health and environment: for example including the right to food into civic education programs at school. This can be transferred to the larger public via debates in public meetings, encourage the use of social media, promote spaces for aggregation and collective activities (for example, food classes).

The activation of education and training activities requires sharing of information among relevant actors, as a cross cutting objective. Stakeholders have proposed the setting of a board for education on FNS in the region, able to coordinate actions carried out at different levels (schools, public authorities, civil society). This eventually may lead to the elaboration of a charter on shared principles among all stakeholders of the education system (social actors, media, ...). For example what is meant by “right to food”? For different people it may mean different things and a shared meaning should be reflected upon.

**Contingency plan for “education”: what happens if?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil society is open</th>
<th>Strategic role of the government</th>
<th>The government retreats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most comments have been included into the main plan</td>
<td>• Turning to local resources may be a problem if large processors and retailers dominate. In this case municipalities should play a role in promoting local products and territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Awareness raising campaigns by the third sector to sensitize private actors (retailers and producers) to a “gift” culture.</td>
<td>• If the state does not spend resources for prevention and education, it is important to identify who are the alternative actors in charge (churches or other actors with a mission on education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trainers in charge of education must recognize the need to promote social inclusion while maintaining identity: those who have been integrated into society are a resource</td>
<td>• There is need for a cultural change in volunteers: to dedicate to self production and organize gardens, and educating people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society is closed</td>
<td>• Moving beyond the collection of food from others.</td>
<td>• Leveraging on fund raising and targeted projects are another option in this scenario (e.g. breakfast for kids).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A “person centred approach” towards FNS**

This theme refers to the ability of the food assistance system to identify, understand and respond to specific needs (also in relation to individual conditions and wider needs), possibly in a flexible and adaptive way. This food assistance system should become able to involve recipients, in a perspective that goes beyond the assistance logic. Adopting a “person’s centered approach” entails five main sub-objectives. A general remark applies to all these cases: in order to achieve these sub-objectives, creating opportunity of exchange between actors will be necessary. In addition, Tuscany Region leadership would be desirable but, in case of unfavorable conditions, such as lack of public support, in the starting phase its role should be
replaced by a strong CSOs network, gradually involving other institutional and private actors, with a more bottom-up approach.

The first objective focuses on “recipients as protagonist”. This objective considers the necessity to overcome the traditional food aid approach and setting up a direction for the recognition of the right to food: recipients should be reactivated through dedicated programs, based on reciprocity (recipients return something back). Food should represent an instrument towards more social inclusion.

An underlying question to be tackled by actors of the food assistance system is who is this “central” person and what does she/he needs. Examples of concrete ways in which to turn this approach into practice are placing food aid within the individual social support path and decreasing (and gradually substituting) food parcels with Emporia. This will inevitably require the involvement of Mayors, Health services and other institutional actors, in order to cover multiple territorial levels, although Caritas and NGOs can be the leading actors.

Another way of achieving recipients as protagonists is finding multiple and integrated responses to the food poverty. Mapping opportunities as well as problems/limits to the achievement of this goal is a main step. This should be realized through the use of IT to create networks, not only in order to streamline food recovery activities (thus, involving retailers, producers, collective catering, when it is possible), but also to consolidate alternative responses to food poverty (e.g., social farming). Integrated responses implies an effective identification of needs and, again, public authorities support (Tuscany Region) would be desirable. In order to identify people’s needs, the involvement of “witnesses of poverty” is deemed necessary: paediatrician, family doctors, school teachers, priests, health and social services’ operators and pharmacies are the first figures to be trained on how to recognize food poverty situations and intervene to help. To be able to monitor needs, the setting up of an Observatory on FNS would represent a fundamental step. The activation of social professions (such as the “frontier operator”) should be explored and valued.

Another dimension of the person is community. The individual is not isolated, therefore a person’s centred approach should consider the community in which the individual lives and this leads to neighborhoods, which should become safe and active. This can be considered a bottom-up led objective, in which neighborhoods have a central and active role. The municipalities would represent a key partner of CSOs and third sector organizations for several reasons: municipal regulations for green areas and urban spaces, predisposition of equipment, cleaning and safety of these spaces are, basically, local administration tasks. In addition, the involvement of schools requires municipal permissions. The municipality level has been chosen for the interaction with CSOs and active citizens, in order to: identify and recover available spaces; creating community centres aiming at developing initiatives around food related themes (e.g., urban gardens); involve schools in these activities and initiatives; organize local fairs, street food occasions to include migrant communities, neighborhood dinners. Creating, or just strengthening, a sense of community would be particularly desirable: it is both a prerequisite and a goal to be constantly pursued.

