



HAL
open science

Sustainability and food and nutrition security: an indicator-based vulnerability and resilience approach for the Mediterranean region

Paolo Prosperi

► **To cite this version:**

Paolo Prosperi. Sustainability and food and nutrition security: an indicator-based vulnerability and resilience approach for the Mediterranean region. Economics and Finance. Montpellier SupAgro; Università degli studi (Catane, Italie), 2015. English. NNT : 2015NSAM0003 . tel-04005790

HAL Id: tel-04005790

<https://theses.hal.science/tel-04005790>

Submitted on 27 Feb 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

THÈSE

Pour obtenir le grade de
Docteur

Délivré par

**CENTRE INTERNATIONAL D'ETUDES SUPERIEURES
EN SCIENCES AGRONOMIQUES
MONTPELLIER SUPAGRO**

Préparée au sein de l'école doctorale
Economie et Gestion - Montpellier (ED 231)
Et de l'unité de recherche
UMR MOISA

Spécialité : **Economie Agroalimentaire**

Présentée par **Paolo PROSPERI**

**Mesures de la sécurité alimentaire et de
l'alimentation durable en Méditerranée,
basées sur les approches de la vulnérabilité et
de la résilience.**

***[Sustainability and food and nutrition security:
An indicator-based vulnerability and resilience
approach for the Mediterranean Region]***

Soutenue le 6 mars 2015 devant le jury composé de

M. Gianluca BRUNORI, Professeur (PU), Università di Pisa

Rapporteur

M. Stephen MORSE, Professeur (PU), University of Surrey

Rapporteur

M. Jean-Louis RASTOIN, Professeur émérite, Montpellier SupAgro

Président du jury

Mme Martine PADILLA, Directrice de Recherche, IAMM-CIHEAM

Co-directrice

M. Iuri PERI, Chercheur (MCF), Università di Catania

Co-directeur

Invités

M. Thomas ALLEN, Economiste (ADM), OCDE

UNIVERSITÁ DEGLI STUDI DI CATANIA
Dipartimento di Gestione dei Sistemi Agroalimentari e Ambientali

Tesi di Dottorato di Ricerca in “Economia Agroalimentare”
XXVI ciclo

PAOLO PROSPERI

Sustainability and food and nutrition security:
An indicator-based vulnerability and resilience approach
for the Mediterranean Region

SEDE AMMINISTRATIVA: Università degli Studi di Catania

SEDI CONSORZIATE:

- Montpellier SupAgro (France)
- Doctoral School of Economics and Management of Montpellier, University Montpellier 1
- Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Montpellier

COORDINATORE: Prof. Giuseppina Carrà

CO-TUTOR: Dott. Iuri Peri

CO-TUTOR: Prof. Martine Padilla

ANNO ACCADEMICO 2013-2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	viii
<i>List of Figures</i>	x
<i>List of Tables</i>	xi
<i>Short abstract</i>	xii
<i>Résumé court</i>	xii
<i>Thesis at a glance</i>	xiii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xiv
Chapter 1	1
Introductory chapter.	
Sustainability of food systems: A Social-Ecological Systems Frameworks perspective	
1.1 - Background	2
<i>Food and nutrition security as main outcome of an integrated food system</i>	3
1.2 - Social-Ecological Systems Frameworks	6
<i>Food system as a Social-Ecological System</i>	7
<i>Defining vulnerability and resilience of a food system</i>	9
<i>Vulnerability of the food system to global change</i>	11
1.3 - Pertinence of the SES frameworks to the analysis of properties and interplays within contemporary food systems	16
<i>Issues related to water depletion</i>	18
<i>Issues related to biodiversity loss</i>	20
<i>Issues related to price volatility</i>	23
<i>Issues related to trends of food consumption patterns</i>	24
1.4 - Insights on a framework to explore the sustainability of the food systems	28
<i>Research analyses of Food Systems and Food Security through the SESs frameworks</i>	28
<i>Contribution of the SESs frameworks and Vulnerability & Resilience theories to Sustainability analysis</i>	31
1.5 - Conclusions	41
1.6 - Aims of the thesis	43
Preface to Chapter 2	47

Chapter 2.....	48
Agricultural biodiversity, social–ecological systems and sustainable diets: Towards resilience for food security	
2.1 - Introduction.....	49
2.2 - Sustainable diets: a new concept calling for changes.....	50
<i>A nutrition-driven perspective.....</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Food security and sustainable development.....</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Diets as system outputs.....</i>	<i>53</i>
2.3 - A complex human–environment system.....	55
<i>Food and nutrition as ecosystem services.....</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Reduction in agrobiodiversity and simplification of diets.....</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Agrobiodiversity and resilience for food security.....</i>	<i>59</i>
2.4 Bio-economic modeling for biodiversity and nutrition.....	61
<i>Modeling activities, capturing diversities.....</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Biodiversity in bio-economic modeling.....</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>Joint assessment of nutrition and biodiversity.....</i>	<i>65</i>
2.4 - Conclusions.....	66
Preface to Chapter 3.....	69
Chapter 3.....	70
Sustainability and Food & Nutrition Security: A Vulnerability Assessment Framework for the Mediterranean Region	
3.1 - Introduction.....	71
3.2 - Food Insecurity and Environmental Unsustainability: A joint regional analysis.....	74
<i>Changes in dietary patterns and food insecurity.....</i>	<i>74</i>
<i>The associated issue of environmental unsustainability.....</i>	<i>76</i>
3.3 - Vulnerability for a multidimensional and dynamic system approach.....	80
<i>Mechanics of change and sustainability.....</i>	<i>80</i>
<i>A causal-factor approach.....</i>	<i>81</i>

3.4 - Methodological steps for the assessment of Vulnerability	83
<i>A composite indicator</i>	83
<i>Calculating a Vulnerability score</i>	85
3.5 - Discussion of the approach	87
<i>Metrics, analysis and prospective</i>	87
<i>Identifying issues and dealing with multidimensionality</i>	90
<i>Examples of application</i>	91
3.6 - Conclusions	94
Preface to Chapter 4	97
Chapter 4	98
Modeling Sustainable Food Systems	
4.1 - Introduction	99
4.2 - Identifying the fundamental sustainability properties of the food system	101
<i>Sustainability as a system property</i>	101
<i>A social-ecological framework</i>	103
<i>Vulnerability/Resilience for the analysis of food system sustainability</i>	105
4.3 - Formalizing the food system as a dynamic system	107
<i>What is a dynamic system?</i>	107
<i>A mathematical representation</i>	108
<i>Categorizing variables, constructing a composite indicator</i>	111
4.4 - Application: Addressing context-specific issues	113
<i>A stepwise approach</i>	113
<i>Identifying global and regional drivers of change affecting the food system outcomes</i>	115
<i>Identifying food and nutrition security issues</i>	118
<i>A causal model</i>	120
4.5- Discussion	122
<i>Why vulnerability and resilience to assess sustainability?</i>	122

<i>Why these specific issues and drivers?</i>	124
4.6 – Conclusions	125
Chapter 5	128
Using Delphi expert elicitation survey to define indicators for assessing the Sustainability of the Food Systems	
5.1 - Introduction	129
<i>Aims</i>	132
5.2 - Research design: Materials and methods	134
<i>Participation and Panel composition</i>	137
<i>Preparation and distribution of Delphi questionnaires</i>	138
<i>The Vulnerability and Resilience framework</i>	139
<i>Data analysis</i>	142
5.3 - Results	143
<i>The Delphi sample characteristics</i>	143
<i>Progression of consensus on the indicators</i>	145
<i>Appraisal of Interactions, Drivers, and Issues</i>	149
5.4 - Discussion	153
<i>Discussion of the results</i>	153
<i>Methodological considerations</i>	168
5-5 Conclusions	179
Chapter 6	182
General conclusions	
<i>Scientific standing</i>	187
<i>Limitations</i>	189
<i>Implications for further research</i>	191
References	196
ANNEX 1: Letter of invitation in the Delphi study.....	249
ANNEX 2: Technical brief.....	251
ANNEX 3: Indicator list.....	254

ANNEX 4: Online Delphi Survey.....	262
<i>Bref résumé</i>	326
<i>Extended abstract</i>	327

List of Abbreviations

AF	Affordability of food
ANSES	French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety
BL	Biodiversity loss
BMI	Body Mass Index
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CC	Climate change
CFCP	Changes in food consumption patterns
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIHEAM	International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies
CVD	Cardiovascular disease
DEB	Dietary energy balance
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (United Kingdom)
E	Exposure
EEA	European Environment Agency
EIU	Economists Intelligence Unit
ETC/SCP	European Topic Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production
EU	European Union
FANTA	Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance Project (USAID)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FNS	Food and nutrition security
FPV	Food price volatility
FSSIM-Dev	Farm System Simulator for Developing Countries
GECAFS	Global Environmental Change and Food Systems project
GFN	Global Footprint Network
GFSI	Global Food Security Index
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GHGE	Greenhouse gas emissions
IAMM	Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Montpellier
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
INFOODS	International Network of Food Data Systems
INRA	French National Institute for Agricultural Research
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
NQFS	Nutritional quality of food supply
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
Oqali	Food quality monitoring service (INRA, France)
PARME	Partnerships and Research in the Mediterranean
PCA	Principal component analysis
PDF	Portable Document Format
PI	Potential impact
PIPAME	Interministerial center for forecasting and anticipation of economic transformation (France)
R	Resilience
RP	Recovery potential
S	Sensitivity

SAFA	Sustainability Assessment of Food and Agriculture systems (FAO)
SCAR	European Union Standing Committee on Agricultural Research
SCFP	Satisfaction of cultural food preferences
SES	Social-Ecological Systems
UN	United Nations
UN-ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDRO	United Nations Disaster Relief Organization
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNEP-MAP	United Nations Environment Programme Mediterranean Action Plan
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UNSDSN	United States Sustainable Development Solutions Network
V	Vulnerability
WB	The World Bank
WCED	World Commission on Environment and Development
WD	Water depletion
WFN	Water Footprint Network
WFP	United Nations World Food Programme
WFS	World Food Summit
WHO	United Nations World Health Organization
XLS	Microsoft Excel

List of Figures

Figure 1:	Food system framework.....	4
Figure 2:	Vulnerability framework.....	10
Figure 3:	Calculation of Vulnerability.....	86
Figure 4:	A causal pathway.....	106
Figure 5:	Basic representation of a dynamic system.....	112
Figure 6:	A Sustainable food system framework.....	108
Figure 7:	Structure and pathway of the Delphi study.....	136
Figure 8:	Matrix of interactions between global, and regional, drivers of change and context-specific FNS issues.....	140
Figure 9:	Share of consensus of the most selected indicator for each of the 24 vulnerability components considered.....	147
Figure 10:	Expert appraisal of the eight interactions proposed in the Delphi study for the selection of the indicators.....	150
Figure 11:	Expert appraisal of the emerged interactions between the initial set of FNS issues and the newly proposed drivers of change	151
Figure 12:	Expert appraisal of the initial set of FNS issues and of the newly proposed ones.....	153

List of Tables

Table 1:	Advantages of a vulnerability approach.....	90
Table 2:	Interactions Drivers of change / FNS Issues.....	120
Table 3:	Global response and participation rates.....	145
Table 4:	Participation rate by composition of the panel.....	145
Table 5:	Consensus rate of the most selected indicator/s per vulnerability component in the three Delphi rounds.....	148
Table 6:	Participation rate and degree of variation of the Delphi disciplinary groups over the three rounds.....	155
Table 7:	Analytical details of the formulation of the most selected indicators.....	158
Table 8:	Appraisal of Food and Nutrition Security issues for Economists and Nutritionists' groups by Standard Deviation.....	166

Paolo PROSPERI

ED 231 - UMR 1110 MOISA Montpellier SupAgro & Università di Catania - DiGeSA (Di3A)

PhD Thesis in Agrofood Economics

Sustainability and food and nutrition security:

An indicator-based vulnerability and resilience approach for the Mediterranean Region

Short abstract

Recurrent food crises and global change are critical issues that pushed food security and environmental sustainability to the top of the political agenda. Using the lens of a broad sustainability approach and recognizing the systemic dimension of sustainability, the thesis developed a multidimensional framework to identify metrics for assessing the sustainability of food systems and diets. Building on the theories of vulnerability and resilience, the Mediterranean Region presents a set of socioeconomic and biophysical drivers of change affecting the sustainability of the food system in its main functions providing food and nutrition security. Formalizing the food system as a dynamic complex system, several causal models of vulnerability were identified, describing the interactions where drivers of change directly affect food and nutrition security outcomes, disentangling exposure, sensitivity, and resilience. This theoretical approach was operationalized through the identification of a first suite of indicators. A reduced pool of metrics was then obtained through an expert-based Delphi survey, moving beyond subjective evaluation and reaching consensus.

Keywords: Food systems, Food Security, Sustainability, Resilience, Mediterranean, Metrics.

**Mesures de la sécurité alimentaire et de l'alimentation durable en Méditerranée,
basées sur les approches de la vulnérabilité et de la résilience.**

Résumé court

Les crises alimentaires récurrentes ainsi que les changements globaux sont des questions cruciales qui placent la sécurité alimentaire et la durabilité environnementale au centre de l'agenda politique. A travers une approche de la durabilité dans son sens large, et par la dimension systémique de la durabilité, cette thèse développe un cadre théorique multidimensionnel pour identifier des indicateurs afin d'évaluer la durabilité des systèmes et des régimes alimentaires. Sur la base des théories de la vulnérabilité et de la résilience, la région méditerranéenne présente un ensemble de facteurs de changement socioéconomiques et biophysiques qui affectent la durabilité du système alimentaire dans ses principales fonctions, censées assurer la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle. En formalisant le système alimentaire comme un système dynamique complexe, plusieurs modèles causaux de la vulnérabilité ont été identifiés, décrivant les interactions où des facteurs de changement affectent directement les résultats de la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle. Ces interactions se déclinent dans les dimensions d'exposition, de sensibilité et de résilience. Cette approche théorique a d'abord été opérationnalisée par l'identification d'une première série d'indicateurs, puis une liste plus réduite a été obtenue par une consultation d'experts (Delphi), permettant d'obtenir un consensus tout en évitant le risque d'évaluation subjective.

Mots clés: Systèmes alimentaires, Sécurité alimentaire, Durabilité, Résilience, Méditerranée, Indicateurs.

Thesis at a glance

Paolo Prosperi

ED 231 - UMR 1110 MOISA Montpellier SupAgro & Università di Catania - DiGeSA (Di3A)

Sustainability and food and nutrition security: An indicator-based vulnerability and resilience approach for the Mediterranean Region

CHAPTER / ARTICLE	OBJECTIVE	METHOD	MAIN FINDINGS / CONCLUSIONS
<p>Chapter 1</p> <p>Sustainability of food systems: A Social-Ecological Systems Frameworks perspective</p>	<p>To describe the interest of the social-ecological system frameworks for answering questions about the sustainability problems that affect the functions of the food system.</p>	<p>An extensive literature review was conducted, on problems related to food and nutrition security, and on SES frameworks approach to food systems dynamics.</p>	<p>The understanding of the food systems as SES proved helpful in answering questions on the sustainability problems of the food system. Theories of vulnerability and resilience are often adopted in research to understand the complex dynamics involving socioeconomic and biophysical aspects, and to implement sustainable development strategies.</p>
<p>Chapter 2 (Article I)</p> <p>Agricultural biodiversity, social-ecological systems and sustainable diets: Towards resilience for food security</p>	<p>To describe food systems as complex social-ecological systems, involving multiple interactions between human and natural components.</p>	<p>An extensive literature review was conducted focusing on the interactions and mutual dynamics of change between nutritional patterns and environment structure.</p>	<p>Conceptual modeling frameworks are described articulating the synergies and tradeoffs between dietary diversity and agricultural biodiversity, and associated ecosystem functions that are crucial resilience factors to climate and global changes. The systemic nature of these interactions calls for multidimensional approaches, integrated assessments, and simulation tools to guide change.</p>
<p>Chapter 3 (Article II)</p> <p>Sustainability and Food & Nutrition Security: A Vulnerability Assessment Framework for the Mediterranean Region</p>	<p>To develop a multidimensional framework for the analysis of the sustainability of diets and food systems, applicable to countries of the Mediterranean region.</p>	<p>A vulnerability / resilience approach has been adapted to analyze the main issues related to food and nutrition security, through causal factor analysis.</p>	<p>A conceptual framework was identified for modeling the relationships between food and nutrition security and sustainability, and developing potential indicators of sustainable diets and food systems.</p>
<p>Chapter 4 (Article III)</p> <p>Modeling Sustainable Food Systems: A Dynamic System Approach</p>	<p>To define the main variables for the formalization and operationalization of the multidimensional concepts of sustainable food systems.</p>	<p>Building on SES frameworks theories of vulnerability and resilience, a dynamic system approach was adopted to model and mathematically represent the changing behavior of the food system variables over the time. A vulnerability / resilience assessment method was then applied.</p>	<p>A feedback-structured framework of the food system formalized eight causal models of vulnerability and resilience, shaping the interactions where a set of drivers of change affect a number of food and nutrition security outcomes, at a subregional level.</p>
<p>Chapter 5</p> <p>Using Delphi expert elicitation survey to select indicators of Sustainable Food Systems</p>	<p>To identify metrics for assessing the sustainability of food systems and diets, building on the interactions between a set of biophysical and socioeconomic drivers of vulnerability and a number of context-specific FNS issues.</p>	<p>Building on a vulnerability / resilience theory-driven approach, an expert-based Delphi method was conducted in 3 rounds with feedbacks. The panel of experts counted, over each of the three rounds, 51, 39, and 36 participants.</p>	<p>Consensus on a reduced pool of indicators was obtained in the 75% of cases (18 indicators). It allowed validating a conceptual and dynamic framework for the food system, and identifying main metrics of reference, moving beyond subjective evaluation.</p>

Acknowledgments

The idea of doing a PhD was first suggested to me in 2009 by Martine Padilla, the initiator and main supporter of this PhD, during the Master and the internship at the CIHEAM-IAMM. She enthusiastically convinced me about the interest and the challenge of observing the contradictory issues of food security, from different points of view and considering the sustainability of the food systems through innovative paradigms of analysis. She really encouraged me then to tackle these issues in a PhD thesis.