One last step concerns nutritional value and quality of food. This objective refers to the food currently distributed through food aid. A law to promote the recovery of food and the reduction of food waste is deemed as necessary, as well as a simplification of rules on products’ expiration dates and the alignment of national legislation all over the territory. These actions should be led by agriculture and health ministries, but lobbying activities by NGOs is essential to raise awareness on the problems and difficulties met by food assistance operators on a daily basis.
### Contingency plan for “Person's centred approach”: what happens if?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil society is open</th>
<th>Strategic role of the government</th>
<th>The government retreats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Act in order to anticipate objectives which are achieved in this scenario;</td>
<td>• Diversification of responses: food recovery along with social farming strategies, in order to compensate the lack of social policies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enjoying institutional support, parallel action on the Plan for Trade;</td>
<td>• Witnesses of food poverty: doctors, pediatricians, etc. could be overwhelmed by the emergency on diseases and health. Therefore operators of civil society must be trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Set dietary guidelines for food provision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society is closed</td>
<td>• Lay the ground for advocacy work by encouraging social research and sharing studies on social justice at all levels;</td>
<td>• In a context of scarce resources, could Tuscany Region act as a broker, at least supporting the network? Concentrate strengths on network development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• awareness-raising campaigns targeting civil society, as well as institutions at local and national level;</td>
<td>• Role of Social Health Districts (SdS) could be the most appropriate level for the coordination of actors. However, a strong leadership is deemed necessary to counteract a closed society. This is also valid for witnesses of food poverty;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• move towards education and social inclusion and allocate resources for these tasks.</td>
<td>• Lobbying for FEAD resources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage self-production;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work on specific projects, such as Breakfast for children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Final Reflections

The present work has dealt with the elaboration of a strategy for food and nutrition security in Tuscany. This has been done by addressing the main stakeholders of the food assistance system, with a primary involvement of Caritas but also other key actors, such as the Food Bank, the regional administration and retailers representatives. The process that we have followed is more valuable to stakeholders if it is clear that it is tailored to improve strategic planning to achieve shared goals in an uncertain future: scenario-guided planning is normally done for organizations, by paid consultants. Therefore the preliminary interviews and meetings were necessary in order to understand what the needs of the organizations were.

As indicated in the introduction, the process reported here fits within a wider research design, however we believe that our effort on the single case has its stand alone value, in terms of the methodology adopted and applied to the local context of the food assistance case study. Our work was aimed at supporting the food assistance network in Tuscany, with Caritas as leading actor, to address the “Alliance for food”, a vision which was suggested by stakeholders, although only conceptualized on a abstract level. During the preliminary research and the two workshops organized, the “Alliance for food” was declined into key themes and fine tuned into draft strategies, that were not discussed collectively before. A challenging work is still ahead, but this starting point has set the base for further collaborations and developments.

This paper started by asking if scenario-guided planning can be a suitable tool to support relevant stakeholders willing to engage in a process of change, and what the combination of methods (i.e., explorative and normative) enables in terms of elaboration of new themes and blind spots and identification of shared priorities in the process of change. Some reflections on preliminary results can be made in these regards.

One crucial aspect in our study was given by the heterogeneous composition of the group of stakeholders invited to participate to the workshop. Caritas was invited as a main partner of a broader network of stakeholders who have their own critical perspectives and aims. Such an “hybrid user environment” – in between a “one client” case and a fully dispersed case – is a specific feature of our case study: it poses a challenge in terms of “appropriation” of the results (i.e., the application of the plan for the achievement of focused impacts becomes harder) and requires to find balance between the objectives of different stakeholders. At the same time, it allows stakeholders to confront within an inclusive planning process, in which there is shared space for relevant collaborations and potential synergies exploitation. Beyond being appreciated by participants – a survey is currently ongoing in order to capture more clearly the experiences of each participant – this “hybrid” composition allowed them to take a step back while looking at their own plans and to adopt an external vision on the strategies. The discussions took place among a broader range of stakeholders, that would not be involved in a single organization planning process: this is particularly relevant for food assistance in Tuscany as this reveals to be a system de facto, but not in explicit terms, in which actors otherwise meet and exchange to tackle daily needs but lack a strategic approach to food assistance (at least on a regional level). Co-designing of plans across scenarios has not only supported the elaboration and testing of concrete actions, but has favoured exchanges between different organizations on ongoing mechanisms, strategies and actions (especially during working groups and lunch time side talks).

Furthermore, this “hybridity” could also be referred to Caritas itself, as it is a highly fragmented organization, where each diocese (there are 17 in Tuscany) is quite independent from all the others. Many

---

2 For example, in relation to nutrition security, it was raised that shortage of fresh fruits and vegetables can be a problem for some food assistance practices (e.g., such as Emporia). It emerged instead that there is a large availability of fresh fruits and vegetables in other regions (e.g., in Emilia Romagna due to the impacts of the Russian embargo, or in southern parts of Tuscany). It was clarified that it is mainly a matter of logistics and connections between the different actors of the food system.
of these operators have to spend most of their time with immediate, daily necessities, which hamper their capacity to have a broader look on structural problems and potential opportunities and make long term plans. In practice this turns, for example, into different kinds of services provided and the lack of a basic, homogeneous level of assistance. Therefore, gathering all these people together in order to engage constructively in a joint discussion on planning FNS in Tuscany could be considered as a first step towards the Alliance for food that hadn’t been much considered yet, at least not by everyone, as a concrete objective.

Another reflection concerns the tool provided to stakeholders to address uncertainty of future context in a systematic way. During back-casting, participants tried to work backwards from the desirable future to the present, identifying all the steps and actions needed, overcoming the limitations and constraints of the present. This turned out to be a challenging task, because of the difficulties not only in imagining long term ideal goals, but also coming down to concrete actions, that should take place in the medium and short terms.