The first person that made this PhD possible is Iuri Peri, from the University of Catania, who was also strongly persuaded of the importance and the perspective of this topic and accepted to co-supervise this PhD with Martine Padilla in a joint international partnership.

I am thankful to both my supervisors for encouraging me in this work and always showing me the right pathway for keeping a rigorous scientific approach, still guarantying my intellectual freedom. Furthermore, they constantly gave their institutional support allowing me assisting and presenting in a number of international events and conferences, organizing seminars and meetings in Catania and Montpellier, and entrusting me with responsibilities that permitted to further develop my skills. This gave me the opportunity to get experience in the international research environment.

I am much indebted in particular to Thomas Allen, who also encouraged me from the beginning to tackle a PhD, and then with whom I could strongly collaborate in the Bioversity International and CIHEAM-IAMM joint partnership. I could learn a lot from him and his advices, and our collaboration was key for the achievement of the results, and for learning how to work in a scientific team, writing articles, presenting and organizing workshops.

I am really grateful to Bruce Cogill who strongly believed and wanted to join efforts in a Bioversity International and CIHEAM-IAMM partnership, and who strongly

contributed to focus the objectives of this common project. Thanks a lot also for participating in the steering committee.

I also am indebted to Foued Cheriet for having accepted to take part to the steering committee of the PhD and for having taken the time to advise me wisely.

I am thankful to the group of experts participating in the exploratory workshops before starting with the Delphi process, who contributed with valuable inputs to make the survey more suitable for the larger panel. I am really grateful to: Hatem Belhouchette, Bernard Fallery, Yves Martin-Prevel, Jean-Louis Rastoin, and George-André Simon.

Special thanks also to the large number of experts who participated in the Delphi survey, giving valuable contributions to the application of a scientific work and for being part of a community working on food security and sustainability of the food systems.

My sincere thanks to all the members of the jury for accepting to take part to the viva and to the not fore-mentioned members, Gianluca Brunori and Stephen Morse, for accepting also to act as rapporteurs.

I want also to express my gratitude to Amid Bencharif and Selma Tozanli for acknowledging my willing, during the Master degree, for doing research on food security. I am very grateful to Bénédicte Oberti for being involved with energy and having encouraged this PhD since the internship period and also for coaching me in the last days of preparation of the viva with Nadège Padilla-Renaud, whom I thank very much too for the kind and valuable advices. Sincere thanks to Vincent Dollé for having provided a strong institutional support from the beginning and to Pascal Bergeret who extended this institutional support from the CIHEAM-IAMM.

I am really grateful to Giuseppina Carrà for coordinating the PhD in Catania and always supporting the interest of this topic and the international scientific collaboration.

Special thanks to Cécile Adamolle, Dominique Poilleau, and Rafaele Sarrade of the Centre de documentation IAMM, for their kind help in providing bibliographic tools, advices and for always helping in finding interesting publications, and to the Centre de documentation Bartoli de Moïsa.

I am grateful to Isabelle Ferrier, Claire Rubio, Melanie Jacques (IAMM), and Anne-Cécile Leroux (Moïsa) for their constant and kind assistance.

Many thanks to the PhD students and colleagues from Catania and Montpellier, and also to those from other Universities whom I have met in the several international meetings and activities all over these four years.

Thanks a lot to all my dearest friends in Montpellier and Rome, and those in London, Madagascar, Cameroun, Quebec, and wherever they are now, for supporting me with advices, patience and simply sharing time and experiences together.

Great thanks to my mother Stefania, my father Tommaso, my brother Marco, and to all our family for their inestimable support.

And in the end, thank you Camille ... for all your support and for celebrating this and many other beautiful things of life together.

"Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control."

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, United Nations General Assembly,
1948.

"It is impossible to dissociate language from science or science from language, because every natural science always involves three things: the sequence of phenomena on which the science is based; the abstract concepts which call these phenomena to mind; and the words in which the concepts are expressed. To call forth a concept, a word is needed; to portray a phenomenon, a concept is needed. All three mirror one and the same reality."

Traité élémentaire de chimie, Antoine Laurent Lavoisier,
1789.

Chapter 1

Introductory chapter.

**Sustainability of food systems: A Social-Ecological
Systems Frameworks perspective**

1.1 - Background

The latest FAO estimates indicate that approximately 805 million people are chronically undernourished worldwide (FAO, 2014). Considering that the global population is projected to reach 7,3 billion in 2015 (UN, 2014), it is possible to estimate that 11% of people are chronically undernourished (FAO, 2014). Concurrently, nearly 2.1 billion people are affected by malnourishment related to unhealthy food consumption and dietary trends, which is reflected in the spread of food-related diseases like obesity and nutrient deficiency (Ng et al., 2014). At the same time food production and consumption exert a huge impact on the environment and are significant sources of green house gases. Furthermore, agriculture is responsible for 70% of water withdrawal (FAOSTAT, 2012) and represents a main driver of deforestation and loss of biodiversity. Food systems rely on physical resources such as land, water, biodiversity, and fossil fuels which are becoming ever more fragile and scarce. Efforts, therefore, need to be focused on the creation of food systems that are more efficient in the use of resources and reduce food waste, at every stage, from primary production to transformation and consumption (UNEP, 2012).

Food insecurity is a persisting global issue and the food system is now facing a new set of intersecting social, environmental, and economic challenges. Food security depends essentially on ecosystems and their services and during the last 50 years the physical and functional availability of ecosystem services has fallen faster than ever before (IAASTD, 2009). Presently Earth's life support systems encounter a condition of serious depletion and human development will be confronted with rising resource shortage (MEA, 2005).

The leading tenet related to food insecurity issues focuses on improving access to adequate food for those who suffer from hunger and malnutrition, and on increasing supply by 70–100% - through agricultural intensification – in order to feed a growing human population confronted with rising incomes, urban transition and changing dietary preferences (FAO, 2009; Foran et al., 2014). A number of common policy strategies have been encouraged to foster sustainable food security and consist mainly of closing yield gaps, improving resource efficiency and production limits, changing

consumption trends, banning agricultural expansion and cutting waste (Godfray et al. 2010; Foley et al. 2011).

Global environmental change - apparent in climate change, ocean acidification, and biodiversity loss - has a growing impact on stocks and flows of ecosystem services at a global level (Ingram et al., 2010). Evidences related to this global change are observed through worldwide-reduced yields that are severely affecting food security (Lobell et al., 2011). Besides environmental change, numerous socio-economic factors bear critical responsibilities in food systems and drive outcomes of food security (Ericksen, 2007).

Food and nutrition security as main outcome of an integrated food system

"*Food Security*" was defined - in the 1996 World Food Summit (United Nations) - as the state that "*exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life*". Food and nutrition security is underpinned by food systems (Ingram et al., 2013) and relies on several properties of food systems, categorized as a range of activities - producing, processing and packaging, distributing, retailing and consuming - that emanate in three main sets of outcomes, namely: food and nutrition security, social welfare and environmental capital. Furthermore, various elements of food systems are altered by, and actively impact, the socioeconomic and environmental conditions of the system across local, regional and global levels. These interactions are featured by - and bring with themselves high uncertainties (Ericksen, 2008a; Ingram et al., 2010; Ingram, 2011) (Figure 1).




Figure 1 - Food system framework (Ericksen, 2008a)

Food and nutrition security then is considered the principal outcome of any food system (Ericksen, 2010) and is a multidimensional concept that can be analyzed at individual, household, community, national, regional and global level (Ingram, 2011). Fulfilling the food demand remains challenging because of the disturbances brought by global environmental change. The food system is partially responsible for these changes through its own activities, which in turn hamper the availability of resources for sustaining the perpetuation of the food system functions (Misselhorn et al., 2012). In order to link these different challenges, and, building on a broad definition of food system, food security can be deemed as the outcome of several different activities. This perspective allows Ericksen (2007) to suggest a social-ecological system (SES) approach for the analysis of the food system, incorporating environmental, social, political and economic determinants summarized in socioeconomic and global environmental change drivers (Gerber, 2014). Thus, food systems are considered social-ecological systems that comprise biophysical and social factors linked through feedback mechanisms (Berkes et al., 2003; Ericksen, 2008a) (Figure 1). Food insecurity, therefore, arises when multiple biophysical, economic and social stresses (strongly linked to global environmental change) negatively impact, individually or concurrently, on different aspects of the food system (Ingram et al., 2013; Ericksen,

2014). These multiple pressures converge on the major determinants of food security, namely supply, access and utilization (Misselhorn et al., 2012).

Global food security is facing several challenges, and there are key elements that might support a successful food system. The global food system is changing fast and in the meantime is being confronted with surrounding global socio-political and ecological changes (Cabell & Oelofse, 2012), however, human societies have the ability to anticipate and modify these changing trends (Holling, 2003).

Together with global environmental change, increasing economic and social inequalities, market and political instability, and shifting consumption patterns hamper the global food system, with consequences such as the double burden of malnutrition (Garrett & Ruel, 2003). Depletion of ecosystem services, the loss of freshwater resources and soil erosion contribute to further threaten the capacity of humans to fulfill their nutritional needs (MEA, 2005; Carpenter et al., 2006). The world population is growing rapidly and diets are shifting towards an increasing demand for meat products. Concurrently modern agriculture still depends on oil coming from fossil reserves and biofuel production (Ericksen, 2008a; Cabell & Oelofse; 2012). These evidences show the crucial contradictions and challenges that the food system is facing. There is an urgent need for developing knowledge-based tools to assess and monitor sustainability of food systems and to identify pathways for food security and resource conservation.

Generally, agricultural and resource management problems are categorized as classic system problems. Similarly to food systems, aspects of systems behavior are complex and difficult to anticipate and causes are multiple. In natural and social systems, and their interplays, problems are often non-linear, dynamic, and cross-level in time and space. It is thus necessary to have one system-perspective where feedbacks occur across temporal and spatial scales. In order to explore and identify the appropriate strategies of response to the interactions in a changing coupled human-environment system in relation to food and agriculture, interdisciplinary and integrated analysis methods are needed (Ericksen, 2006; Thompson et al., 2007). Since systems approaches focus on the dynamic interactions among different components, they are necessary for understanding the non-linear mechanisms through which global

environmental change impacts not only on agricultural production but also on economic, cultural, and other factors (Ericksen, 2014).

Scientific analyses of contexts, systems and their properties inform the political process on how to achieve sustainability, and diversification of knowledge, integration of methods and inclusiveness in decision-making and governance are key (Scoones et al., 2007). For the food system, the potential answers can be found in the analyses of the quantitative nexuses between diets, the environment and human health, through the contribution of nutritionists, agriculturists, public health professionals, educators, policy makers and the food industry sector (Tilman & Clark, 2014). In such a dynamic scenario, measures of food and nutrition security that only focus on outcomes, such as hunger and malnourishment, might be too narrow for a comprehensive understanding of the food system and its changing causal mechanisms. However there are presently no precise and reliable global common metrics in use to measure the sustainability of food systems (Vinceti et al., 2013). There is a call for multidisciplinary and more inclusive, social-ecological, system-oriented approaches that look at the resources (financial, physical, natural, and social) to capture the dynamic processes between and within the food system activities, nutrition and health, and environmental outcomes (Allen et al., 2014).

1.2 - Social-Ecological Systems Frameworks

Foran et al. (2014) comprehensively synthesize what is generally intended by the term 'Social-Ecological System' (SES): "*SES visualizes the human–environment interface as a coupled 'system' in which socio-economic as well as biophysical driving forces interact to influence food system (and sub-system) activities and outcomes, both of which subsequently influence the driving forces*". SESs are dynamic systems that are continuously changing in response to internal or external pressures (Berkes & Folke 1998; Schluter, 2014) and the literature concerned was initially oriented mostly towards environmental change and the medium- and long-term impacts of human activities on future human prosperity (Foran et al., 2014). Furthermore, most complex phenomena involving concurrently social and ecological systems are indivisible and

any differentiation is thus considered counterfeit and subjective (Berkes & Folke 1998). SESs involve societal (human) and ecological (biophysical) subsystems in mutual interaction (Gallopín 2006).

Food system as a Social-Ecological System

Food systems are a form of complex social-ecological system (Allen et al., 2014) spanning the biological and socioeconomic processes encompassed in the production, distribution, marketing, preparation, and consumption of food (Misselhorn et al., 2012).

Building on Roe's method (1998) of triangulation of conceptual frameworks, Foran et al. (2014) picked a set of four dissimilar groups of conceptual frameworks oriented towards a rigorous analysis of the complexity in food systems in order to improve interdisciplinary interactions and the understanding and interventions in food security dynamics. This comparative analysis involved the conceptual framework groups of Agroecology, Agricultural Innovation Systems, Social-Ecological Systems and Political Ecology. The authors observed that the SES frameworks emerge within the other sets with respect to problem framing. In fact, SES frameworks highlight cross-level and cross-domain interactions in a system, while the other sets of frameworks opt rather for focusing on a particular domain or level. The SES frameworks arise as system-oriented frameworks that give further priority to complexity, analysis of systemic interactions and problem identification (Foran et al. 2014). In addition, from this analysis it is possible to observe that the SES frameworks appear to further emphasize the understanding of the relationships and the behavioral conditions of food systems faced with global change.

Alternatively, Binder et al. (2013) compared ten established conceptual frameworks that are meant to analyze social-ecological systems, namely: Driver, Pressure, State, Impact, Response - Earth Systems Analysis - Ecosystem Services - Human Environment Systems Framework - Material and Energy Flow Analysis - Management and Transition Framework - Social-Ecological Systems Framework - Sustainable Livelihood Approach - The Natural Step and Vulnerability Framework. These conceptual frameworks were identified to allow an organized and interdisciplinary reflection on the complex issues in social-ecological systems,

however, with regards to contextual and structural criteria, it is possible to find critical divergences within these frameworks, especially for the conceptualization of the ecological and social systems and their interconnections (Binder et al., 2013). The conceptual frameworks were classified throughout their contextual and structural characteristics into four groups: Ecocentric, Integrative, Policy and Vulnerability frameworks. The SES framework is thus considered an Integrative Framework since, consistently with Foran et al. (2014), it deems the mutuality between the social and the ecological systems and comprehends various types of feedbacks loops within the social system and between the social and ecological systems in different time scales. Significantly, as demonstrated by Binder et al. (2013) the SES framework approach emerges among the other frameworks as potentially the best candidate for gathering and diffusing pertinent data on the social and ecological systems to be applied in any framework, and as a common research approach for interdisciplinary analyses of social-ecological systems with the precise goal to tie together disciplinary and methodological bounds (Epstein et al., 2013). For several years now a vast community of scholars has gathered knowledge to make the SES framework a common classificatory framework for enhancing the understanding of complex social-ecological systems through multidisciplinary efforts (Ostrom 2009; Epstein et al., 2013). In fact, the SES framework approach is widely considered as unique in its treatment of social and ecological systems in equal depth and its ability to offer a structure for developing several levels of specificity by discerning diverse tiers (Binder et al., 2013).

Initially the SES framework originates from literature on ecosystem management and ecology and has strongly contributed to adaptation to global environmental change reasoning of natural resource management (Foran et al., 2014). The SES framework embodies the theories of resilience and vulnerability (Foran et al., 2014) and in the last decade it has been usefully applied to food systems (Ericksen, 2007; Ingram et al., 2010).

It is assumed that a SES frameworks perspective for enlightening food security would lead to enhanced resilience in various specific food systems domains, through increased knowledge of systemic interactions, institutional transformation, diversity and connectivity between sub-systems (Ingram et al., 2010; Foran et al., 2014).

Several investigations, from different discipline perspectives, were led on food and nutrition security through the lens of vulnerability. Socioeconomic studies find the causes of vulnerability, at both the level of the individual and at various group levels, mainly in socioeconomic and political factors (Gorton et al., 2010). Other studies focus on impacts of and responses to environmental change, floods and droughts in vulnerable regions, and the connection to governance, inequality problems and physical and social geography factors (Ericksen et al., 2009; Eakin, 2010; Ingram, 2011; Misselhorn et al., 2010).

Defining vulnerability and resilience of a food system

Over the last quarter of a century a host of efforts, mainly from agricultural sustainability studies, have been oriented towards the ability of food systems to absorb stress while keeping their original functions (Conway, 2007; Conway & Barbier, 1990; Thompson et al., 2007). Consistently, Misselhorn et al. (2012) state that a resilient food system enhances food security and is able to minimize, withstand and anticipate environmental and economic disturbances at different temporal and spatial levels. In addition Berkes et al. (2003) and Gunderson and Holling (2002) find that shocks and perturbations potentially represent opportunities for innovation and transformation. On the other hand, a food system is considered vulnerable when it fails in delivering one or many of its intended outcomes, because of even small stresses that might bring to significant social-ecological consequences (Adger, 2006; Ericksen 2008a; Ericksen, 2008c; Eakin, 2010).

Vulnerability - as the propensity or predisposition to be adversely affected (IPCC, 2014) - of a food system is a function of exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity (Turner et al., 2003; Ericksen et al., 2010) and food systems can be vulnerable, and resilient, to a set of stressors (Adger, 2006) such as environmental pressures, socioeconomic instabilities and institutional and policy factors (Figure 2).




Figure 2 - Vulnerability framework (Turner et al, 2003)

Therefore the analysis of the vulnerability of a geographical area needs to take into account the complex spatial and temporal interconnectedness and feedbacks that govern the achievement of the outcomes (supply, access, utilization) of all the activities and steps contributing to food and nutrition security (Eakin, 2010).