In relation to future oriented thinking, a key point concerns the boundary between actors’ sphere of influence and the given scenario context. It is important to remind that this boundary between actors’ sphere of influence and their larger contexts is not fixed or fully exogenous. For instance, changes in policy may normally be considered as part of the decision context for local food initiatives that they will simply have to adapt to. Downscaling the scenario in the local context requires dealing with the delicate balance between exogenous events in relation to strategic actions: to what extent stakeholders can impact on the scenario and change it? The distinction depends on the perception that agents have. This process intended to allow for a conscious focus on actors agency potential: implicit in the method is questioning the supposed limitations on agency that participants have in the scenarios. Moreover within the Transmango research process the participation of local cases, and upscaling to the EU level in the final parts of the project means that their ideas and recommendations could have some impacts at the EU level (which means that EU policy now falls within their sphere of influence to some degree).

Another point relates to the downscaling of scenarios on the European food system, that were built by considering a range of eight variables with different states (see Brzezina et al. 2016). The adaptation to the local context in relation to the characteristics of food assistance shifted the focus on case study specific variables: the coordinates around government approach and openness of civil society, in the first place, but also other key issues such as availability of food surplus, voluntary workers, vulnerable groups and food assistance overall demand.

Two final remarks. First, the process was initially designed to be developed in four days. We had to shrink into two days for organizational reasons, in order to fit into stakeholders agendas. This inevitably impacted on the degree of elaboration and completeness of downscaled scenarios and planning. Second, it is too early to make a final statement on the actual feasibility of the plans drafted. This needs to be verified through careful monitoring in the next year time to allow researchers to check on actual implementation, although the first short term steps have already been set by including the results on the plans in next Caritas annual report, for Tuscany Region.
5. Annex

Annex 1 - Participants WORKSHOP 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G1 – The Protein Union</th>
<th>G2 – Retrotopia</th>
<th>G3 – The Price of Health</th>
<th>G4 – Fed up Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Francesca/Paolo)</td>
<td>(Sabrina/Daniele)</td>
<td>(Stefano/Silvia)</td>
<td>(Elena/Laura)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Nardi (UNIMC)</td>
<td>Fabio Bartolini (UNIPI)</td>
<td>Giovanni Belletti (UNIFI)</td>
<td>Gianluca Brunori (UNIPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Minghi (SdS Pisa)</td>
<td>Luciano Rossetti (UniCoop Firenze)</td>
<td>Natale Bazzanti (Banco Alimentare)</td>
<td>Alessandro Martini (Caritas Toscana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donatella Turri (Caritas Lucca)</td>
<td>Massimiliano Lotti (Osservatorio Regionale Povertà)</td>
<td>Emanuele Morelli (Caritas Pisa)</td>
<td>Marcello Suppressa (Caritas Pistoia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umberto Ottolina (Emporio Prato)</td>
<td>Giovanni Tondo (Caritas Siena)</td>
<td>Gabriele Chianucci (Caritas Arezzo)</td>
<td>Luca Puccetti (Regione Toscana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice dall’Olio (Caritas Firenze)</td>
<td>Stefania Comparini (Regione Toscana)</td>
<td>Cosimo Romano (Regione Toscana)</td>
<td>Bianca Pianigiani (Caritas Siena)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 2 - Agenda WORKSHOP 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Expected results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0945-1000</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Welcome, introduction on project and aim of the workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1010</td>
<td>Brief presentation of the case study &quot;The food assistance system towards food security &quot;</td>
<td>Case study framework. Overview of the day's activities and presentation of facilitators Introduction of participants (name and affiliation). Time horizon definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010-1115</td>
<td>VISIONING</td>
<td>Brainstorming in couples: 3 speed meets (5 minutes each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing of key elements on post-its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clustering of elements in macro-themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voting by using stickers to select the three most important themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115-1135</td>
<td>Rich Picture</td>
<td>Assignment of topics to groups. Each participant will choose the group to attend. Graphic visualization of themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140-1245</td>
<td>Back-Casting</td>
<td>Definition of an action plan, going backwards - from the future to the present - to achieve the objectives that make up the vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of sub-objectives, actions and actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330-1340</td>
<td>Re-introduction of the afternoon session</td>
<td>Recalling what was done in the morning and summary of afternoon activities. Brief introduction of four scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340-1520</td>
<td>Downscaling of the EU scenarios</td>
<td>Individual reading of the scenario. Individual post its on scenario elements: clustering, storytelling and title definition. The question: what are the elements relevant for food assistance in Tuscany in the context of the given scenario?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520-1545</td>
<td>Back-casting “light”</td>
<td>Light &quot;version&quot; of the back-casting, using newspaper headlines. The question is: what should happen in 2022 for the 2030 scenario to take place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545-1650</td>
<td>Causal maps</td>
<td>Development of causal maps on the relationships and the dynamics of each scenario. Variable definition, causal directions (+ or -) and the degree of certainty about the relationship (all certain, disagree/uncertainty (note), all uncertain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-1715</td>
<td>Plenary synthesis: each scenario group’s rapporteur describes the main narrative of the scenario and the elements of the causal map (5 minutes each)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3 - Participants WORKSHOP 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G1 – It could be better</th>
<th>G2 – Solidarity in half</th>
<th>G3 – Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</th>
<th>G4 – Tuscany in 3D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Francesca/Paolo)</td>
<td>(Sabrina/Daniele)</td>
<td>(Stefano/Valentina, Laura)</td>
<td>(Silvia/Elena)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefano Lomi (Regione Toscana)</td>
<td>Fabio Bartolini (UNIPI)</td>
<td>Giovanni Belletti (UNIFI)</td>
<td>Gianluca Brunori (UNIPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donatella Turri (Caritas Lucca)</td>
<td>Massimiliano Lotti (Osservatorio Regionale Povertà)</td>
<td>Natale Bazzanti (Banco Alimentare)</td>
<td>Alessandro Martini (Caritas Toscana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice dall’Olio (Caritas Firenze)</td>
<td>Caterina Tocchini (Regione Toscana)</td>
<td>Emanuele Morelli (Caritas Pisa)</td>
<td>Marcello Suppressa (Caritas Pistoia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 4 - Agenda WORKSHOP 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-09:30</td>
<td>Reintroduction and outline of the workshop</td>
<td>Overview of WS1 and outline WS2: objectives, methods and agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:00</td>
<td>Re-immersion in scenario</td>
<td>Each scenario group reconvenes. Everyone reads the digitized local scenario and accompanying materials, such as insights from the causal map. A short round of conversation happens to make sure everyone understands the scenario. Any missing elements are written down on post-its and collected/clustered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>Scenario-based review of plans (start)</td>
<td>Everyone stays in the scenario groups, where each scenario group receives all the plans from the first workshop’s morning session. The facilitators have digital forms to work through for each of these plans. For every aspect of the plan, the group asks – is this action/strategy/etc. possible in this scenario, or not? If not, what could be recommended (concretely) to make the plan better able to work in this scenario? Facilitators: the main challenge with this exercise is time. It is very easy for participants to get focused on one minor step in one of the plans. We will have a good amount of time for this process, but we also have many plan elements to go through. Try to find the 1-2 most important strengths, and 1-2 most important weaknesses, of each plan associated with a sub-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:45</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-13:00</td>
<td>Scenario-based review of plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-15:30</td>
<td>Presenting scenarios and feedbacks on plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**objective; provide 1-2 clear and concrete suggestions that would allow the plan to succeed in your scenario, and move on. This way, your group is more likely to be able to finish reviewing all plans; if you have time left, you can add more details to your review.**

**Participants stay in their scenario groups. Each group briefly presents their scenario so all are reminded of the key assumptions and changes in that scenario world. Facilitators, make sure that your group has a succinct, 3 minute presentation of the scenario (for instance using the first paragraph of the digitized scenario with any highlights or changes suggested on the day).**

Then, a plenary discussion proceeds by discussing each plan in turn. So, comments on group 1’s plan are described by scenario group A, then the comment on group 1’s plan by scenario group b; then comments on group 1’s plan by scenario group c. Scenario groups have prepared their comments so that they can present what they thought were the main strengths and weaknesses of the plan in their scenario, and what their main recommendations would be to make the plan work better in their scenario.

The facilitator writes down these comments in a table organized per group plan (horizontal) and per scenario (vertical), but as an additional way of capturing the discussion, before the review discussion starts, members of the plan’s group are also told to write down notes on these comments for later integration.

Because we have a day for this workshop, it is not expected to be feasible to use the lunch break to print out the digital scenario-based comments and hand them out to all plan groups – attempting this usually creates a risky dependence on fast printers et cetera and creates a lot of stress in the workshops. This is why we have plenary discussion and notes (as b below) instead. However, if the day goes faster than expected (which may be the case in some processes where only two scenarios and two plans were used), using the lunch break to print the comments might be feasible.
## 2. Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub objective</th>
<th>Actions (2016→2030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integrated and coordinated policies for FNS (2030)</td>
<td>1.1: creation of a “promoters group” active on a regional level, in charge of the direction of actions, responsible for brokering among regional and local actors. This “promoters group” works towards raising awareness of regional stakeholders. 1.2 a: It identifies local institutional actors to be involved in the coordination of FNS in Tuscany 1.2 b: Promoters group address social health districts, which must coordinate and interact. 1.3: The promoters group engages with municipalities and “third sector” actors in network building activities. 1.4.a: Based on the network built and the knowledge exchanged, the creation of an ad-hoc Regional Committee on FNS is established. 1.4.b: The third sector network is made in charge within the promoters group to involve actors of the supply chain (producers and retailers) and stimulate a debate on food and nutrition security. 1.5.a: The committee activates a monitoring of food insecurity on the territory, and supports project development. 1.5.b: The third sector develops a self reflection on its inner functioning. They try to find common aims and synergetic solutions (example on food drives,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan starts in 2016 with a conference, which will be organized to launch this pact. This is followed by a consolidation of the third sector network activities, through the coordination of information, the sharing of a common strategy and initiatives. In 2017 we will see the establishment of the Committee and the preparation of the Regional plan for food security. This could be announced in 2019 to be made official in 2020. New proposal: First action in 2016: Conference for the proposal of the agreement on food assistance. Starting the path. Strengthening of the third sector network with shared objectives, practices and methodologies; Creation of a working group on the third sector before the committee. Creation of opportunities of cross-coordination (among actors?) Promotion of the committee</td>
<td>Objective 1. The main problem in this scenario is that there is some level of conflict. There are two alternatives: a closure between these two spheres or an effort to dialogue (pressure by Caritas to have more public education) 1.3 Europe pays: on this point everybody agrees 1.4 Take the opportunity to recover food from public canteens. In this scenario, hospital food will be abundant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 a</td>
<td>The committee elaborates incentives for SMEs and retailers to encourage CSR and donations, tax relief measures. Universities and retailers can also be involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 b</td>
<td>The committee puts pressure on public authorities to develop tendering process that award points based on the recovery of food in public canteens (needs regulation, Green Public Procurement that is also social).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>The committee lobbies at the European level to ensure FEAD continuity planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Developing a Food and Nutrition Security action plan adopting a prevention approach