The concept of vulnerability has been adopted and largely explored in several disciplines and from various scientific communities referring to ecology, public health, human development, natural disaster, climate change and global environmental change, livelihoods security, sustainability science and risk and resilience (Adger, 2006; Fussler, 2007; Cordell & Neset, 2014). Vulnerability assessment belongs generally to a context and an area of study defined by natural or artificial boundaries (Downing & Patwardhan, 2005; Schroeter et al., 2005) (Figure 2). Except for broad assessments of vulnerability to global environmental change (Rockstrom et al., 2009), climate change vulnerability is generally analyzed at a regional and local level since vulnerability is strongly context-specific. An assessment

method could be appropriate in one region but inadequate in another area (Cordell & Neset, 2014).

Resilience, closely related to vulnerability in social-ecological systems, implies concepts of adaptation, transformation, innovation, self-organization and the capacity to perpetuate the activities over time despite the occurrence of stressors (Adger, 2006; Cutter et al., 2008; Folke, 2006). Resilience is a characteristic of complex and interrelated social-ecological systems that provides the system with the ability to absorb perturbations and also with the capacity to benefit from change through generating opportunities for development and innovation (Rockstrom, 2003; Adger, 2006; Resilience Alliance, 2010).

Vulnerability of the food system to global change

Contemporary food systems are characteristically cross-level and cross-scale (Liverman and Ingram, 2010), and rely on a large set of biophysical and socioeconomic factors. Food and nutrition insecurity is the final result of a number of interactions between the global environmental change impacts on the food system and various socioeconomic dynamics. The effects of these interactions are observed in given exposed areas or populations. A sustainability perspective and a multidisciplinary analysis help to explore the complex interconnectedness of the economic, social and environmental aspects of the food systems in order to inform decision-making on the critical challenges of food insecurity and strengthen sustainable and resilient livings for present and future generations (Misselhorn et al., 2012).

In recent vulnerability analyses, climate change is one of the most studied topics. Since the early 1990s numbers of scientific studies concerning climate vulnerability have increased regularly over time (Adger & Kelly, 1999; Kelly & Adger, 2000; Klein and Nicholls, 1999; Tegart et al., 1990). In recent years, investigations have advanced by incorporating social vulnerability to climate change and adaptive capacity (Ericksen & Woodley, 2005; Fussel & Klein, 2006; Parry et al., 2007; Schroeter et al., 2005; O'Brien et al., 2004; Cordell & Neset, 2014). As mentioned above, the impacts of climate change interplay with other changing dynamic mechanisms belonging to different economic, political, temporal and biophysical

domains (such as poverty, gender inequality, food price increases and natural resources depletion) on a local, regional and global scale (Ericksen et al., 2009). Implementing linear policies becomes difficult in such uncertain dynamic conditions (Funtowicz & Ravetz, 1993, Kriegler et al., 2012; van der Sluijs, 2005; Vervoort et al., 2014).

From a social-ecological systems perspective where the simultaneous occurrence of several nature- and human-related drivers of change (such as climate change, natural resources depletion, habitat loss and pollution, shifting dietary patterns, financial speculation on food commodities, and oil extraction) threaten the ability of a global food system to maintain its vital functions and processes, food security is a global scale issue, from the North to the South (Brunori & Guarino, 2010; Allen et al., 2014). The drivers of change affecting the food system can be identified in five main categories, namely: environmental, economic, social, technological and political (SCAR, 2008).

Despite the importance of the various specific interactions between a number of global and regional drivers of change and context-related food and nutrition security issues, it is still necessary to stress the role of climate change as main environmental driver of global change that affects agricultural production and food security through unattended biophysical shocks (SCAR, 2011). Global environmental change implies transformations in the physical and biogeochemical environment from both natural and human origins such as deforestation, fossil fuel consumption, urbanization, land fill, agricultural intensification, freshwater withdrawal, fisheries exploitation and waste production (Liverman & Kalapadia, 2010). Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and changes in land use, engendered by food system activities, strongly contribute to climate change, however these activities appear responsible for other aspects of global environmental change as well such as alteration of freshwater quality and supply, biodiversity, land cover and soils, nutrient cycling and air quality (Ingram et al., 2010). At a regional level it has been shown that climate change strongly contributes to major environmental concerns such as desertification, water stress, biodiversity loss, and soil degradation in the European Mediterranean area (Van Ittersum & Rijk, 2009).

Furthermore, GHG emissions directly affect temperature, freshwater availability and numerous parameters of climate change. Climate change and natural resource depletion alter the world's food supply, and indirectly impact prices and quantities, and hence trade (Godfray et al., 2010; Ingram et al., 2010), that in turn have serious impacts on food availability and affordability (Wood et al., 2010).

With specific regards to the food system human activities, the rate of agricultural land-use expansion over the last 60 years has substantially degraded biodiversity, topsoil, forests and water-quality (MEA, 2005). Increasing water shortages and extreme weather events are associated with yield reduction and instability, and a decrease in areas suitable for traditional crops (Olesen, 2006; Olesen & Bindi, 2002), phenomenon that as been reported likely to occur in the European Mediterranean region (Schröter et al., 2005; Metzger et al., 2006).

Both climate and non-climate drivers affect food systems. For instance, non-climate drivers such as urbanization and pollution, and other socio-economic processes (including land-management change) directly and indirectly influence social-ecological systems (Parry et al., 2007). Globalization, trade internationalization and a plethora of global forces, such as changes in demographic, economy, politics and environment, transform food production and consumption patterns including marketing influence many food-related context-specific practices (Oosterveer & Sonnenfeld, 2012).

Almost all food systems in a global food system threaten the ability of Earth to provide food in the future. For this reason these food systems are not considered to be sustainable. Food production in Europe is closely outstripping the regional and global environmental breaking points, particularly with regards to nitrogen synthesis, phosphorus use, land use and degradation, and the dependence on fossil energy. Within the same context, agriculture and fisheries are the largest drivers of biodiversity loss and water extraction (SCAR, 2011). These critical environmental outcomes reveal that the future of food availability is closely related to the society's capacities in providing appropriate technologies and practices to sustain the productivity of the natural assets and compensate the ecosystem services degradation (Eakin et al., 2010). Broadly considering that the exacerbation of the habitat loss has

effects on poverty, international trade, finance and investments, and political equilibriums makes evident that this change jeopardizes not only food supply but also global stability and human development. Then, sufficient and nutritious food will be less affordable for disadvantaged groups of the population because of the concurrent occurrence of price volatility, interconnectedness of global commodity markets, increasing pressure of climate change on food production and loss of biodiversity (SCAR, 2011). The 2007-2008 food crisis demonstrated the complex interlinkages of the food system with environmental, financial and energy crises, calling for interventions of mitigation (SCAR, 2008).

System processes imply that manifold interactive pathways of change and environmental feedbacks and social responses to a change or driver can generate further changes that resonate throughout social–ecological systems. This phenomena and perturbations are not entirely controllable or predictable (Ericksen, 2008c; Eakin, 2010). Thus, building on a wide understanding of food systems, the interactions between and within biogeophysical and human environments regulate a set of activities towards the achievement of the food security outcomes (availability, access, utilization), and these activities are consecutively altered by several factors (Ziervogel & Ericksen, 2010; Bausch et al., 2014). Therefore, in a complex and adaptive system, for instance the European food system, food security outcomes are not possible to be forecasted by means of conventional command-and-control approaches. There is then a call for a deeper and common analysis of causality dynamics characterized by the complex interplay of socioeconomic, environmental, technological, and global political factors around the food system (Ingram, 2008). Vulnerability and resilience of agri-food systems originate from several sources that interact to engender unpredictable responses, and system thinking is key to account for the interdependencies between drivers, feedback loops and non-linear trends (SCAR, 2008).

Food security and development practitioners work towards food security trying not to further compromise environmental and social welfares. Nevertheless they risk undermining ecosystem services through increasing the efficiency of food production (MEA, 2005). The aim thus is to build resilient food systems, achieving food security and trying to maintain desirable ecosystem states and services, despite global

environmental pressures (Folke et al. 2002; Gunderson & Holling, 2002; Walker et al., 2006). To answer this necessity is key to close the gap in the understanding on the interactions among food security, vulnerability, resilience, and ecosystem services (Ericksen et al., 2008).

1.3 - Pertinence of the SES framework to the analysis of properties and interplays within contemporary food systems

The principal outcome of any food system is food and nutrition security. In particular food and nutrition security comprises the three components of availability, access and utilization. Food availability, or supply, is the amount, type and quality of food that a unit gets to consume. The access to food consists of the ability to acquire appropriate food and can be analyzed in terms of affordability, allocation and whether consumers can meet their food preferences. The utilization of food refers to the ability to consume and benefit from food (Ericksen et al., 2010). Nutritional security fully integrates this definition of food security since the available and accessible food has to be nutritious. The fulfillment of such food demand is jeopardized by global environmental change including climate, biodiversity, water availability, land use, tropospheric ozone and other pollutants, and sea level rise (Foresight, 2011; Ingram et al., 2010). As described above, these biophysical changes are generated also through food system activities and feedbacks on the environment that are further intensified by the coexistence of Global Environment Change (GEC) with competition for natural resources (Molony & Smith, 2010; Misselhorn et al., 2012; Ingram, 2011). For many years now various research studies have considered, from different perspectives, the vulnerability and resilience frameworks as some appropriate methodologies to find solutions to food security problems (Alwang et al., 2001). These principles are still regarded as key to reconsider social research and social intervention policy approaches to food security (Brunori & Guarino, 2010).

"Food security can only come from making food systems sustainable" (Lang, 2012). To assess the sustainability of the food system - i.e. its capacity to maintain its essential functions/services over time (Conway, 1985) (food and nutrition security being its principal outcome) - we need to understand what might affect its processes, to what extent the drivers of change (such as forces likely to affect the structure and the functions of a system) impact the food system outcomes (such as the activities along the value chains), and how actors respond to these pressures. Food security is at risk of an increasing number of dynamic constraints and drivers of change, and its multiple dimensions need to be holistically and systematically considered faced with

these new challenges (SCAR, 2008). Thus, a food system, together with its functions, is considered vulnerable to one or more stressors (such as economic shock, institutional instability, environmental change etc.) when it is not able to sustain food security (Ericksen 2008c).

Building on Eakin (2010), the whole food system is here conceptualized as a vulnerable entity and specific vulnerabilities are explored through analysis of the characteristic food system outcomes. Thus the “*what is vulnerable*” is identified in the capacity of a specific entity, providing ecological and social services, that is composed of a number of actors, activities and processes acting against the global drivers of change. The functions of the system will be considered vulnerable if negative food system-outcomes will emerge (Eakin, 2010). For instance the current joint crisis of malnutrition and unsustainability originates from agricultural and food systems that do not provide sufficient essential nutrients for dietary requirements of people (Allen et al., 2014; Graham et al., 2007; Declerck et al., 2011). As supported by a recent paper whose title literally states “*Vulnerability of Food Security to Global Change*” (Ericksen, 2014), we refer to the analysis of vulnerability and resilience, of an issue of the system, to a critical driver of change, with the aim of assessing the potential of the system to maintain its activity over time, and thus the likelihood of the sustainability of the system. Ericksen (2008c) suggests that vulnerability and resilience are inherent properties of the processes and activities of food systems, and also determine the responses to external and internal stressors occurring over time. This analysis would help to elucidate how vulnerability is manifest in a food system, finding and anticipating the characteristic of the potential vulnerability and the adaptive behavior. One key conceptual element is a clear distinction between causal events and outcomes (Dilley & Boudreau, 2001); a “*causal factor approach*” that describes the interactions leading to the final outcomes. This would allow a dynamic analysis of the particular issues of vulnerability, instead of a static identification of vulnerability to a broad and general final outcome (Prosperi et al., 2014). A broad understanding of vulnerability on a wide range of sectors or issues would not be sufficiently focused to implement actions (Eakin & Luers, 2006; Ionescu et al., 2009; Luers, 2005). There is then a rising call for new types of systems analysis and modeling tools (Nicholson et al., 2009).

The integrated fragmentation of the broad vulnerability into specific vulnerabilities represents a response to the lack of causal factor analyses. Developing and applying this approach could provide empirical evidence contributing to a better understanding of the behavioral aspects of the food system (Ericksen, 2008c). This approach has already been used to elucidate dynamic feedback mechanisms characteristic of the food system providing a more detailed view of the food security issues and demonstrating that the various crises since 2007 (oil, food, financial and economic) were interdependent. This provides the elements for anticipating and changing attitudes to risk (SCAR, 2008). In particular, through this approach Ericksen (2008b) prompts at describing the impact of environmental change on the food system within a socio-economic and political change, in order to identify the synergistic effects of this plethora of stressors interacting with the food systems and often leading to its vulnerability.

In the following sections a set of stressors, selected from the environmental, economic, social, technology and policy drivers mentioned above (SCAR, 2008), are analyzed (through literature review at European level) for their potential impact on a set of critical aspects of food and nutrition security, including availability, access and utilization issues, in a sort of interplay systemic mechanism that answers the question "*what is vulnerable/resilient to what*" in food systems.

Issues related to Water depletion

Nutritional quality

The loss of freshwater resources may affect the nutritional quality of food supply through the reduction of the production of specific nutrient-dense foods because of water scarcity, and also through utilization of low quality water sources because of both water shortage (and consequent low dilution) and water contamination. The nutritional characteristics of diets are directly related to environmental conditions (Proserpi et al., 2014). In fact agriculture affects health directly through its capacity to deliver a sufficient quantity of nutritious foods to consumers (Dangour et al., 2012; Johnston et al., 2014). Meat production can necessitate several multiples of water (4000-15000 l/kg) than grain production (1000-2000 l/kg) (Khan & Hanjra, 2009). The state of greenhouse gas levels impacts rainfall, hampering water availability and quality. In turn, agrofood productivity impacts prices and quantities and hence trade

and markets (SCAR, 2008; Wood et al., 2010). Current water usage and management are driving toward food shortages. Global food production is increasingly dependent on rain, and climate change is reducing rainfall rates in many parts of the world. Concurrent climate change, increasing demand and higher costs for water and fertilizers exacerbate the vulnerability of the agrofood systems and are affecting poorer consumers (SCAR, 2008). Furthermore, global consumption of food has increased and projected population and socioeconomic growth will double food demand by 2050 (FAO, 2008). It has since been estimated that cereal yields will need to increase by 40% and net irrigation water requirements by 40-50% (SCAR, 2008) to meet this demand. If at international level, competition for water to guarantee the domestic food security of nations is increasing, at a sectorial scale there is a growing competition for water between agriculture, public water supply, industry and energy sectors, suggesting that insecurity in food supply may well become an issue in the future (Bates et al. 2008; SCAR, 2008).

More specifically, in some areas there is a shift from hydrological surplus to deficit; the 'dilution' capacity of water is reduced, and the concentration of agrochemicals and soil nutrients increases. Furthermore, higher water temperatures will affect water quality and exacerbate many forms of water pollution (e.g. sediments, nutrients, pathogens, pesticides, salts) (Bates et al, 2008; SCAR, 2008) that will likely hamper human health through the contamination of agricultural product (PARME, 2011). Moreover, often farmers prefer using pesticides for increasing crop yields without considering the threat to a fundamental ecosystem service such as water resource (Ericksen et al., 2010).

Access to food

Water scarcity and depletion may also affect the economic access to food, for instance through the impact of water pricing on food prices. It is widely acknowledged that GHG impact on precipitation quantity and frequency, affect productivity and in turn affect food availability and its quality (Wood et al., 2010). For now, scarcity mechanisms, put in place to control the use of available water, comprise access limitations, either technological, legal or through pricing (SCAR, 2011). It has been shown that increasing water prices (through financial support to guarantee water quantity and integrated river basin management to improve water-use efficiency)

inevitably lead to an increase in the cost of agricultural production, and therefore a potential decrease in food affordability (Ingram & Kapadia, 2010). Regulating water utilization efficiency can have a considerable impact on biological, economic, and nutritional factors (SCAR, 2011). Agrobiodiversity richness can contribute to contrast water scarcity and its indirect impacts, for instance through developing drought-resistant. Also focusing on food import from water rich countries can reduce the impact of water on food prices, whether the price of the external imported virtual water is lower than the internal one (Prosperi et al., 2014).

Issues related to Biodiversity loss

Nutritional quality

The nutritional characteristics of diets are closely interlinked with the state of the environmental capital (Prosperi et al 2014). The loss of biodiversity richness affects the availability of diverse necessary nutrients to food production. Indeed, agricultural production impacts on health directly through its potential in supplying adequate amounts of nutritious foods for consumers (Dangour et al., 2012; Johnston et al., 2014). The quality of nutritional supply and human health is thus in danger because of a loss in biodiversity (Allen et al., 2014). Genetic diversity has declined globally, particularly among cultivated species (MEA, 2005) and biodiversity loss has detrimental effects on human nutrition as commonly available foods do not provide the adequate nutritional diversity required for sufficient intake of micronutrients by human beings. In fact, nowadays global food chains are homogenized for processing and delivering few species and varieties. Diversity and local species are neglected (Khoury et al., 2014); three crops alone (rice, wheat and maize) account for more than 55 % of human energy intake (Stamp et al., 2012). Meanwhile the micronutrient superiority of some lesser known cultivars and wild varieties has been observed. Recent research analyses have demonstrated that the pro-vitamin A carotenoid content fluctuate between banana cultivars from 1 µg to 8,500 µg/100 grams, beta-carotene concentration can vary by a factor of 60 between sweet potato cultivars, and that the protein content of rice span from 5 to 13 per cent, depending on the variety (Kennedy and Burlingame, 2003; Burlingame et al., 2009; Litaladio et al., 2010).