| 2.1 | Creation of a regional board for the coordination of actions towards food security (same committee as above). |
| 2.2 | Confronting with local actors (see first column). Actors involved: Tuscany region dept + regional committee + local health district. Providing support to |

| 2.1 | Creation of a regional board for the coordination of actions towards food security (same committee as above). |
| 2.2 | Confronting with local actors (see first column). Actors involved: Tuscany region dept + regional committee + local health district. Providing support to |

### 2.1: Creation of a regional board for the coordination of actions towards food security

- **Actors**: Tuscany Region department + regional committee + local health district.
- **Scope**: Providing support to FP activities in parallel, in order to involve institutions in the next (regime) phase.

### 2.2: Confronting with local actors

- **Actors**: Tuscany region dept + regional committee + local health district.
- **Scope**: Providing support to FP activities in parallel, in order to involve institutions in the next (regime) phase.

### 1.5.a New objective

- The committee elaborates incentives for SMEs and retailers to encourage CSR and donations, tax relief measures. Universities and retailers can also be involved; provide data and communicate; promotion of social responsibility for Public Administration.

### 1.5.b

- The committee puts pressure on public authorities to develop tendering process that award points based on the recovery of food in public canteens (needs regulation, Green Public Procurement that is also social). Financing innovating projects.

### 1.6.a

- The committee elaborates incentives for SMEs and retailers to encourage CSR and donations, tax relief measures. Universities and retailers can also be involved; provide data and communicate; promotion of social responsibility for Public Administration.

### 1.6.b

- The committee puts pressure on public authorities to develop tendering process that award points based on the recovery of food in public canteens (needs regulation, Green Public Procurement that is also social). Financing innovating projects.
## Annex 5 – Detailed revision of plan for “education”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub objective</th>
<th>Actions (2016⇒2030)</th>
<th>Tuscany 3D</th>
<th>It could be better</th>
<th>Solidarity in half</th>
<th>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 increase awareness on resources available and production processes</td>
<td>1.1.a Role of retailers in surplus food recovery: retailers favor food surplus recovery 1.2.a Emphasize the cost reduction and the possible reinvestment 1.3.a Change promotion strategies by retailers (do not encourage buying beyond effective needs) 1.4.a Indicators on food waste and increase efficiency in resource use. 1.5.a Make explicit and communicate overall convenience (not only economic advantage) at all levels. Indicators on food waste and communication campaigns by the retail sector to inform on food waste. The whole system contributes in order to gather information on surplus and communicate. 1.1.c Enhance project skills and planning as a specific competence. This becomes a specific object of education/training, in order to achieve cultural change.</td>
<td>Anticipating Objective 1 at 2020. New formulation of 1.4 + 1.5.a Make explicit and communicate overall convenience (not only economic advantage) at all levels. Indicators on food waste and communication campaigns by the retail sector to inform on food waste. The whole system contributes in order to gather information on surplus and communicate. 1.1.c Enhance project skills and planning as a specific competence. This becomes a specific object of education/training, in order to achieve cultural change.</td>
<td>Point 1.1 (role of retailers in surplus recovery) is partly less relevant (it’s already happening). Retailers should promote education on food related issues. Working on the quality of foods, sugars, etc. In relations to retailers turning to local resources (2.b). Problem: why should large retailers relate with local producers at a time when the industry is concentrated in few large processing firms? The promotion of local products should be carried on by Municipalities (promotion of territory).</td>
<td>1.1.a. Targeted gift/ Directed ‘surplus’: awareness raising campaigns by the CSOs to educate retailers to the culture of gift. 1.2. Push for incentives for firms to donate.</td>
<td>In relations to 2.1 (role of retailers) What does the large distribution do in our scenario? For example, where there is much self-consumption, there is room for the large retailers? Large retailers are more present in the suburbs. There they have a greater corporate social responsibility. It is not credible that local producers sell to the large distribution in this scenario. But there may be a space for the rich segment, which remains a niche, the bulk retailers sell in the peripheries. It is necessary to understand how and why the retailers recover surplus. There will be quite a tendency to reduce waste, thanks to greater efficiency. Recovery of food works well in times of wealth, where there is stock, and less in the “just-in-time” system. The survival of the Food Bank is linked to FEAD resources. If FEAD stops the Food Bank stops. Today FEAD represents 50% of resources, the rest is...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3. The food assistance actors promote collaboration in order to exploit public-private synergies

1.3.c The food assistance actors promote collaboration in order to exploit public-private synergies.

1.4.c The food assistance actors activate fundraising strategies.

In relation to available resources and fund raising (1.1c, 1.2c, 1.3c): In this scenario, the presence of private actors represents a strength. The interest in corporate firms in social responsibility is the main strength to aim at quality and healthy food.

| Cultural change, lifestyles | 2.1.a Work on training priests and religion teachers | New objective nr.1: this has been identified as priority 1.1 Education and training target all segments of population. New element: Education and training of retailers and businesses and lobbying activity on them. New element: Creating and maintaining network of trained people (meeting of trainers and trained?) 2.2.b Including the right to food into civic education programs at school. 2.1.c Create and animate debates in public meetings, encourage the use of social media, promote spaces for aggregation and collective activities (example, food classes) | In relation to educating to healthier life styles there are funding problems in this scenario. The state does not spend resources for prevention and education. It is important to identify who are the subjects in charge (churches or other actors with a mission on education, eg. Laboratory on education to taste, in Prato). 2. It is the “enlightened” part of society and CSOs that aims to spread the culture of gift and generosity. Trainers in charge of education must recognize the need to promote social inclusion while maintaining identity: those who have been integrated into society are a real resource to be used in education in their turn (see frontier operators in Person’s centered approach Plan). | In relation to 2.2 (cultural change, lifestyle – education). The scenario entails sparse population, closing out status. The strength of the scenario may be that self-consumption might encourage to attend cooking schools. Urban gardening is consistent with the scenario. There is need for a cultural change in volunteers: to dedicate to self-production and organize gardens, beyond educating people. Moving beyond the collection of food from others. |

| Coordination | 3.1 Sharing of information among relevant actors 3.2.a Board on Education | New objective 3: Awareness on food as a right/on the right to food | In relation to coordinating information on FNS (3.b). | In order to achieve this objective, sharing and disseminating studies and principles should be elaborated. Civic |
### 3. Person centered approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub objective</th>
<th>Tuscany 3D</th>
<th>It could be better</th>
<th>Solidarity in half</th>
<th>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Finding multiple and integrated responses to the food poverty</td>
<td>1.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator. 1.2 Map opportunities. The Region facilitating the process. 1.3 Use of IT technology to create networks for food recovery. GDO, collective catering and producers of food. 1.4 Evaluate the available amount of food. Ex. Recovery and redistribution of surplus food.</td>
<td>In relation to objective 1 (finding multiple responses to food need). The possible responses to food should be diversified. In relation to surplus recovery it is necessary to act on the food collection strategies. For example the Region has financially supported social groups for land allocation aimed to self and collective production etc..This is already happening in some areas: those who ask for social services are encouraged to participate to social farming etc.. (it is not a “one way gift” but return strategies should be analyses on FNS, right to food, as well as on emerging and still unidentified needs.</td>
<td>Solidarity in half</td>
<td>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</td>
</tr>
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<td>1.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator. 1.2 Map opportunities. The Region facilitating the process. 1.3 Use of IT technology to create networks for food recovery. GDO, collective catering and producers of food. 1.4 Evaluate the available amount of food. Ex. Recovery and redistribution of surplus food.</td>
<td>In relation to objective 1 (finding multiple responses to food need). The possible responses to food should be diversified. In relation to surplus recovery it is necessary to act on the food collection strategies. For example the Region has financially supported social groups for land allocation aimed to self and collective production etc..This is already happening in some areas: those who ask for social services are encouraged to participate to social farming etc.. (it is not a “one way gift” but return strategies should be analyses on FNS, right to food, as well as on emerging and still unidentified needs.</td>
<td>Solidarity in half</td>
<td>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 It concerns both recovery and distribution of food. Reformulate as two different sub-objectives: distribution and access. 1.1 In Tuscany in 3D scenario it already exists. 1.2.a Integration: map problems and opportunities. Tuscany Region and local authorities. 1.2.b Parallel action on the Plan for Trade.</td>
<td>In relation to objective 1 (finding multiple responses to food need). The possible responses to food should be diversified. In relation to surplus recovery it is necessary to act on the food collection strategies. For example the Region has financially supported social groups for land allocation aimed to self and collective production etc..This is already happening in some areas: those who ask for social services are encouraged to participate to social farming etc.. (it is not a “one way gift” but return strategies should be analyses on FNS, right to food, as well as on emerging and still unidentified needs.</td>
<td>Solidarity in half</td>
<td>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator. 1.2 Map opportunities. The Region facilitating the process. 1.3 Use of IT technology to create networks for food recovery. GDO, collective catering and producers of food. 1.4 Evaluate the available amount of food. Ex. Recovery and redistribution of surplus food.</td>
<td>In relation to objective 1 (finding multiple responses to food need). The possible responses to food should be diversified. In relation to surplus recovery it is necessary to act on the food collection strategies. For example the Region has financially supported social groups for land allocation aimed to self and collective production etc..This is already happening in some areas: those who ask for social services are encouraged to participate to social farming etc.. (it is not a “one way gift” but return strategies should be analyses on FNS, right to food, as well as on emerging and still unidentified needs.</td>
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<td>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator. 1.2 Map opportunities. The Region facilitating the process. 1.3 Use of IT technology to create networks for food recovery. GDO, collective catering and producers of food. 1.4 Evaluate the available amount of food. Ex. Recovery and redistribution of surplus food.</td>
<td>In relation to objective 1 (finding multiple responses to food need). The possible responses to food should be diversified. In relation to surplus recovery it is necessary to act on the food collection strategies. For example the Region has financially supported social groups for land allocation aimed to self and collective production etc..This is already happening in some areas: those who ask for social services are encouraged to participate to social farming etc.. (it is not a “one way gift” but return strategies should be analyses on FNS, right to food, as well as on emerging and still unidentified needs.</td>
<td>Solidarity in half</td>
<td>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator. 1.2 Map opportunities. The Region facilitating the process. 1.3 Use of IT technology to create networks for food recovery. GDO, collective catering and producers of food. 1.4 Evaluate the available amount of food. Ex. Recovery and redistribution of surplus food.</td>
<td>In relation to objective 1 (finding multiple responses to food need). The possible responses to food should be diversified. In relation to surplus recovery it is necessary to act on the food collection strategies. For example the Region has financially supported social groups for land allocation aimed to self and collective production etc..This is already happening in some areas: those who ask for social services are encouraged to participate to social farming etc.. (it is not a “one way gift” but return strategies should be analyses on FNS, right to food, as well as on emerging and still unidentified needs.</td>
<td>Solidarity in half</td>
<td>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator. 1.2 Map opportunities. The Region facilitating the process. 1.3 Use of IT technology to create networks for food recovery. GDO, collective catering and producers of food. 1.4 Evaluate the available amount of food. Ex. Recovery and redistribution of surplus food.</td>
<td>In relation to objective 1 (finding multiple responses to food need). The possible responses to food should be diversified. In relation to surplus recovery it is necessary to act on the food collection strategies. For example the Region has financially supported social groups for land allocation aimed to self and collective production etc..This is already happening in some areas: those who ask for social services are encouraged to participate to social farming etc.. (it is not a “one way gift” but return strategies should be analyses on FNS, right to food, as well as on emerging and still unidentified needs.</td>
<td>Solidarity in half</td>
<td>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator. 1.2 Map opportunities. The Region facilitating the process. 1.3 Use of IT technology to create networks for food recovery. GDO, collective catering and producers of food. 1.4 Evaluate the available amount of food. Ex. Recovery and redistribution of surplus food.</td>
<td>In relation to objective 1 (finding multiple responses to food need). The possible responses to food should be diversified. In relation to surplus recovery it is necessary to act on the food collection strategies. For example the Region has financially supported social groups for land allocation aimed to self and collective production etc..This is already happening in some areas: those who ask for social services are encouraged to participate to social farming etc.. (it is not a “one way gift” but return strategies should be analyses on FNS, right to food, as well as on emerging and still unidentified needs.</td>
<td>Solidarity in half</td>
<td>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator. 1.2 Map opportunities. The Region facilitating the process. 1.3 Use of IT technology to create networks for food recovery. GDO, collective catering and producers of food. 1.4 Evaluate the available amount of food. Ex. Recovery and redistribution of surplus food.</td>
<td>In relation to objective 1 (finding multiple responses to food need). The possible responses to food should be diversified. In relation to surplus recovery it is necessary to act on the food collection strategies. For example the Region has financially supported social groups for land allocation aimed to self and collective production etc..This is already happening in some areas: those who ask for social services are encouraged to participate to social farming etc.. (it is not a “one way gift” but return strategies should be analyses on FNS, right to food, as well as on emerging and still unidentified needs.</td>
<td>Solidarity in half</td>
<td>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator. 1.2 Map opportunities. The Region facilitating the process. 1.3 Use of IT technology to create networks for food recovery. GDO, collective catering and producers of food. 1.4 Evaluate the available amount of food. Ex. Recovery and redistribution of surplus food.</td>
<td>In relation to objective 1 (finding multiple responses to food need). The possible responses to food should be diversified. In relation to surplus recovery it is necessary to act on the food collection strategies. For example the Region has financially supported social groups for land allocation aimed to self and collective production etc..This is already happening in some areas: those who ask for social services are encouraged to participate to social farming etc.. (it is not a “one way gift” but return strategies should be analyses on FNS, right to food, as well as on emerging and still unidentified needs.</td>
<td>Solidarity in half</td>
<td>Do I want to go to live in the countryside?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.5 Involvement of local producers networks