The focus on ecologically simplified farming systems, based on cereals, contributes to micronutrient deficiency, poorly diversified diets, and malnutrition in both developed

and non-developed areas (Frison et al., 2006; Graham et al., 2007; Negin et al., 2009; Remans et al., 2011; Welch & Graham, 1999). This increased reliance on domesticated species and selected crop varieties can be linked to a significant reduction in dietary diversity. Agricultural biodiversity is thus considered an essential component in the sustainable delivery of a more secure and nutritious food supply (Allen et al., 2014). Paradoxically the efforts accomplished to guarantee food supply, based on the exploitation of ecological services, hamper the ability of the ecosystems to deliver the essential nutrients for human diets (Palm et al., 2007). Nutritional diversity is now widely recognized to be a key factor for adequate diets likely to satisfy the complex human nutritional needs (WHO, 2003; Arimond et al., 2010; Roche et al., 2008; Randall et al., 1985; Torheim et al., 2004; Arimond & Ruel, 2004; Pelletier & Frongillo, 2003). Recently, it has been evaluated that coastal and marine biodiversity contributes to the nutritional basis of 20 % of the world's population. Its loss represents a major risk of irreversible nutritional damage. Furthermore, loss of agrobiodiversity interacts with other food system stressors and thus makes food systems more vulnerable to climate change and to volatility in prices for energy, water and fertilizer, since globally privileged varieties are usually strongly dependent on external inputs. The impact of natural resources depletion and the decline of the recovery potential of the food system, based on the ecosystem services, will significantly shape the future of food and nutrition security (SCAR, 2011).

Plant and livestock genetic diversity is widely acknowledged for contributing to ecosystem services conservation and food and nutrition security issues through, in particular, supporting the viability of agricultural systems and long-term productivity, ecosystem cultural services, pest management, soil water retention and increased nutritional value of foods, vis-à-vis increasing global environmental and natural uncertainties (Thrupp, 2000; Reidsma & Ewert, 2008; Eakin, 2010; IAASTD, 2009; SCAR, 2011; SCAR, 2008).

Cultural preferences

The loss of biodiversity may affect the satisfaction of cultural food preferences. According to the EU-SCAR Foresight 2011, the loss of agrobiodiversity is considered one of the main drivers (amongst others such as price volatility, access restrictions and the interconnectedness of global commodity markets, as well as the increasing

detrimental action of climate change on food production systems) that will make adequate food still more inaccessible to the poor.

Diets are complex combinations of different food items influenced by cultural and regional preferences (de Ruiter et al., 2014). In the agrofood system, it is acknowledged that crop mix is altered by climate change, and that the livelihood of producers and cultural traditions and preferences, which are strictly linked to regional varieties and diets, are at risk (Liverman & Kapadia, 2010). Few global crop commodities and food products characterize the human preference for energy-dense foods (Kearney, 2010; Khoury et al., 2013) and the global trend consists of homogenizing food production instead of enhancing and keeping traditional food cultures (Jacques & Jacques, 2012). Habitat depletion and biodiversity loss contribute to reduce the enormous amount of information on nutritional and health benefits of the foods, that shapes the cultural food preferences of people (Kuhnlein et al., 2009). Furthermore, monoculture and lack of diversity push food system failure (Wahlqvist & Meei-Shyuan, 2007). For instance, in public health terms, the worldwide maneuvered trends of human preference for energy-dense foods, built on limited global crop commodities and processed foods, is closely related to the increasing occurrence of non-communicable food-related diseases (Kearney, 2010; Pingali, 2007; van de Wouw et al., 2010).

Agrobiodiversity includes a series of social, cultural and ethical variables (Allen et al., 2014). Food intake variety is positively correlated with a sense of personal food security (Wahlqvist, 2003). The decreased food biodiversity, caused by the homogenization of the global diet, could result in the loss of unique and traditional foods (Jacques and Jacques, 2012). For instance several scholars have observed that in remote bush communities, access to traditional foods cannot be met anymore with locally available wild food, and that local populations can only access more expensive food of far lower quality and cultural relevance (Ericksen et al., 2010).

Know-how of preparing a more diverse diet can change consumption of different food products (Johnston et al 2014; Termote et al. 2010) and can provide resilience elements for satisfying cultural food preferences against biodiversity loss. Stimulating

consumption habits that are sensitive to the impact of food crop choice on health is now critical (Khoury et al., 2014).

Issues related to Price Volatility

Nutritional quality

Food price volatility may affect the nutritional quality in food supply through direct and indirect impacts such as feedback loops on production due to consumer demand (SCAR, 2008). In particular, trade dynamics have a potential negative impact on food supply, especially in disadvantaged groups (Cummins et al., 2005; WHO, 2008). The links between productivity, prices and trade, and their impacts on food availability and affordability are widely acknowledged since food system prices, quantities exchanged and trade are closely associated with the state of greenhouse gas levels, temperature, rainfall and other surface climatic parameters that hamper food production (Wood et al., 2010). Furthermore, there is a clear link between food prices and oil prices. The reason is that the present agricultural production, trade, processing, distributions and retail systems, and fossil fuels, are tightly coupled systems, and this is an important driver of the vulnerability of food provisioning (DEFRA, 2008; SCAR, 2008). Hence, changes in international trade and agricultural policies can lead to profound changes in the composition and availability of food supplies and can significantly affect food prices. At a global level it was observed that food prices were relatively stable until 2005 and increased significantly in 2008, with a multiplier of 3.2 times the rice basic price, 2.1 times the wheat price and 2.5 times the corn price (IFAD, 2009).

Access to food

The determinants of food affordability involve pricing policy, seasonal and geographical variations in price, ratio between local and external prices, and households' income and wealth levels (Ingram, 2008). Food price volatility through market disruption may affect the capacity of vulnerable nations and populations to access healthy amounts of food. Price volatility has a considerable effect on food security since it impacts incomes and purchasing power (HLPE, 2011). This is linked to the income and employment conditions of people and also to dominant consumption patterns. Food access depends upon the affordability of adequate food, which itself is based on the income of the people and the prices prevailing in the

market. Both of these variables fluctuate from year to year and food price volatility is considered one of the most relevant drivers altering food accessibility for the poor (SCAR, 2011). In the context of food systems, prices, trade and productivity impacts are closely related to food affordability and availability (Wood et al., 2010). Food prices and food affordability are paramount determinants of food choices, obesity and non-communicable diseases (Lee et al., 2013). Studies carried out during the recent food price inflation have brought into discussion the capacity of certain social groups to access quality food once taken for granted (SCAR, 2008). Increase in food prices is a global trend that affects especially the poorer social groups dependent on salaries and tightly connected to the rest of the economy (Von Braun, 2008). Even in European contexts these increases are likely to hamper access to desired and quality food (UK Cabinet Office, 2008). This phenomenon was manifest in the recent food price inflation (SCAR, 2008) since higher food prices tend to have negative impacts on consumer health directly affecting food intake (quality and quantity of affordable food) (Regmi & Meade, 2013).

Consumers normally attempt to cope with the crisis by modifying shopping strategies, for instance purchasing lower quality foods, as demonstrated by Italian consumers who reduced meat consumption and increased their consumption of pasta whilst also purchasing more of their food from discount grocery stores (Brunori & Guarino, 2010). Alternatively, resilience opportunities can be found in the capacity of shifting towards cheaper or locally available foods while meeting the same caloric and nutritional requirements. Countries can also implement food policies for diversifying supply sources through different strategies such as subsidies, food stamps or promoting diversity in food consumption patterns.

Issues related to trends of food consumption patterns

Nutritional quality

Food consumption patterns and trends have a direct and critical effect on food production patterns and overall food security (UNEP, 2012). In fact, food industry focus is to meet the needs of price and quality for the consumers. In turn, the nutritional characteristics of diets are directly related to environmental conditions, which are consequences of the production system associated with current food consumption patterns (Prosperi et al., 2014). Trends in consumption patterns involve

the variety of diets, changing habits, the difference in food consumption between the rich and poor, and health gaps within social groups. Between 1963 and 2003 the available food consumption of meat and eggs increased worldwide respectively to 65% and 100% (Kearney, 2010). The consequences of the nutrition transition, characterized by a stronger demand for cereals, simple sugars and an increase of meat and animal products consumption in low- and middle-income countries, impact food supply, its quality, and the related pressure on ecosystems, but also production, imports, and prices (SCAR, 2011). These changing habits are also reflected in the consumption of food outside of the home and with increased consumption of industrially-produced highly processed foods with an often higher content in energy and fat (Prentice et al., 2003; WHO, 2008).

Understanding the determinants of consumer choices can improve agricultural and food systems in delivering nutritious food, as well as the health of the consumer (Allen et al., 2014). A broader scientific understanding is necessary for influencing food choices towards healthier food habits and for informing consumers. At a supply chain level, the food industry and retail sector, as well as the media, play a key role in changing consumer patterns (SCAR, 2011). A food system approach elucidates the interrelation of food production and processing, and food consumption patterns and nutritional outcomes (Schubert et al., 2010).

Dietary balance

Dietary energy balance is hampered by the shift towards particular food consumption and dominant lifestyles (increase in fats and sugars, decrease in plant proteins). These changes lead, as causal factors, to obesity and cardiovascular and nutrition-related non-communicable diseases such as heart disease, cancer, overweight and diabetes (PARME, 2011), with the latter tripling in some developing countries (UNEP, 2012). This trend towards industrially produced products and away from traditional foods is defined as "*nutrition transition*" (Kuhnlein et al, 2004; Popkin & Gordon-Larsen, 2004), and comes at great economic, physical and psychosocial expense (Ingram et al., 2010). It is now widely assumed that the nutritional transition, allied to more sedentary lifestyles, is also driving obesity (SCAR, 2008). Changes in global social systems are key as well in influencing diets through issues related to household livelihood and income and world population dynamics (Mendez & Popkin, 2004;

Monteiro et al., 2004; Hawkes et al., 2009). Nutrition transition moving towards diets of highly processed foods and animal products with high levels of saturated fats is now developing rapidly in middle- and low-income countries, changing the face of food consumption (Popkin, 2002; Friel & Lichacz, 2010). In the meantime, especially in the developed world, a disproportionate consumption of meat, dairy products and processed foods is generating a rapid increase of food-related health problems, such as obesity and diabetes (Liverman & Kapadia, 2010).

Recent years have shown that access to cheap food has led to an explosion of obesity-related problems in developed nations. In fact food prices and food affordability are still main causal factors of food choices, obesity and non-communicable diseases (Lee et al., 2013; Brunori & Guarino, 2010). Food consumption patterns vary with different lifestyles and are characterized by wide gaps in the frequency and in the amounts consumed (Johnston et al., 2014). The often-strong focus of consumers on low-price and convenience products overcome concerns for the risks of obesity or diabetes, generated by overconsumption of these foods (Ericksen et al., 2010). Moreover, increases in calorific intake are also associated with shift in eating habits such as a greater intake of sugar and other calorific sweeteners, more frequent consumption of foods away from the home and in fast foods. In fact, the nutritional quality of meals prepared at home can be quite different to that of meals acquired outside (vending machines, restaurants and fast food outlets) (Nielsen & Popkin, 2004). At now, in several countries the majority of persons spend less than 30 minutes per day for food preparation and processed foods constitute the bulk of consumption. Furthermore, generally, out-of-home food consumption diminishes control over the amounts of calories within- and the nutritional quality of the foods consumed, especially calories provided by fats and sugars. In several major countries and specifically in Mexico, USA, and UK, it has been observed that energy from sugar-sweetened beverages and other energetic beverages augmented to 17–25% of total energy intake (Popkin, 2011). In terms of energy balance, as well as the energy that enters the body, it is also important to consider the amount of energy expended by the consumer. Changes in food consumption patterns also imply the adoption of habits, or the abundance of jobs, leisure and transport options that are mainly sedentary (Swinburn et al., 1999). It also must be mentioned that policies and processes of

globalization promote excessive consumption of calories (UNSCN, 2000; Garrett and Ruel, 2005; Friel & Lichacz, 2010).

Such dietary changes, characterized by consumption patterns that are increasingly homogenized and based on few global crop commodities and highly processed food products, generate also declines in diversity in human oral and gut microbiota, negatively impacting health and leading to obesity and overweight (Lozupone et al., 2012; Khoury et al., 2014). According to WHO data, overweight or obesity concern over two-thirds of women population in North Africa and the Middle East, and the half of women in Latin America and the Caribbean, with an increase of 0,92% per year and 0,31% per year respectively (Popkin, 2013).

Shifting from actual consumption trends have been identified as a response to rising levels of obesity, cholesterol levels, and other diet-related illnesses (Burch & Lawrence, 2010). This is slowly leading to public awareness campaigns and community movements for more healthy diets (Barling et al, 2009; Obersteiner et al., 2010). Cultural knowledge on preparing varied diets and on nutritional and health benefits of the foods can contrast the negative effects of changing consumption patterns (Termote et al., 2010; Kuhnlein et al., 2009).

As in ecological systems, increasing diversity in gut microbiota may confer further resilience through bacteria likely to have high functional response capacities, hence helping consumers to avoid the effects of a decreased dietary diversity (Lozupone et al., 2012). Therefore, dietary therapeutic strategies to improve gut microbiota, may represent appropriate treatments to counteract overweight and obesity and manage metabolic health (Cardoso et al., 2013; Nadal et al., 2008; Lopez-Legarrea et al., 2014).

Developing policy to warrant food security is a critical challenge that needs inclusive and integrated analytical approaches (Maxwell & Slater, 2003) and the involvement of the stakeholders is key to building up a framework and to assigning hierarchy to measurements (Aubin et al., 2013). Experimental research and case studies, however, are required to show if this approach (SES and Vulnerability/Resilience) is useful for food system management. There is also a need for outcome-orientated assessment

criteria to focus on food security (Ericksen, 2008c). There is a call for system approaches to capture the dynamic processes between and within the food system activities, nutrition and health, and environmental outcomes. Computational complex systems modeling techniques aim at capturing the co-evolution of human and biological systems, and the complexity of human decision-making (Hammond & Dubé, 2012). They allow exploring key processes and outcomes of the analyzed systems for food and nutrition security, delivering innovative and deeper insights at the environmental level. Efforts for strengthening the understanding of the theories of vulnerability and resiliencies within the food systems, through the social-ecological systems frameworks, are needed to explore the sustainability of the food system.

1.4 - Insights into a framework to explore the sustainability of the food systems

Research analyses of Food Systems and Food Security through the SES frameworks

As stated above, resilience, vulnerability and adaptability have long been employed within the SES frameworks by different research areas and reflect the emergent properties of a system concerning its ability to respond to a changing environment and are strongly context dependent, especially in spatial and temporal scales and perspectives (Carpenter et al., 2001; Cabell & Oelofse, 2012; Callo-Concha, 2014). The SES frameworks and the theories of vulnerability and resilience have been suggested and applied, through different approaches, to the study of food systems at regional and subregional level by several international research teams and institutions from a global perspective. Four approaches of differing size and caliber are reported here as examples.

Global Environmental Change and Food Systems-GECAFS

Global Environmental Change and Food Systems (GECAFS) was a ten years long (2001-2011) international and interdisciplinary research comprehensive programme aimed at understanding the relationships between food security and global environmental change. A major objective of GECAFS was to identify strategies to

cope with the impact of global environmental change on food systems and to determine the environmental and socio-economic consequences of adaptive feedbacks towards food security, through improving understanding of the interactions between food systems and the Earth System's key socioeconomic and biogeophysical components. The project delivered an innovative conceptual and analytical framework as well as methodological tools to investigate how global environmental change affects food security at a regional scale, strengthening multidisciplinary efforts and engaging development communities in policy discussions to improve food security. The project focused on human activities within the food system and operated on decision support systems to communicate GEC issues to policy-makers in a structured and systematic manner and integrated social and natural science understandings of how food systems are vulnerable to global environmental change (through the concepts of 'vulnerability' and 'adaptation') to better identify feasible adaptation options for food systems (GECAFS, 2011; Ingram et al., 2010)

2nd EU SCAR Foresight Exercise

In the 2nd Foresight Exercise (2008) of the Standing Committee for Agricultural Research (SCAR) of the European Union, it was considered insufficient to simply look just at the multiple dimensions of food security (availability, access and utilization) and it was thus proposed that the analysis be enlarged to the several biophysical and socioeconomic constraints that are determinants of a state of uncertainty of the food system. The foresight report attempts to answer, from a system perspective, the explicit question "*how to reduce the vulnerability of social, economic and ecological systems*", exploring the risks and opportunities emerging from systemic feedback-loops, and linking the approach of vulnerability to the concepts of ecosystem services and sustainable development. The report identified, described in detail and justified several sets of drivers of change (economic, social, environmental, technological, and policy) at a global and European level. This effort is directed towards a wider resilience perspective beyond the narrow view of food security, changing attitudes to risk, and privileging diversification over specialization (SCAR, 2008).

TRANSMANGO

TRANSMANGO is an ongoing EU 4-year research project - under the 7th Framework Programme - that aims at obtaining a comprehensive image of the impacts of the global drivers of change (climate, economic concentration and market structure, financial power, resource competition, marginalization, property rules, geopolitical shifts, consumer preferences, consumption patterns and nutritional transition) on European and global food demand, and on raw material production, and on food flows. The research focuses on the vulnerability and resilience of European food systems in a context of socio-economic, behavioral, technological, institutional and agro-ecological change and aims to improve understanding of the new challenges and opportunities that the food sector will face in the future. The evaluation of the vulnerability and resilience of current and future European food systems is conceived at different levels to pinpoint the directions for European policies that aim to tackle these multiple challenges. Through this systemic and modeling approach, with the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders, and by designing of scenarios for the desired transition pathways in the food system the project aims to understand the sustainability frontiers of different food production systems under the new unfolding conditions and the vulnerabilities of European food systems vis-à-vis future shocks and stresses, and how these may affect FNS focusing on the diversity of local situations within the EU and within regions (TRANSMANGO, 2014).

Metrics of Sustainable Diets and Food Systems

"Metrics of Sustainable Diets and Food Systems" is a multi-institutional small-scale project (Bioversity International & CIHEAM-IAMM, 2014) and its aims consisted of exploring the different approaches to assess the sustainability of diets and food systems, establishing a multidisciplinary taskforce of experts, and identifying a shortlist of indicators for sustainable diets and food systems. The initial focus was in the Mediterranean region at a sub-regional level. The research approach builds on the assumptions that sustainability assessment aims at capturing the ability of a system to maintain and enhance its essential functions over time, and that sustainability addresses threats to preserving life support systems, including their capacity to withstand and adjust. It was considered key to assess stocks of- and changes in human and natural assets. Derived from sustainability sciences, the scientific approach was based on the theories of vulnerability and resilience within the social-ecological

systems frameworks, in order to analyze the sustainability of critical food and nutrition security issues. A double set of drivers of change and context-specific food and nutrition security issues were identified at a subregional level. This theoretical modeling exercise allowed the identification of a first suite of indicators. A reduced pool of metrics was then obtained through an expert-based elicitation process (Delphi Survey), moving beyond subjective evaluation and reaching consensus. This small-scale initiative involves a specific and technical selection of indicators (Chapter 5 closely refers to the application and results of this project).

The common thread that links these four different programs (for size and aims) is the approach that is built on the dynamic perspective of the social-ecological systems and the related complex interactions occurring around and inside the food systems. The concepts of vulnerability and resilience are adopted across these projects, even if through different applications and goals with respect to the different understanding of the sustainability of the food systems. Because of the SES scientific approach, the geographical analysis of the food system is carried out at a regional level. The GECAFS project demonstrated how food systems could be conceptualized as coupled social–ecological systems (see Figure 1) and that vulnerability arises in SES from multiple stressors operating across different temporal and spatial scales and levels. In this project and in the 2nd EU SCAR Foresight Exercise it is emphasized the need to identify not only what stresses and changes cause vulnerability, but also the importance of considering the multiple interactions among these stresses and changes. Building also on this broad theoretical approach, the Metrics of Sustainable Diets and Food Systems' project proposed a specific and reductionist operationalization of the vulnerability and resilience analysis and assessment, strengthening the importance of this analyses for guiding the understanding towards the sustainability of the food systems.

Contribution of the SESs frameworks and Vulnerability & Resilience theories to Sustainability analyses

Despite the strong orientation of the applications of SESs frameworks and vulnerability and resilience theories towards sustainable development interventions and exploring the biophysical factors that endanger the sustainability of social-ecological wellbeing, the conceptual connectivity and relationship with sustainability

is still not obvious. Starting from Turner et al. (2003) there has been a strong effort to encourage the consideration of the usefulness of vulnerability and resilience research for sustainability science.

SEs frameworks for Sustainable Development

Various frameworks have been developed aiming at defining a common language, framing research and guidance towards sustainable development of SES (Gallopín et al. 2001, Holling & Allen, 2002, Turner et al., 2003, Ostrom, 2007), and the SESs frameworks variables have been key in identifying sustainable outcomes in natural resources management. The variables selected through the SESs frameworks explain the dynamics and the interactions in the social and ecological systems and the framework provides also further variables for exploring the potential sustainable development and management strategies of a social-ecological system (Binder et al., 2013; Schluter et al., 2014). This type of framework is suitable for the analysis of complex social-ecological issues that consist dynamic interactions, and for answering research questions about what are the characteristics, activities and dynamic factors of the system leading to, or impeding sustainable management (Binder et al., 2013). Scoones et al. (2007) support a new science for sustainability that integrates established perspectives from natural- and social sciences, also through adding "*a positivist, sometimes reductionist, analytic*" to comprehensive, holistic, multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholders scientific approaches (Holling, 1998).

Moreover, Schroeter et al. (2005) foster the link between the common goals of sustainability science and global change vulnerability assessment towards the suitability, efficacy, equity, and legitimacy of the outcomes for further sustainable interventions and development pathways (Kates et al., 2001; Clark & Dickson, 2003; Yu et al., 2012). Indeed, the concepts of resilience and adaptive capacity are often associated with sustainability (Conway, 1985; Strunz, 2012). Resilience, vulnerability and adaptability concepts have been applied in interdisciplinary research and broadly developed as proxies for sustainable strategies (Turner, 2010), through the hypothesis that a broadly resilient but slightly vulnerable and strongly adaptable system could maintain its functions over time (Callo-Concha, 2014). Pretty (2008) and Schewenius et al. (2014) describe how sustainability in agricultural systems integrates the concepts of resilience and persistence (the abilities of a system to buffer disturbance

and change and to continue over long periods) while focusing on wider economic, social and environmental outcomes (Holling, 1973; Folke, 2010; Chelleri & Olazabal 2012; Elmqvist et al., 2013).

Building on the shift of the understanding of sustainability from the formal definition of Sustainable Development (UN, 1987), as threefold focus of the human efforts (Martins et al., 2007), to a widely established perspective of sustainable systems that are dynamic in response to unexpected events and disturbances (Holling, 2003), many approaches were identified to systemize the study of change. Thus sustainability can be described as the ability of a system to rebound from shocks and stresses (Holling, 1993; Ludwig et al., 1997; Folke, 2002; Scoones et al., 2007). This latter perspective is key to exploring and anticipating the trends of the changing phenomena occurring, to reducing impact, and to fostering towards the system pathways in the analysis of sustainability (Callo-Concha, 2014). Sustainability focuses on pressures affecting the perpetuation of life support systems and provides practitioners and decision makers with understanding of these disturbances, their implications, and the ability of the system to cope with them (Turner, 2010). To identify sustainable solutions to world agrofood systems, it is considered key to account for and explore the dynamic uncertainty represented by a set of key drivers of change (Thompson et al., 2007).

Operationalizing Vulnerability & Resilience for a system analysis

Within the SES's analysis, the theories of vulnerability and resilience have proved a useful framework for understanding the dynamic interconnectedness between humans and the environment, and have offered models for improving society's capacity to deal with global change. The main goal of assessing resilience is to pinpoint vulnerabilities in social-ecological systems (Berkes et al., 2003). Such knowledge is crucial for implementing sustainable management strategies and actions (Rammel et al. 2007; Cabell & Oelofse, 2012). Nevertheless there is still a need for further understanding of the dynamics of sustainability of SESs (Carpenter et al. 2009; Schluter et al., 2014) and for a deeper comprehension in social and sustainability science in global change and food security for assessing the food system's vulnerabilities and the socioeconomic and political strategies of adaptation (Yu et al., 2012).

However, resilience and vulnerability are problematic to operationalize through precise assessment methods (Cummins et al., 2005) due to their theoretical and multi-dimensional nature (Cabell & Oelofse, 2012). Scoones et al. (2007) underline that system functions have to be sustained in the face of vulnerabilities occurring at different spatial and temporal scales and suggest that there are four necessary but individually insufficient properties that define the sustainability of a system: stability, durability, resilience and robustness. Stave and Kopainsky (2014) proposes, in system dynamics terms, to describe the resilience of a food system, or a simple food system unit, through an analysis of the stocks, building on the hypothesis that any given stock might be sustainable if the flows in and out of the stock are the same. This approach would allow observation of how different conditions of sustainability might have different consequences for the resilience of the system, with respect to its abilities to cope with change through the available socioeconomic, environmental and institutional assets.

In order to structure the vulnerability and resilience analysis of the social-ecological systems towards a more sustainable future, Cabell and Oelofse (2012) consider that it is first necessary to identify the limits of the focal system (Carpenter et al., 2011) that can be designed through biophysical factors, political frontiers, and cultural aspects. In fact each specific system is integrated within other systems across different spatial and temporal tiers. The regional level is considered an important level for food security, food system research and global environmental change considerations. The sub-global, or sub-continental geographical regions scale is a natural level for studies of social-ecological systems (such as food systems) since they are generally defined by common cultural, political, economic and biogeographical contexts. Furthermore, research at regional scale can deliver a set of assets to practitioners, researchers, policy-makers, natural resource managers and other stakeholders for focusing the attention on global change and food security (Liverman & Ingram, 2010). Although regions are not always clearly homogenous for socioeconomic and biophysical aspects, before any vulnerability and resilience assessment is necessary to draw artificial boundaries to define a study area (Schroeter et al., 2005). Thus, considering that vulnerability is extremely context-specific, (Cordell & Neset, 2014) and that global change is manifest through sub-global or regional driving forces, cross-scale trade-offs will need to be identified.

When applied to the food system, the system thinking gives us a dominant perspective that allows for global complexity and nonlinearity (Ulanowicz, 1997). A complex system refers to a system constituted from numerous components with numerous types of relationships, and presenting as a whole more characteristics than as a single component individually. Several approaches, analytical frameworks and fields of knowledge originate from these principles, such as systems dynamics, systems of systems, ecological thinking, ecosystem approach, systems thinking, etc. (Callo-Concha, 2014).

Assessing vulnerability to sustainability problems

Starting from the analytical approach of vulnerability and resilience in relationship to global environmental change, but specifically working on phosphorus resource vulnerability, Cordell and Neset (2014) define a set of several attributes that are necessary to meet the challenge to assess vulnerability to sustainability problems (problems such as climate change, natural resources depletion, peak oil, market and political instability etc.): integration and inclusiveness of and within coupled human-environment systems; record of complexity of interacting stressors and nested scales; participation of relevant stakeholders; assessment over time for current and future vulnerabilities; study of solutions-oriented adaptation and system resilience strategies; policy-relevance.

Several scholars proposed different approaches for measuring resilience, spanning from measuring context-dependent proxies of resilience for each SES (Bennett et al., 2005; Carpenter et al., 2006) to more quantified approaches such as mathematical models (Fletcher et al., 2006) and also building more conceptual models of SES (Resilience Alliance, 2010). However, it has been proved necessary to follow a stepwise approach to describing the SES in question by first defining its boundaries, framing key issues and driving forces, and identifying critical thresholds, referring to the Carpenter et al.'s question (2001) "*the resilience of what to what.*" (Cabell & Oelofse, 2012). Two considerable efforts have sort to provide a 'rule of thumb' through defining a common methodological step-processes for the assessment of vulnerability and resilience; Schroeter et al. "*An eight step method for global change*

vulnerability assessments" (2005) and Cordell and Neset "*Six-step phosphorus vulnerability assessment framework*" (2014).

Despite vulnerability and resilience theories proven key in the investigations of complex social-ecological systems (Leach, 2008), there is still a need for appropriate metrics, in order to measure the conditions of the system and the stages that have been gained towards resilience, that could be achieved through developing a more flexible process of identification of indicators and proxies (Cabell & Oelofse, 2012). Moreover, since there is a growing acknowledgment that the impact of food security research on decision making needs to be strengthened, the approach of social-ecological systems science is considered as the key to support decision makers in accounting the broad sets of interplaying stressors towards definition of resilience solutions (Vermeulen et al., 2013; Vervoort et al., 2014). Hunger problems rely also on the increasing complexity of food systems and an analysis focusing on system dynamics, interactions, feedbacks and non-linear relationship could contribute to identify resilience pathways (Ramalingam et al. 2008, Thompson & Scoones 2009; Gerber, 2014). However, vulnerability and resilience theories are not normative concepts (Adger, 2006), and they therefore need to be used and integrated conjointly with other normative concepts, in order to create a constructive dialogue with policy-makers (Leach, 2008; Plummer, 2010).

Innovative and appropriate approaches to analysis and assessment should still focus on complexity of food system for their intrinsic entangled and questioned nature (Foran et al., 2014). For unraveling essential problems in the analysis of social-ecological systems, inter and transdisciplinary research is largely deemed as extremely helpful (Carpenter et al., 2009; Hammond & Dube', 2012; Ostrom, 2009; MEA, 2005, Liu et al. 2007, Huber et al., 2013), especially in terms of assessment of wide sets of potential outcomes, agreement within multiple stakeholders with different goals and intervention pathways, and modeling complex dynamics across the different tiers of food systems. Various qualitative and quantitative methodologies can be implemented and integrated in hybrid frameworks using data and information on previous experiences, in order to seize system complexity and identify synergies and trade-offs for decision-making (Ericksen et al., 2009; Anderies & Janssen, 2013; Saldarriaga et al., 2014).

Despite valuable and numerous efforts, most applications of the social-ecological systems frameworks still belong to the scientific community, whilst development practitioners' interest for this framework might be inhibited by its system-orientation and problems with agency that may not be adequately developed or studied (Foran et al., 2014). Frameworks, theories, and models are the elementary units that the scientific community applies to developing, proving and adjusting knowledge, and, through an integrative approach, they are fundamental for creating common languages, answering questions about mechanisms of a system at various scales and under changing states (Epstein et al 2013). However, such more integrative and holistic science, and within an interdisciplinary context, may provide reductionist analytic approaches that can be refined through dialogue and interaction across disciplines, sectors, policy debates and coordination (Holling, 1998; Scoones, 2007).

Although dynamic models are strongly proposed as suitable tools to explore social-ecological interactions, it still remains extremely challenging because of the complexity of the systems studied and the integration and development of knowledge, theories, and approaches from different disciplines (Schluter et al., 2014). Attempts of integration of different frameworks for analyzing social and ecological systems have been proposed. For example by Prosperi et al. (2014) who attempt to integrate the vulnerability framework into the application of the SES frameworks for the food system, and also alternatively by Loring et al. (2013) who propose to integrate the Water-Food-Energy nexus into a diagnostic application of the SES frameworks.

Measuring sustainability and transferring scientific information to policy-makers

Assessing issues related to sustainability problems, with the goal of informing the decision-making process and policy-makers, involves a number of critical implications. There is, in fact, a growing debate about the importance of the role, utility, adoption, focus and final goals of the sustainability indicators.

Indicators and composite indices are often considered key to presenting complex data and trends to policy makers through scientific evidence. For their capacity to synthesize multifaceted issues they are deemed as important tools to simplify complex datasets to be communicated and used by non-specialists that need to advocate their policy and management activities with evidence (Bell & Morse, 2003, 2008; Hezri &

Dovers, 2006; Dale & Beyeler, 2001). Furthermore, since the contemporary historical and political context allowed raising a plethora of initiatives focused on the identification and formulation of indicator to assess society's wellbeing and development, there is also an increasing public and expert-based debate, at different stakeholder levels, on the issues related to the identification and use of indicators of sustainability (Stiglitz et al., 2010; Sébastien & Bauler, 2013). In the meantime the identification of indicators for the policy use and the pathway leading to the choice of indicators, often through group dynamics, are challenged to be traceable and evidence-based for guaranteeing transparency in decision-making and effectiveness of evidence-based policy (Bell & Morse, 2013).

However, the integration level and the role of the policy indicators, in the institutional decision making processes, are uncertain and questioned by several scholars who demonstrate that the contemporary idea based on the existence of direct and transparent links between the formulation of evidence-based indicators and the use made by policy-makers is highly arguable and can be considered rather dogmatic (Innes, 1998; Ayres, 2000; Gudmundsson, 2003; Lehtonen, 2004; Hezri & Dovers, 2006; Rosenström, 2006; Boulanger, 2007; Rydin, 2007; Turnhout et al., 2007; Bell and Morse, 2008; Bell & Morse, 2011; Bauler, 2012; Sébastien & Bauler, 2013). In fact policy decisions are not only based on the quality of the information provided but also on other factors linked to the argument and the power of individuals, or groups of people, who are making policies, and also to their interests, intentions and to the surrounding institutional and evolving social contexts.

Often we measure what we want to measure. In fact, some key and acknowledged indicators can provide information only on the aspects for which they have been created to measure (Bell & Morse, 2013). Also, there are several and different ways to interpret indicators and select data. It is, therefore, important to know how the information about the indicators is transferred to policy-makers, and which are the actual aims of using the indicators (Chess et al., 2005). For instance, indicators might also be used for justifying decisions that would have been taken anyhow, or, in other cases, the lack of indicators could be used to justify the inertia in policy-making (Gudmundsson, 2003; Hinkel, 2011). The role of press, as intermediary on the communication of information through indicators, is also crucial (Morse, 2011), and

aggregation of data also can strongly alter the messages for policy-makers (Chess et al., 2005).

Several studies demonstrated also that often the indicators that have been prepared in appropriate technical manner are not actually applied nor they have a real impact on policy-making (Bell & Morse, 2013). A study of Sébastien & Bauler (2013) tries to answer questions about the necessity to increase the understanding of the motivation that pushes policymakers, stakeholders, civil society and citizens to adopt indicators and composite metrics, and how those measures actually impact policies in complex society dynamics. In that study (Sébastien & Bauler, 2013) it was found that, for justifying the use and explaining the impact of sustainable development composite indicators, user factors (tenets and opinions of policy actors) and policy factors (institutional framework) were central, and that, on the other hand, the indicator factors (intrinsic and technical characteristics of the indicators) had a marginal role. Referring to EU institutions, the authors (Sébastien & Bauler, 2013) used these findings to prove the need of a greater involvement of the actors in the political and institutional contexts where indicators have to be identified and applied. These elements are confirmed also by similar results that were found in other works that show that research involving sustainability indicator use and effect needs to take into account the geographical, socioeconomic and cultural context within which such tools are implemented, and not only to be a technical exercise (Cassar et al., 2013).

Specifically, with regards to vulnerability assessment, Hinkel (2011) warns from many common usages of vulnerability indicators, rising important questions both for science and policy-making. The arguments of the author are related to vulnerability to climate change, but they can be of great help if they are applied and interpreted for a vulnerability and resilience approach to study the sustainability problem of the food system. Vulnerability assessments' main goal is to inform decision-making (Schroeter et al., 2005; Patt et al., 2008). In particular, for Hinkel (2011), assessing vulnerability points at defining mitigation targets, identifying vulnerable people/regions/sectors, raising awareness of climate change, allocating adaptation funds to vulnerable people/regions/sectors, monitoring the performance of adaptation policy and conducting scientific research. The author questions these aims of the use of vulnerability indicators, through a critical and technical analysis. According to this

analysis, vulnerability indicators should not be considered as appropriate tools to identify mitigation target, since this is rather an issue that belongs to the development and the application of integrated assessment models at a global earth system level. Such models are highly complex and cannot be reduced to a simple indicator function. Moreover, the use of vulnerability indicators to identify vulnerable people/regions/sectors could be appropriate if conducted at a local level and on narrowly defined system, using few variables. Otherwise, at larger scales the vulnerability frameworks could help in identifying variables but not in aggregating them into a simple index. Similarly, vulnerability indicators are not considered adequate tools for allocating adaptation funds to vulnerable people/regions/sectors, neither at global or national level, since the choice of variables will always be scientifically questionable and the negotiation for the choice of indicators will always disappoint some stakeholders. With regards to the application of vulnerability indicators to monitor adaptation policy the author insists on the need for context-specificity and on the importance of the clarity of the definition policy goals. Also, he recommends distinguishing between outcome indicators, observable in the far future, and process indicators, monitored at the present time. Hinkel (2011) analyses also the non-suitability of the vulnerability indicators as tool for raising awareness of uncertain climate change, since this would generate a problem of risk communication. As mentioned above, communication and intermediaries, such as the press, play a key role in transferring information through the use of indicators. The concept of vulnerability is complex and difficult to be used for risk communication.