1.5 Involvement of local producers networks encourages. It is important, however, that these strategies are systematized by means of a regional coordination. and social justice in order to lay the ground for advocacy work. Social research at all levels should be involved;
- awareness-raising campaigns targeting civil society, as well as institutions at local and national level;
- Caritas and CSOs move towards social inclusion and education and allocates resources to these activities;
1.a Institutions react to external pressures
1.b Creation of a frontier operator by the public sector withdrawn, because some do not want to have that kind of control, others do not have the organizational structure to meet its obligations.
Identification of witnesses? - > Scenario with strong individualism, these key players will cmq active and present. However NB directed, the need to have a central subject (SDS?) to organize.

### 2. Effective identification of needs

#### 2.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors.
- The Region should be the leading facilitator
- Identify the “witnesses” of food poverty: pediatrician, school teachers, priests, health and social services and pharmacies
- Creation of an observatory on food and nutrition in security needs, coordinated by social services (regional level)
- Training of “witnesses” on how to recognize food poverty needs
- Monitoring needs of Objective 2 becomes a cross-cutting action to be immediately achieved (in 2020, before than objective 1).

New order:
2.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors.
- The Region should be the leading facilitator
2.2 Creation of an observatory on food and nutrition in security needs, coordinated by social services (regional level)
2.3.a Identify the “witnesses” of food poverty: pediatrician, school teachers,

A weak point in relation to “identification of needs”, by so called witnesses, doctors, pediatricians and so on. They are engaged in dealing with the emergency on diseases and health. Therefore operators of civil society must be trained in order to work on prevention.