In particular the author (Hinkel, 2011) identifies in the different scales and levels of analysis some of the main parameters and technical issues to consider for judging the validity of using vulnerability indicators. Also the research on vulnerability assessment and indicators does not imply a specific research question and may generate confusion. A more specific contextualization of the research goals and tools might avoid this confusion and lack of research question, describing the system problems, defining particular factors of vulnerability, identifying vulnerable units of systems, and then applying the use of variables.

1.5 - Conclusions

Food and nutrition security, as principal outcome of the food system, needs to be sustained over time. A deeper understanding of the interrelated dynamics of change that govern the complexity of the food systems is necessary to identify the threats to the sustainability of the food systems. Scholars and policy-makers call for metrics of food security and sustainability of the food system, in order to provide decision-making with appropriate information (Barrett, 2010; Dicks et al., 2013).

Considering food systems as complex social-ecological systems and thus analyzing together natural and social systems and their interactions as one system with critical feedbacks throughout temporal and spatial scales, interdisciplinary and integrated investigation approaches become key for exploring and designing effective responses to human-environment interactions related to food and agriculture in a unpredictable and dynamic context (Ericksen, 2006; Thompson et al., 2007). Several studies identify vulnerability and resilience for helping draw causal dynamic interactions affecting the sustainability within the food systems. Building on a SES framework for the food system, vulnerability and resilience theories operationalize a causal pathway to identify which are the variables concerned with the sustainability of the food system outcomes. A set of indicators of exposure, sensitivity and resilience could proxy the variables that describe the sustainability interrelations underneath the sustainability of the food systems and could be selected through an interdisciplinary and reproducible method. However, first it is necessary to shape a methodological and organized structure, identify the driving forces to which the food system might be vulnerable, and categorize the food system units that are likely to be exposed. In fact the primary goal of assessing resilience is to identify vulnerabilities in social-ecological systems to create a more sustainable future for people (Berkes et al., 2003; Cabell & Oelofse, 2012).

However, while vulnerability and resilience theories are helpful as metaphors, in metrics they are still considerably weak tools for assessment (Carpenter et al., 2001; Cabell & Oelofse, 2012). According to Cummins et al. (2005), resilience and vulnerability are problematic to operationalize for their abstract and multi-

dimensional nature. Furthermore, since it is system-oriented, the social-ecological systems frameworks approach is still a research tool exclusive of the scientific community and not yet suitable for development practitioners because of limited options for agency (Foran et al., 2014). Also integration of different theories, models and frameworks originating from various disciplines might lead to analytical reductionism in the study of complex and interrelated food systems (Scoones, 2007) and further problems might derive from the multiple temporal scales and spatial levels that need to be considered within a complex food system.

Taking into account these factors highlights the challenges that the assessment of vulnerability and resilience faces within the study of the sustainability of the food system in order to satisfy the consideration of a set of aspects such as the coupled human-environment systems, complex interactions and driving forces, nested spatial scales, involvement of stakeholders through participatory process, dynamic assessment over time, providing information for decision- and policy-makings towards resilience.

In the context of a social-ecological system and vulnerability/resilience analysis of the sustainability problems affecting contemporary food systems, these efforts should be directed towards the rising call for system approaches in order to capture the dynamic processes between and within the food system activities, nutrition and health, and environmental outcomes (Allen et al., 2014) and for developing metrics and measurement mechanisms for the sustainability of the food systems to give policymakers information and trade-offs data for intervention and dialogue with the stakeholders (Johnston et al., 2014).

There remain no global common metrics to assess the sustainability of a food system (Vinceti et al., 2013). A consistent range of evidence-based sustainability metrics and standards needs to be identified to conduct analyses of the quantitative linkages between food security, nutrition, diets, health, agricultural productivity, resource use, environmental impacts, and costs and benefits (Beddington et al., 2012) through joint multidisciplinary efforts of professionals coming from nutrition, agronomy, public health, education, policy- and decision-making and the food sector (Tilman & Clark, 2014).

Indicators direct us to knowledge, and metrics related to the systems' sustainability allow presenting important conditions, complex data, and trends to policy makers (Bell & Morse, 2010; 2011). There is, therefore, a need for integrated sets of metrics, understanding different trends and interactions of food systems within the large framework of social-ecological systems, in order to provide practitioners with adequately substantiated modeling tools that allow the results of management decisions to be visualized easily.

1.6 - Aims of the thesis

This thesis builds on the social-ecological systems (SES) frameworks and the vulnerability and resilience theories for identifying an assessment tool that expresses the causal dynamics in the interactions (or interplays) between global change drivers and food security outcomes, to guide towards the selection of appropriate metrics.

In the introductory chapter a wide literature review is presented in order to describe the interest of the social-ecological system frameworks - for answering questions about the sustainability problems that affect the functions of the food system - and the previous and future opportunities provided by a vulnerability and resilience analysis.

The second chapter describes food systems as complex social–ecological systems, involving multiple interactions between human and natural components. A strong focus is on nutritional patterns and environment structure that are interconnected in mutual dynamics of change. The systemic nature of these interactions calls for multidimensional approaches, integrated assessments, and simulation tools to guide change. In this chapter conceptual modeling frameworks are described articulating the synergies and tradeoffs between dietary diversity and agricultural biodiversity, and associated ecosystem functions that are crucial resilience factors to climate and global changes.

In the third chapter the fundamental sustainability properties of the social-ecological framework are identified, describing how the vulnerability and resilience theories contribute to the understanding of the causal dynamic interactions of the socioeconomic and biophysical factors acting in the food system. Elements found in literature are reported for illustrating how the vulnerability and resilience approaches are applied for shaping causal interactions building on potential impact and recovery potential.

In the fourth chapter it is illustrated the formalization of the food system as a dynamic system. Building on the concepts of vulnerability and resilience the dynamic variables of the food system are identified and modeled following a stepwise application for vulnerability and resilience assessments allowing define the study area, developing context-specific knowledge of the social-ecological system (identifying specific drivers of change), hypothesizing stresses and interactions with the vulnerable issues of the food systems, and finally formalizing these interactions into eight causal models (of vulnerability/resilience). Then we discuss this modeling approach within the context of the assessment of sustainable food systems, and draw further perspectives of research for identifying specific indicators through a vulnerability/resilience modeling exercise.

The last chapter of the thesis illustrates the process of selection of metrics through an expert elicitation method (Delphi survey) that guide to the identification of a reduced pool of indicators, through a shared consensus, selected within a number of dynamic interactions between socioeconomic and biophysical changes, affecting the food system, and food and nutrition security issues, likely to be affected by those changes.

The general aim of this thesis is to analyze and explore the sustainability of the food system through identifying a systemic set of metrics at the Mediterranean level. This general aim involved three specific goals:

- Developing a multidimensional framework to improve the dynamic understanding of the sustainability of food systems and diets, applicable to countries of the Mediterranean region.

- Identifying the main variables to formalize and operationalize the abstract and multidimensional concepts of sustainable food systems.
- Defining metrics for assessing the sustainability of food systems and diets, at a subregional level, combining a vulnerability and resilience framework with a Delphi elicitation process.

Preface to Chapter 2

The stark observation of the co-existence of undernourishment, nutrient deficiencies and overweight and obesity, the triple burden of malnutrition (Pinstrup-Andersen, 2006), is inviting us to reconsider health and nutrition as the primary goal and final endpoint of food systems. Agriculture and the food industry have made remarkable advances in the past decades. However, their development has not entirely fulfilled health and nutritional needs, and moreover, they have generated substantial collateral losses in agricultural biodiversity. Simultaneously, several regions are experiencing unprecedented weather events caused by climate change and habitat depletion, in turn putting at risk global food and nutrition security. This coincidence of food crises with increasing environmental degradation suggests an urgent need for novel analyses and new paradigms. The sustainable diets concept proposes a research and policy agenda that strives towards a sustainable use of human and natural resources for food and nutrition security, highlighting the preeminent role of consumers in defining sustainable options and the importance of biodiversity in nutrition. Food systems act as complex social–ecological systems, involving multiple interactions between human and natural components. Nutritional patterns and environment structure are interconnected in a mutual dynamic of changes. The systemic nature of these interactions calls for multidimensional approaches and integrated assessment and simulation tools to guide change. This chapter proposes a review and conceptual modelling framework that articulate the synergies and tradeoffs between dietary diversity, widely recognized as key for healthy diets, and agricultural biodiversity and associated ecosystem functions, crucial resilience factors to climate and global changes.

Chapter 2

Agricultural biodiversity, social–ecological systems and sustainable diets: Towards resilience for food security¹

¹ *This chapter is adapted from:*

Allen, T., Prosperi, P., Cogill, B., & Flichman, G. (2014). Agricultural biodiversity, social–ecological systems and sustainable diets. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 73(04), 498-508.

2.1 - Introduction

Humanity faces a global nutrition crisis, with the dual problem of hunger and obesity. A total of 842 million people still suffer from undernourishment (FAO, 2013a) while obesity has become a significant public health issue with 500 million obese adults (Finucane et al., 2011). More than 1 billion adults are projected to be obese by 2030 if no major effort is made (Kelly et al., 2008). Meanwhile, climate change and environmental degradation are massive threats to human development. Indisputable and unprecedented changes in extreme weather and climate events have been observed and will increasingly have detrimental impacts on livelihoods, particularly in combination with other environmental threats (IPCC, 2013). Above all, global biodiversity is constantly declining, with substantial ongoing losses of populations, species and habitats.

Vertebrate populations have declined by 30% on average since 1970, and up to two-thirds of species in some taxa are now threatened with extinction (UNEP, 2012). These global changes have major implications for food and nutrition security.

There is a bi-directional relationship between the environment and food. Human subjects depend on the goods and services provided by natural and managed ecosystems to meet their food needs. The production of food and its nutrient content are inextricably linked to the environment. Ecological interdependences are key factors for the dietary content of most living species we consume (Frison et al., 2011). The observed environmental degradation and biodiversity depletion, in particular, are affecting the food systems, with implications for yield, quality and affordability (MEA, 2005). At the same time, processes along the food chain, from agricultural production to food consumption, produce other outputs than food that are returned to the natural environment, such as pollution or waste. Human activities impact the diversity of organisms found in ecosystems, and thus influence the provision of ecosystem services.

The links between environmental degradation and food system activities are increasingly recognized and translate into joint negative environmental and nutritional

outcomes (Ericksen et al., 2009; Gregory et al., 2005). The sustainable diets' research and policy agenda essentially aim at putting nutrition and health at the core of sustainable development. However, there is not a clear understanding of the interactions between food systems; their production activities and subsequent outputs, ecological processes and human nutrition. This has resulted in a perceived lack of evidence of the benefits of agrobiodiversity on nutritional outcomes from food systems, preventing agrobiodiversity from being a key consideration in food and nutrition policies.

Since the processes underlying nutrition insecurity and diet-related environmental, economic and social unsustainability derive from a shared food system, a recurrent fundamental question is: what types of system shift could create an enabling environment for sustainable diets? Research has a critical role in answering this type of question. System dynamics are widely considered of particular interest to food and nutrition security (Hammond & Dube, 2012). Starting from a conception of food systems as social–ecological systems, thus fully tackling the systemic dimension of the food sustainability question, this chapter proposes a review and a conceptual modeling framework that articulates biophysical processes with socio-economic dynamics. Within this coupled human–environment framework, taking into account the determinants that influence food consumer behaviors will be key to improving strategies that mitigate negative patterns on health and the environment. It will help frame the agricultural biodiversity's role in nutrition and develop modeling tools for the policy-makers to guide changes towards sustainable diets and food systems.

2.2 - Sustainable diets: a new concept calling for changes

A nutrition-driven perspective

Gussow and Clancy (1986) were the first to suggest the term 'sustainable diet' to describe a diet 'composed of foods chosen for their contribution not only to health but also to the sustainability (the capability of maintenance into the foreseeable future) of the (. . .) agricultural system' (Herrin & Gussow, 1989). Literally, the concept of diet in nutrition refers to the sum of foods consumed by a person.

Whole diet, or dietary pattern, analysis has emerged as an alternative and complementary approach to the study of individual nutrients or foods, highlighting the dynamic and multiple factors involved in eating practices (HU, 2002). It helped better communicate healthy eating messages that emphasize a balance of food and beverages within energy needs (Freeland-Graves & Nitzke, 2013). More fundamentally, adopting a whole-diet approach is now seen as necessary to examine the relationships between nutrition and health. It reflects the increasing recognition of the multidimensional nature of diets and diet-related diseases, from nutrient intakes and metabolism to food consumption behaviors and attitudes (Kant et al., 2009).

Multidimensionality is further enhanced as the impacts of diets not only on health, but also on the environment or the economy, are considered to assess the sustainability of food choices. Participants at the 2010 International Conference jointly organized by the Food and Agriculture Organization and Bioversity International agreed on a common definition of sustainable diets as *"those diets with low environmental impacts which contribute to food and nutrition security and to healthy life for present and future generations. Sustainable diets are protective and respectful of biodiversity and ecosystems, culturally acceptable, accessible, economically fair and affordable; nutritionally adequate, safe and healthy; while optimizing natural and human resources"* (FAO & Bioversity, 2012).

The sustainable diet concept advocates for a more consumer-driven thinking on the sustainability of agriculture, promoting a research and policy agenda that introduce nutrition as one of its core dimensions. It claims that understanding the determinants of consumer choices can improve agricultural and food systems, the environment and the health. More fundamentally, it emphasizes the health and food security purpose of food systems, and highlights the need for quality, not just quantity or access. Advocates promote economically, socially and environmentally sustainable food systems that concurrently ensure 'physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life' (UN, 1996). This reminds us that food, or more precisely feeding people, is agriculture and food systems' main reason for being (Haddad, 2013). As such, the

concept of sustainable diets provides a food and nutrition security-orientated perspective on the question of the sustainability of food systems.

Food security and sustainable development

Food and nutrition security is a major concern today with still 842 million people undernourished (FAO, 2013a). Resulting undernutrition is affecting millions of people, in particular children under 5 years with about 165 million stunted children in developing countries (UNICEF, 2013).

Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, with wide subregional variation, are the most affected regions by stunting. Undernutrition is accompanied by, in some cases linked to, micronutrient malnutrition. Malnutrition involves privation in essential micronutrients with low food diversity. Deficiencies in essential micronutrients have detrimental effects on health; vitamin A is required for multiple physiological processes, ranging from vision to embryonic development; iron is an important component of hemoglobin, the oxygen carrying component of blood; iron also plays an important role in brain development and iron-deficiency anemia can impair the cognitive development of children; iodine is essential for healthy thyroid function and growth, etc. Simultaneously, increased prevalence of overweight and obesity are reported in both low- and high-income countries and represent the major health threats. Excessive fat accumulation, measured by the BMI, is acknowledged to be a risk factor for various non-communicable diseases and health problems, including CVD, diabetes, cancers and osteoarthritis (WHO, 2014). Simultaneously, climate change and environmental degradation are major challenges to sustainable development.

The global climate and other life-supporting environmental systems are seriously perturbed and depleted (IPCC, 2013). These changes include higher temperatures, drought-prone and long-term drying conditions in some sub-tropical regions, rising sea levels, acidification of oceans, declining water quality, depleting fish stocks, increasing frequency and severity of floods and other climate-related natural disasters. Biodiversity is also at risk, with 20930 species and ecological communities known to be threatened (IUCN, 2013). Biodiversity, the basis of ecosystem health and future

food security, has been more seriously harmed by human activities in the past 50 years than at any other time in human history (UNEP, 2012).

Agriculture and the food sector have historically been major contributors to environmental degradation. For instance, irrigated agriculture globally accounts for 70% of the consumption of freshwater resources (OECD, 2013). However, there is a bi-directional relationship between environmental degradation and food system activities. People, particularly those living in developing countries, are vulnerable to environmental changes that result in reduced quantity, quality and affordability of food. Similarly, nutrition transition and food system transformation go together. The current global health crisis of malnutrition, both in developed and developing countries, and the contemporaneous urging environmental degradation present new challenges for food systems and calls for changes. Improved food systems could be a major partner in the environmental solution.

Diets as system outputs

A crucial question is then: can optimal diets be derived that concurrently meet dietary requirements while reducing detrimental environmental impacts? Contrary to conventional wisdom, recent evidence suggests that high nutritional quality products might not be necessarily more environment-friendly. Although plant-based foods have lower greenhouse gas emissions (GHGE) per unit weight, better quality diets were found associated with significantly higher GHGE after adjustment for energy intake (Vieux et al., 2012; Vieux et al., 2013). So, can consumers lower, for example, their carbon footprint through making changes in the kind of food they buy, and still meet nutritional adequacy recommendations? MacDiarmid et al. (MacDiarmid et al., 2012) derived what would look like such an optimal diet for a representative UK consumer for different GHGE reduction targets.

Using mathematical linear programming, they conclude that such a diet can be achieved for the GHGE objectives set for 2020 (−25 %); however, meeting the targets for 2050 (−70 %) and dietary recommendations will require a ‘radical shift in food consumed’. Ad hoc constraints were added to the model to maintain simulated diets within consumers’ acceptability limits. These results clearly show that demand-side approaches to the problem of environmental unsustainability are desirable and likely

to contribute to improvements. However, as highlighted by MacDiarmid et al. (2012), GHGE reductions should be made to both the demand and supply sides within the food chain, in particular to attain longer-term objectives. If other environmental, economic, social and ethical aspects of sustainability were to be included in the optimization model, while strengthening the acceptability constraints, one can wonder if feasible solutions can be derived by changes at the sole food basket level. Linear optimization theory tells us that if there are x decision variables, then a set of x equality constraints needs to be specified for one unique optimal solution and vice versa. Any extra equality constraints will overspecify the problem. If feasible solutions are to be identified, extra decision variables need to be considered. In other words, other levers need to be operated jointly with actions encouraging behaviour changes.

The processes underlying food insecurity and diet-related environmental, economic and social unsustainability derive from a shared food system. For instance, GHGE are not food attributes, but outputs of different activities along the value chain. Food consumption is a heavy contributor to ‘embodied’ or indirect emissions in products that result from activities prior to purchase (Kim and Neff, 2009). In practice, these indirect emissions are very hard to be accurately estimated and attributed to a good or an individual.

Modeling exercises of optimal diets have had to use so far averages coming from life-cycle assessment studies on, sometimes, rather aggregated food groups. There might thus be a high degree of variation around these average estimates. For instance, Lindenthal et al. (2010) report substantial differences in terms of GHGE between organic production methods as compared with conventional farming in Austria (10–21% lower CO₂-eq/kg product for organic dairy, 25% for organic wheat bread and 10–35% for organic vegetable.). Similar studies elsewhere have reported the same results (Kustermann et al., 2008; Petersen et al., 2006).

Consumers stand at the top of the food system and diets are outputs of longer and more complex food chains encompassing several activities. Technologies and policies affect the overall environmental performances, food security and health outcomes (Ingram, 2011). To derive optimal sustainable diets, we need to look at all the

variables that influence the flow of activities along the food system. These are the levers to act upon. To assess and enhance food sustainability, focus needs to move beyond the food basket while ultimately bearing in mind that diets and nutrition are the final reason for being of the food system. Burchi et al. (2011) define a system as ‘a set of elements that function together as collective units which have properties greater than the sum of their component parts’. The food system concept describes the required inputs, processes and generated outputs involved in the provision of food and nutrients for sustenance and health, including growing, harvesting, processing, packaging, transporting, marketing, consuming and disposing of food (Ericksen et al., 2009; Ratoin and Ghersi, 2010; Rutten et al., 2011). The current joint crisis of malnutrition and unsustainability has roots in agricultural and food systems that do not deliver enough essential nutrients to meet dietary requirements for all (Graham et al., 2007; DeClerck et al., 2011). The solution to sustainable diets lies both in sustainability-orientated food choices and in changes in the food systems. And modern societies depend on complex social–ecological systems to provide food (Ericksen et al., 2009; Fraser et al., 2005; Turner et al., 2003; Ostrom, 2009).

2.3 - A complex human–environment system

Food and nutrition as ecosystem services

Agriculture and the food sector at large have a first-hand touchpoint with nature: crops need soil, water, insects for pollination, etc. The analysis of the relationships between resource acquisition and living organisms, at the heart of the sustainable diet concept in the case of human organisms, is also an ecological question, and can surely benefit from insights from ecology. Ecosystems consist of a community of species, or biodiversity, interacting with each other and with their environment. The product of these interactions, which include competition, predation, reproduction and cooperation, is essential to human wellbeing. Human subjects depend on goods provided by natural and managed ecosystems. These goods and other benefits provided by ecosystems to mankind are collectively referred to as ecosystem services (Ecosystem services were defined in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) as ‘the benefits people obtain from ecosystems’, both natural and managed. These

services may be categorized as provisional (fiber, food, water and fuel), regulative (climate and disease regulation, water purification), cultural (aesthetics, heritage, education, recreation and spiritual) or supporting services (nutrient cycling, primary production and soil formation)). All are processes through which ecosystem sustain human livelihoods. Food production is an ecosystem service central to human welfare (Costanza et al., 1997). The capacity of ecosystems to provide us with the energy and nutrition for our daily life fully depends on the foods that agriculture and food systems provide us. Clear from this process-based interpretation, human nutrition should be considered one of the most fundamental ecosystem services, or alternatively as dependent on several ecosystem services, including provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural services (DeClerck et al., 2006).

Agricultural biodiversity, or agrobiodiversity, is the sub-component of biodiversity that refers to the biological variety and variability of living organisms that are involved in food and agriculture. It can be considered at three main levels: ecosystem diversity, species diversity and genetic diversity (Heywood et al., 2013; UN, 1992). It includes habitats and species outside of farming systems that benefit agriculture and enhance ecosystem functions such as pollination, soil dynamics and control of GHGE. Agrobiodiversity comprises the constituents of biological diversity important to food and agriculture as well as for the agroecosystem (Frison et al., 2011; Brussaard et al., 2010). Furthermore, it is the result of the deliberate interaction between human subjects and natural ecosystems. Subsequent agroecosystems are thus the product of not just physical elements of the environment and biological resources, but vary according to cultural and management systems (Heywood et al., 2013). Agrobiodiversity includes a series of social, cultural and ethical variables.

Reduction in agrobiodiversity and simplification of diets

Modern agriculture and food systems are contributing to the simplification of the structure of the environment, replacing nature's biodiversity with a small number of domesticated plant species and animal breeds (Altieri, 2000). This process has been one of the main factors that allowed much of the human population to enjoy unprecedented levels of development and improved health. However, as efforts have been directed at maximizing production and productivity, uniformity has replaced diversity within cultivated systems (Sage, 2013). Agricultural intensification, which

implies specialization and genetic standardization, reduction of utilized species, conversion of forests and wild land to anthropogenic habitats, homogenization of soils through amendments, is certainly the first human related cause of biodiversity loss (Frison et al., 2011; Rosen, 2000; Tilman et al., 2002). The increase in food supply has thus come with important trade-offs that include soil degradation and loss of many regulatory and supporting ecosystem services. These trade-offs can impair the ability of the ecosystems to deliver the essential nutrients for human diets (Palm et al., 2007).

This increased reliance on domesticated species and selected crop varieties can be linked to a significant reduction in dietary diversity. Modern agriculture is genetically dependent on a handful of varieties for its major crops (Kahane et al., 2013). The world's agricultural landscapes are planted mostly with some twelve species of grain crops, twenty three vegetable crop species and about thirty-five fruit and nut crop species (Fowler & Mooney, 1990) (as a comparison, one single hectare of tropical rain forest contains on average over 100 species of trees (Perry, 1994); cited in (Altieri, 1999). This process of simplification of agriculture generated a model where only a small number of crop species dominate our energy and nutritional intakes. Three crops alone (rice, wheat and maize) account for more than 55% of human energy intake (Stamp et al., 2012).

Although varying in nutrient content, no single crop species is capable of providing all essential nutrients. Nutritional diversity is now widely recognized to be a key factor for adequate diets likely to satisfy the complex human nutritional needs (Arimond et al., 2010; Roche et al., 2008; Randall et al., 1985; Torheim et al., 2004). Evidence of the valuable outcomes of diversity in decreasing malnutrition, morbidity and mortality (Frison et al., 2011; Tucker, 2001) is completed by indications of positive correlation with child growth and survival (Arimond & Ruel, 2004; Pelletier & Frongillo, 2003).

The importance of nutrient diversity for human wellbeing calls for dietary diversification. However, the quality of nutritional supply and human health is in danger because of a loss in biodiversity. A reduction in the consumption of varied, 'nutritionally-rich' and 'functionally-healthy' plant-based foods is reported in most

developed and emerging countries (Johns & Eyzaguirre, 2006). The preeminent simplification of human diets, associated with changing lifestyles, led to nutrient deficiencies and excess energy consumption. However, the elimination of most essential nutrient deficiencies (most important micronutrients usually reported are vitamin A, iodine and iron, zinc; Graham et al. (2007) provide a list of fifty-one essential nutrients for sustaining human life) requires only small increases in the variety of food items an individual consumes (Ruel, 2003). As a result, balanced nutrition in human diet can depend significantly on the diversity within crops (Mouillet et al., 2010).

Ecological interdependences are key factors of the dietary content of most living species. Some lesser-known cultivars and wild varieties have been reported to be micronutrient superior over other more extensively utilized cultivars. For example, recent analyses have shown that provitamin-A carotenoid content of bananas differs by a factor of 8500 between different cultivars (Burlingame et al., 2009). In Micronesia, the local 'karat' banana has been found to contain high levels of provitamin-A carotenoids, which contribute to protection against vitamin A deficiency and chronic diseases, including certain cancers, heart disease and diabetes (Engelberger et al., 2003) (cited in Sajise, 2005). In this regard, the term 'neglected and underutilized species' or 'development opportunity crop' refers to those species whose potential to improve people's livelihood is not being fully exploited (given the current lack of detailed and comprehensive nutritional information about diversity within crops at the cultivar level and the role it plays in nutrition, the Food and Agriculture Organization has launched the INFOODS initiative (Mouillet et al., 2010; Padulosi et al., 2011). For instance, a local fruit, *Berchemia discolor*, was found to contribute in a low-cost manner to closing nutrient gaps in Kenya (Termote et al., 2013). Peach palm (*Bactris gasipaes*) provides, under low soil fertility and extreme rainfall conditions, starchy fruits with high protein density, rich in monounsaturated oleic acids, carotenoids, vitamin E and potassium (Graefe et al., 2013). Amaranth, as a leafy vegetable, is nutritionally comparable with spinach while showing strong photosynthetic activity and water use efficiency (Wang & Ebert, 2012; Ebert, 2014). The drumstick tree (*Moringa oleifera*) combines the traits of high yield and high nutrient density in essential micronutrients, vitamins, antioxidants and bioavailable iron, making it a good supplement for children and pregnant and lactating women

(Ebert, 2014). All these examples demonstrate how intraspecific biodiversity and the consumption of neglected species and varieties can be essential to nutrition security.

Increasing the number of crops available to local communities, in particular in developing countries, increases the likelihood of obtaining the nutrients needed for healthy and productive lives (DeClerck et al., 2011). Deckelbaum et al. (2006) showed that biodiversity and hunger hotspots geographically correspond, reminding us of the link that Jared Diamond unraveled about the spatial relationship between biodiversity availability and society development (Diamond, 1997). This evidence, demonstrating the correlation between hunger and biodiversity-losing areas, confirms the need for local biodiverse agricultural systems.

DeClerck et al. (2011) further observed that improving functional agrobiodiversity in Kenya reduces anemia incidence, and that interventions supporting environmental sustainability, through biodiversity, can have multiple direct and indirect outcomes on human health and nutritional wellbeing. Similarly, in rice-based aquatic production systems, Halwart (2006) found that vegetal agrobiodiversity allowed improved biological diversity and diverse nutritional sources for human subjects (calcium, iron, zinc, vitamin A, some fatty acids and limiting amino acids). Moreover, through fish biodiversity, rice yields increase and the presence of several aquatic organisms in rice ecosystems allows a better biological control of vectors and pests. Animal and vegetal agrobiodiversity in rice-based ecosystems increases income through yield growth and lower costs for pesticides through biological control (Diamond, 1997). These issues suggest, for tackling malnutrition, but also other aspects of food insecurity, the need to link ecology and agriculture to human nutrition and health.

Agrobiodiversity and resilience for food security

On top of nutritional issues, agricultural biodiversity is an essential component in the sustainable delivery of a more secure food supply. Agrobiodiversity is the outcome of thousands of years of efforts by farmers, selecting, breeding and developing appropriate production systems and methods. It plays a crucial role in productivity and livelihood of farmers, by providing the wide range of resources they need to increase productivity in favorable settings or to adapt to variable conditions. Biodiversity simplification resulted in an artificial ecosystem that requires constant

human intervention, whereas plant biodiversity allows internal regulation of essential functions in natural ecosystems (Altieri, 1999). Several nature- and human-related drivers of change threaten the ability of social–ecological systems to maintain vital functions and processes: climate change, natural resources exploitation, habitat depletion, pollution, etc.

Understanding how agrobiodiversity is likely to impact agricultural and ecosystems is key. Climate change is a potent risk to the world's food supply in coming decades, likely to undermine production and driving up prices (Godfray et al., 2010; Ingram et al., 2010). Agricultural biodiversity will be absolutely essential to cope with the predicted impacts of climate change. Crop genetic diversity provides partial resistance to diseases, and enables farmers to exploit different soil types and microclimates for a variety of nutritional and other uses (Altieri, 1999). Improved resilience, to climatic shocks among others, is observed in highly biodiverse ecosystems (Swift et al., 2004; Rees et al., 2001). In Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia, between 26 and 50% of rural households relied on indigenous fruits as a coping strategy during critical seasonal hunger periods (Akinnifesi et al., 2004; Powell et al., 2013). Furthermore, biodiversity in agroecosystems accomplishes multiple ecological services beyond the production of food such as: nutrients recycling, hydrological regulation, purification of toxic chemical compounds, etc. For instance, improvement in agroforestry biodiversity reduces nutrient leaching and soil erosion and refurbishes key nutrients from the lower soil layers (FAO, 2011a). To assess the role of agricultural biodiversity in sustainable and secure food production, cross-sectoral approaches are necessary as potential benefits can be manifested at different ecological and human scales (Frison, 2011). Farmers also conserve, and modify their use of, agrobiodiversity to better adapt to different environmental conditions, but also to changing market conditions (Pascual et al., 2011). In Indonesia, the conservation of high levels of biodiversity in rubber agro-forests helped secure population livelihood during the 2008 fall of rubber prices by providing an alternative source of income from secondary products (Powell et al., 2013; Feintrenie & Levang, 2009). Agrobiodiversity can thus be seen as a crucial asset to keep multiple options open. As a general rule, increasing the number of species in a community will enhance the number of functions provided by that community, and will reinforce the stability of the provision of those functions (DeClerck et al., 2011).

2.4 Bio-economic modelling for biodiversity and nutrition

Modelling activities, capturing diversities

In recent years, there has been a significant development of bio-economic models, enhanced by the recognition of the multifunctionality of agriculture and the multiplicity of objectives assigned to the agricultural policies (Janssen & van Ittersum, 2007). The subsequent increasing demand for integrated assessment called also for more dialogue and co-operation between scientists from various disciplines, and bio-economic models have been advocated as an adequate tool for such a purpose (Kragt, 2012). Bio-economic models refer to models that couple both an economic and a biophysical component. Brown (2000) more precisely identifies models primarily concerned with *‘biological process (. . .) to which an economic analysis component has been added’*.

Another kind of model consists of *‘economic optimization models which include various biophysical components as activities among the various choices for optimization’*. In between, he suggests a third category that integrates in an interactive manner the biophysical and the economic modules. This last category genuinely deserves to be called ‘bio-economic’.

At the heart of most bio-economic models lies the paradigm that, for analyzing the relationships and tradeoffs between socio-economic systems and biophysical and ecological processes, and to help evaluate how management actions affect different policy objectives, it is necessary to model activities (Flichman et al., 2011). What produces biodiversity depletion or soil erosion is not wheat or maize production per se, but the way it is produced. And there are several ways of producing the same product.

The degree of pressure on the environment will depend on the crop selected and its combination with other crops, the tillage technique, the type of soil, the production system, the period of harvest, the seasonality and many other technical issues. It is

therefore not adequate to associate a final product with a single simple production function. The relationships between a final product and the inputs associated with its production, highly non-linear because of the large set of possible combinations, might be better captured by considering the variety of activities or production processes.

Land, water, seeds (of different species and varieties), labor, energy, machinery, fertilizer, etc. are taken into account as inputs to the agricultural production. Food are outputs, as well as pollution, changes in landscape, depletion of natural resources, soil erosion, loss of underground water, habitat destruction, biodiversity losses, etc. There are numerous possible combinations of inputs to produce several outputs. Using an example from agricultural production, wheat systems do not only produce grain, but also straw and different types of pollution. They are 'joint products' (Baumgartner et al., 2001; Pasinetti, 1980). Thus each activity can produce several products (e.g. grain, straw and pollution), and in turn each product can be produced by several activities (e.g. several ways of producing grain). As a consequence, modeling the relationships between a final product and the 'externalities' become even more challenging to synthesize.

Bio-economic models represent production activities in an explicit manner. A production activity describes a specific production process. Usually called an engineering production function, it describes explicitly the relationships between factors of production and products expressed in physical quantities (e.g., kg fertilizer/ha, m³ water for irrigation, etc.). In agriculture, an activity is defined by the technical coefficients that represent the use of inputs needed to produce different outputs (Flichman et al., 2011). These engineering production functions, which use primal variables (physical quantities), constitute the essential link between the biophysical and economic processes. Models based on cost functions, which use dual variables (prices), can hardly analyze the relationships between inputs and outputs in a straightforward and proper manner. The fact that one product is obtained through several production activities, explains in part the complex and non-linear relationships between inputs and outputs observed per product, which are difficult to capture mathematically. On the contrary, the average cost can more realistically be assumed equal to the marginal cost when considered per activity. Relationships between inputs and joint products by activity are thus linear functions of Leontief type. The use of

engineering production functions creates a strong information demand, requiring data framed in terms of physical input–output matrices. However, thanks to this representation, positive and negative jointness can be simultaneously taken into account. This more direct approach can help assess the joint interactions between biodiversity and nutrition.

Biodiversity in bio-economic modeling

There are basically four approaches to introduce biodiversity or agrobiodiversity in bio-economic optimization models. In a normative approach, it is possible to include biodiversity conservation targets directly in a multiobjective function. Multi-objective optimization models are goal-oriented models, where optimal decisions need to be taken in the presence of trade-offs between two or more conflicting objectives. Holzkämper and Seppelt (2007) developed a spatially explicit optimization model with respect to ecological and economic goals, namely habitat suitability for three target species and profit losses from different land-use options. Results show that optimum agricultural land-use patterns differ between species, as well as between study sites. Groot et al. (2007) explore the synergies and trade-offs between financial returns, landscape quality, nature conservation and environmental quality in a spatially explicit land-use allocation model, which combines agronomic, economic and environmental indicators with biodiversity and landscape quality indicators. More specifically, their Landscape IMAGES model couples an agroecological model to a multi-objective optimization algorithm that generates a set of alternative landscape configurations. An agroecological engineering approach was used to design production activities.