2.2 Central role of the new profession of frontier operators among the “witnesses” of food poverty.
2.3 Needs monitoring activities by the CSOs network (see 1.5 Governance and network).

1.2 Identifying needs in the scenario is a critical aspect. The lack of public investment in developing adequate skills makes this objective quite unrealistic. Is it possible to operate network systems without public support? In theory, the network building should be a bottom up process but in reality if the public does not support it, it falls. In a context of scarce resources, the region can act as a broker? Intermediary? Yes, however, this requires resources, the network is not cost free. It is necessary to identify the most appropriate level, which is not regional, but more local. An example from the new program FEAD: new rules have been set, many associations have withdrawn, because some do not want
| 3. Safe and Active Neighborhoods | Objective 3 is more focused on creating a sense of community and becomes a strategic goal. New order: 3.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. This should be led by neighborhoods. 3.2 Involvement of schools to develop food culture and social relations. The municipality is in charge. 3.3 Safe and active neighborhoods. In the scenario that is difficult because there is little sympathy for the stranger, more attention to the community people. The local citizen is more easily attached by the network of social services. The illegal immigrant, is much more difficult to integrate. Concerning actions 1.3 (safe neighborhoods) and 1.4 (recipients as protagonists) there is a major obstacle in this scenario: there is an isolated view of the food problem within the more general problem. It is not just a food issue, but a lack of integration. We need to create opportunities for exchange at local level between social and assistance systems. No one has a complete picture of the problem. The network must involve not only the actors of the food system, but all the actors of the social system. Not only food packages, but self-production and territorial policies, collective production policies should be put into place. In the scenario analyzed, everything becomes more complicated because there is lack of financial and active presence of the public actor - therefore more leadership and activism. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Recipients as protagonists</th>
<th>New formulation of nr.4: Overcoming food aid approach 4.2 Set up a direction for the recognition of the right to food. Mayors, Health services and the Tuscany Region (cover multiple territorial levels). 4.1 and 4.4 are achieved in this scenario</th>
<th>4. Reformulated as Active recipients: they will be able to leverage on their capabilities 1.4-1.2 developing network is crucial 1.4- The development of the Emporium is unrealistic, because it’s very expensive. It requires both personal (at least two people always present plus volunteers). Self production should be encouraged in this scenario. Certainly the Emporium allows recipients to be protagonists, in fact it generates exchanges, return paths (e.g., giving you 50 Euros of spending a week, you give me two hours of volunteering).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Food quality</td>
<td>New formulation of nr.5: access for all people to good quality food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences (nutritional and cultural aspects of food). 5.1 Approve the law to promote food recovery and reduce waste 5.2 Anticipated at 2020: alignment of national legislation on the territories These actions should be led by agriculture and health ministries. Lobbying by NGOs.</td>
<td>1.5 Quality Food: set specific programs and projects (Project of children's lunches, food for c.) proves better than making a general donation, partly because the company uses it in terms of image return. The increase of fresh food in food assistance practices is another relevant issue: the problem here is not lack of fresh food. There is plenty of surplus linked to the Russian Embargo. The problem is logistics: to be able to give it away in a small time. It is also a cultural problem linked to nutrition education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

urban gardens). 3.5 Organize local fairs, street food occasions to include migrant communities, neighborhood dinners. Organized with the help of Caritas and third sector actors.

and coordination between private parties is needed. But in a system in which society is closed and careless, it becomes unrealistic.

4 Recipients as protagonists
4.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator
4.2 Set up a direction for the recognition of the right to food. Mayors, Health services ... (cover multiple territorial levels)
4.3 Place the food aid within the individual social support path
4.4 Decrease and gradual substitution of food parcels with Emporia (i.e. social markets) establishment. Caritas and NGOs should be leading actors.

New formulation of nr.4: Overcoming food aid approach 4.2 Set up a direction for the recognition of the right to food. Mayors, Health service and the Tuscany Region (cover multiple territorial levels). 4.1 and 4.4 are achieved in this scenario

4. Reformulated as Active recipients: they will be able to leverage on their capabilities 1.4-1.2 developing network is crucial 1.4- The development of the Emporium is unrealistic, because it’s very expensive. It requires both personal (at least two people always present plus volunteers). Self production should be encouraged in this scenario. Certainly the Emporium allows recipients to be protagonists, in fact it generates exchanges, return paths (e.g., giving you 50 Euros of spending a week, you give me two hours of volunteering).

5 Food quality
5.1 Create opportunities for exchange between actors. The Region should be the leading facilitator
5.2 Approve the law to promote food recovery and reduce waste
5.3 Simplify legislation and on product expiration dates
5.4 Alignment of national legislation on the territories These actions should be led by agriculture and health ministries. Lobbying by NGOs.

New formulation of nr.5: access for all people to good quality food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences (nutritional and cultural aspects of food). 5.1 Approve the law to promote food recovery and reduce waste 5.2 Anticipated at 2020: alignment of national legislation on the territories These actions should be led by agriculture and health
| ministries. Lobbying by NGOs. 5.3 Dietary guidelines (balanced diet, diversification of food, training, ...) | | Another bottleneck in food assistance is lack of meat and this is due to hygienic sanitary problems. There is need for clear rules and incentives for companies (procedures, manuals, guidelines). |