Alternatively, impacts on biodiversity of different land-use management options and policy scenario can be assessed through optimization models. Schönhart et al. (2011) address the effects of land use intensity and landscape development on biodiversity at farm and landscape levels. Their integrated land use model combines a crop rotation model with a biophysical process model (erosion–productivity impact calculator) and a spatially explicit farm optimization model. Field- and farm-specific crop yields, crop rotations and environmental outcomes of the biophysical model are inputs to the farm optimization model, which maximizes total farm gross margin subject to resource endowments and several balance equations.

Decisions in integrated land use model are assumed to reflect actual producers' choices postulating efficient farm resource utilization. This structure allows introducing landscape metrics, such as the Shannon's diversity index, to quantify the spatial biodiversity impacts of landscape development scenarios. Scenario analysis is used to assess the cost-effectiveness of different agro-environmental measures to achieve biodiversity targets. One asset of the integrated land use models is the inclusion of spatial modeling of landscape elements. Similarly, Mouysset et al. (2011) adopt a multi-criteria approach to assess jointly the impacts of public policy options on conservation of biodiversity and farming production. Assuming income-maximizing farmers under technical constraints, the authors test different taxation scenarios on economic performances and farmland bird abundance.

As argued by Schönhart et al. (2011), biodiversity conservation targets can also be introduced in the model as constraints. Van Wenum et al. (2004) study optimal wildlife management on crop farms using integer programming. They compute a wildlife-cost frontier at the farm level evaluating the optimal trade-off between species richness and total gross margins. Their model derives sets of management activities that maximize farm income under incrementally varying wildlife conservation requirements.

Results provide the extent to which stepwise increases in species richness objectives impact negatively farm profits.

A last approach consists of integrating agrobiodiversity at the core of the model in the definition of the agricultural activities. All the earlier examples of models that consider impacts on biodiversity are based, at least partially, on engineering production functions. It implies defining activities such as obtaining constant marginal costs. Combinations of crops and rotation schemes, in interaction with the environment and agronomic technique, on the farm at the field level have to be considered to specify activities. For example, maize, beans and squash (the indigenous 'American three-sisters') planted simultaneously would be modeled as a specific activity, different from an activity involving only one of the three crops or any other combination. The planting techniques used, either just in the same field or in the same hole, would also be distinguished. Conceptually, this approach by activity would allow setting agrobiodiversity at the core of the model, and better match an

understanding of the environmental and nutritional outcomes of diets as system outputs. Indeed, specific environment and nutrition impacts can thus be specified by activity and not by product. However, one strong limitation regards data requirements. Given the wide array of possible combinations, a large number of technical coefficients, which enter the model as external variables, need to be available and properly estimated to result in real improvement to existing modelling exercise.

Joint assessment of nutrition and biodiversity

The increasing demand for integrated assessment, including nutrition (Hammond & Dube, 2012; Frongillo et al., 2013; Misselhorn et al., 2012; Remans & Smukler, 2013) calls also for bio-economic models integrating consumer choices and dietary patterns, and subsequent sets of food consumption and nutrition indicators. A nutrition-driven food system, which also ensures that environmental integrity, economic self reliance and social well-being are maintained and enhanced, places people, as consumers, as one of its central focus (Burchi et al., 2011). Not only should we be able to determine food and nutrient availability at the farm or food system level, resulting from the use of biodiversity for instance, but we also need to understand and consider how it translates into actual consumption at the household and individual level. To achieve this, models of food consumption patterns and behaviours need to be integrated into the bio-economic models. This type of tool will allow a proper nutritional analysis and evaluation of required changes in the food systems to reach sustainable diets. In the context of developing countries, farm household models offer the conceptual background to expand existing bio-economic farm models, to capture the interactions between ecological dimensions and agronomic decisions with consumers' choices (and acceptability of simulated options in terms of consumers' preferences) and nutritional outcomes. Smallholder farmers are vital for developing countries' economies, supporting today one-third of humanity (IFAD, 2014). Farm households, while increasingly selling and relying on markets, represent an '*easier to control for*' food system at the smallest scale.

In the case of smallholder farmers in developing countries, the deciding entity is both a producer and a consumer. In the existence of market failures, non-separability regarding production and consumption decisions has to be assumed, and a farm-

household approach becomes necessary (Sadoulet & De Janvry, 1995). Several attempts have been made to couple bio-economic and farm-household models (Janssen and van Ittersum, 2007; Holden et al., 2004; Kruseman and Bade, 1998; Ruben and van Rujven, 2001; Shiferaw et al., 2001). In particular, the Joint Research Centre, with the CIHEAM-IAMM and other partners, further developed the FSSIM model of the European Commission for application in developing countries.

The FSSIM-Dev (Farm System Simulator for Developing Countries) model is a bio-economic farm household optimization model, with a first application to Sierra Leone (Louhichi et al., 2013). A household module has been added to the modular structure of FSSIM. Production, and related environmental outcomes, as well as food consumption are outputs of the model. Conditionally on the quality of the data about the environmental impacts associated with each production activity, and about food consumption and associated nutritional intakes entered and generated out of the model, such a model could assess the farming practices best suited to improve different sets of nutrition and/or biodiversity indicators and the associated trade-offs. In a normative approach, this approach could help define optimal combinations of activities and resulting diets. In a more positive approach, it could identify through simulation analysis the factors more likely to help attain some of these optimal combinations.

2.4 - Conclusions

A wider deployment of agricultural biodiversity is key for the sustainable delivery of a more secure and nutritious food supply. The importance of nutrient diversity for human wellbeing calls for dietary diversification. However, the quality of nutritional supply and human health are in danger because of losses in biodiversity. Biodiversity benefits affect social–ecological systems all along the food value chain, from agricultural activities, food processing and consumption patterns to nutrition and health status. There is a call for system approaches to capture the dynamic processes between and within the food system activities, nutrition and health, and environmental outcomes. Computational complex systems modeling techniques aim at capturing the

co-evolution of human and biological systems, and the complexity of human decision-making (Hammond & Dube, 2012). They allow exploring key processes and outcomes of the analyzed systems for food and nutrition security, delivering innovative and deeper insights at the environmental level. Food consumption behaviors play a central role in driving us towards the sustainable food system.

Understanding how food supply translates in nutrition-adequate consumption patterns, together with capturing choice determinants and underlying consumer's perceptions of environment-friendly practices, are crucial to help guide changes towards sustainable uses of resources for nutrition. Food consumption behavior has not attracted enough attention from the sustainability community. Further research requires knowledge of the concepts and insights from a wide range of disciplines to tackle the complexity and diversity of influences at work in food choices. Joint efforts are needed in addressing food and nutrition security through a multidisciplinary and multisectoral approach to social–ecological systems.

Preface to Chapter 3

Recurrent food crises and climate change, along with habitat loss and micronutrient deficiencies are global issues of critical importance that have pushed food security and environmental sustainability to the top of the political agenda. Analyses of the dynamic linkages between food consumption patterns and environmental concerns have recently received considerable attention from the international and scientific community. Using the lens of a broad sustainability approach, this chapter aims at developing a multidimensional framework to evaluate the sustainability of food systems and diets, applicable to countries of the Mediterranean region. Derived from natural disaster and sustainability sciences, a vulnerability approach, enhanced by inputs from the resilience literature, has been adapted to analyze the main issues related to food and nutrition security. Through causal factor analysis, the resulting conceptual framework improves the design of information systems or metrics assessing the interrelated environmental, economic, social and health dynamics of food systems.

Chapter 3

Sustainability and Food & Nutrition Security: A Vulnerability Assessment Framework for the Mediterranean Region²

² *This chapter is adapted from:*

Prosperi, P., Allen, T., Padilla, M., Peri, I., & Cogill, B. (2014). Sustainability and Food & Nutrition Security: A Vulnerability Assessment Framework for the Mediterranean Region. *SAGE Open*, 4(2).

3.1 - Introduction

Over the past 25 years, the international and scientific community has repeatedly attempted to deal with the issue of sustainability. “*Our Common Future*” (UN, 1987), commonly known as the “*Brundtland Report*”, argues that sustainable development should meet “*the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*”. It stresses the necessity to implement economic, social, environmental and institutional progress that can be maintained over time. Worldwide concerns about sustainable development are also reflected in the global food security debate, which states that “*Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life*” (FAO, 1996). The 1996 World Food Summit (WFS) identifies four main determinants of food security: food availability, accessibility to food, food utilization, and the stability over time of the three previous dimensions; depletion in any one of these leads to food insecurity.

The first crucial change from the supply-based food security concept of 1974 (UN, 1975) came with the access-related definition of food security (FAO, 1983; World Bank, 1986) using Sen’s entitlements approach (Sen, 1981). Then, the nutrition approach guided the notion of utilization (Statz et al., 1990), highlighting the need for quality, including good and culturally accepted feeding practices, food safety and nutritional value. During the same period, Maxwell and Frankenberger (1992) sustain the theory that household access to sufficient and nutritious food at all times is key to food security. Building on the 1986 World Bank report “*Poverty and hunger*”, the stability dimension, related to the temporal dynamics of food insecurity, was explicitly acknowledged.

Associating sustainable agriculture and food security, Speth (1993) suggests orientating development strategies towards the combined socio-economic-environment goal of sustainable food security. Sustainable food security is actually the concept underpinning the 1996’s definition of the WFS where environmental and social issues were further stressed, especially for climatic risks, water availability,

biodiversity losses and cultural food preferences. The term of “*sustainable food security*” was already coined in March 1987 in the Brundtland Report. Yet in 1983 Swaminathan was among the first to point out the need for an ecological foundation to food security “*to protect basic life-support systems of land, water, flora, fauna, and the atmosphere*” (Swaminathan, 1983, p. 37). In 1987, Swaminathan reaffirmed the sustainable food security concept, extending it to encompass both to nutritional and water issues, while Gussow and Clancy (1986) were the first to use the term “*sustainable diets*” to define diets both healthy for the environment and humans.

The multiple interconnected dimensions of these two concerns – sustainable development and food & nutrition security – open new avenues for multidisciplinary research, as demonstrated by the emerging literature on the topic and the more recent related global events. The main conceptual outcome of the 2010 International Scientific Symposium on Biodiversity and Sustainable Diets is the definition of sustainable diets as “*those diets with low environmental impacts which contribute to food and nutrition security and to a healthy life for present and future generations. Sustainable diets are protective and respectful of biodiversity and ecosystems, culturally acceptable, accessible, economically fair and affordable; nutritionally adequate, safe and healthy while optimizing natural human resources*” (FAO & Bioversity International, 2012, p. 7).

It is clear from this definition that the issue of sustainability of diets closely refers to food and nutrition security. The sustainable diets definition establishes four main goals for the governance of a future sustainable food system: human health and nutrition, cultural acceptability, economic viability and environmental protection (Fanzo et al., 2012). It highlights some crucial elements such as the importance of biodiversity stocks not just for the agriculture and the environment, but also for adequacy to nutritional recommendations and cultural acceptability. The multiple conditions of sustainability clearly encompass several dimensions. These conditions refer to different sets of capital that allow flows of services to be maintained over time. Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi (2009) suggest that these welfare-producing services can be sustained over time when stocks of capital (natural, physical, human and social) are transferred to future generations.

The analysis of the sustainability of food security requires a shift towards a multidimensional vision (Pinstrup-Andersen, 2009), but also a transversal approach across the multiple activities leading to diets. Achieving both sustainability and food security requires more than focusing on agriculture or on markets or on household food baskets, but to look at the overall food system (Ingram, 2011). Sustainable food systems are key for assuring sustainable food security (FAO & Bioversity International, 2012), and they cannot be pursued in the absence of food and nutrition security (Buttriss & Riley, 2013). Food security and food system sustainability are then indispensable prerequisites to each other and they need to be jointly analyzed.

Policymakers and stakeholders play a key role in the governance of future sustainable food systems, at a different spatial scale. They need evidence-based scientific information to define policy and implement actions (Barrett, 2010). The aim of this chapter is to develop a conceptual framework, applied to the Mediterranean region, which links concepts, methods and metrics, for a multidimensional joint analysis of food and nutrition security and food system sustainability. Building on the resilience literature, the vulnerability approach (Turner et al., 2003) provides a systemic causal pathway to analyze the impacts of the main drivers of change on specific food security and nutrition outcomes. It allows understanding and assessing the conditions of sustainability of the food system. This chapter provides the conceptual background to develop metrics, relying on evidence-based scientific knowledge, to inform all stakeholders, particularly policymakers, on response interventions to major changes at national and regional scale, in order to maintain the ability of the system to provide food security and good nutrition over time, while taking into account environmental, social and economic constraints and assets.

We first introduce the Mediterranean context and briefly review the main issues related to food and nutrition security and food system sustainability in the region. Developed from natural disaster and sustainability sciences, the vulnerability conceptual framework is presented as a valid approach to capture and model food system sustainability. We then expose the associated metrics – or information system – to quantify vulnerability that integrates three essential components: exposure,

sensitivity, and adaptive capacity (Turner et al., 2003). We finally discuss the utility of this approach with examples of its possible application to Mediterranean countries.

3.2 - Food Insecurity and Environmental Unsustainability: A joint regional analysis

Changes in dietary patterns and food insecurity

Globally, more than 2 billion people are food insecure, either undernourished, malnourished or overnourished (FAO, 2012; Strang, 2009; WHO, 2013). Concurrently, there is consensus among the international and scientific community on the non-sustainability of the western agrofood system, in terms of its impacts on natural resources and ecosystems, and on human health with increasing prevalence of non-communicable diet-related diseases. The Mediterranean region has been identified as one of the main critical hotspots of environmental unsustainability due to intense human activity and agricultural exploitation (Capone et al., 2012; Salvati, 2013). A large part of its population can also be considered food insecure. Using United Nations (UN) anthropometric and population composition data³, out of a total population of about 500 million, it is possible to estimate that at least 215 million adults and children (44% of total population) are “*qualitative and quantitative food-insecure*” in the Mediterranean region^{4,5}. The geographical zone represents an interesting testing area of study in which to carry out a multidimensional analysis of the inter-connected factors that characterize food insecurity and environmental unsustainability. In this section, we present a joint analysis of the current situation and show how both issues intersect.

³ Data is not completely available for all Mediterranean countries.

⁴ This count involves overweight and underweight adults (age > 20 years) and overweight, underweight, stunted and wasted children (age < 5 years) within the Mediterranean population. Available data at September 2013 were collected from: World Health Organization, Global Database on Child Growth and Malnutrition and Global Database on Body Mass Index; UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs – Population Division).

⁵ In UN databases many of the cited statistics are not assessed in several Mediterranean countries: Child stunting, wasting and underweight are not assessed in Cyprus, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia and Spain; Child wasting is not assessed in Algeria, Croatia, Morocco, and Turkey. Child stunting is not assessed in Turkey; Child overweight is not assessed in Croatia, Cyprus, France, Israel, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Serbia; Adults underweight is assessed just in France, Italy, Jordan, Malta, Portugal, Spain, Macedonia and Turkey. Adults’ overweight is assessed in all Mediterranean countries.

On the supply side, all the dietary energy supplies (DES) of the Mediterranean countries⁶ largely exceed the average dietary energy requirements. At the same time the majority of these countries are strongly dependent on imports, especially for cereals (except France and Turkey). Furthermore, the share of DES derived from cereals is still considerably high (Egypt 65%, Morocco 57%, Algeria 55%, Tunisia 51%, Libya 49%, Turkey 48%) (FAOSTAT 2009, data available in November 2013)⁷. This cereal-centered dependency can lead to a regional and national vulnerability. In particular, it occurs at the expense of middle- and low-income groups, and of the national government expenditure. For example, bread subsidies, amounting to US\$ 2.5 billion per year, were introduced in Egypt in 2008 (FAO, 2012). It is also necessary to consider food price volatility, in particular for cereals, as it affects consumers' capabilities to access food. Other related socio-economic factors also determine access to food, such as adult literacy, which is still low in some countries (Libya 89%, Algeria 73%, Egypt 72%, Morocco 56%) (UNESCO, data available in November 2013). As for the utilization dimension of food security, nutritional value and food safety remain critical issues. Infant mortality (Morocco 28‰, Algeria 26‰, Egypt 18‰, Tunisia 14‰, Albania 13‰, Turkey 12‰), child stunting (Egypt 31%, Syria 27%, Albania 23%, Morocco 23%, Libya 21%, Algeria 16%, Tunisia 9%), wasting (Morocco 11%, Syria 11%, Albania 9%, Egypt 8%, Libya 6%, Algeria 4%, Tunisia 3%) and underweight (Morocco 10%, Syria 10%, Egypt 7%, Albania 6%, Libya 6%, Algeria 4%, Tunisia 3%) are still considerably high (WHO, data available in November 2013). In addition to this, obesity and overweight are growing problems common to all the Mediterranean countries, both for adults and children. This double burden of malnutrition is manifest in Egypt with prevalence rates of 33% in adult obesity and 20% for child overweight, against 31% for child stunting. Overweight and obesity are also risk factors in cardiovascular diseases, which contribute to 42% of all deaths in the Mediterranean (Rastoin & Cheriet, 2010).

Obesity is closely linked to dietary behavior and socio-economic determinants, but also to agricultural policies, production systems and food chain characteristics

⁶ Except for the Occupied Palestinian Territories.

⁷ The share of different commodities in total supply is used also as a proxy metric of dietary diversity, which is strictly linked to health and nutrition factors.

(Delpeuch et al., 2009). In the Northern Mediterranean countries, these diet-related pathologies are the symptoms of an overconsumption of meat (especially red meat), dairy products and eggs (Padilla, 2008), with a tendency towards overconsumption of energy-rich and nutrient-poor foods (Darmon & Soler, 2013). In Southern Mediterranean, the double burden phenomenon represents the chronic phase of a nutrition transition. Statistics show a change of diet towards a regime that is richer in animal proteins and fats, at the expense of dietary diversity and food providing important micronutrients (Popkin, 2003). At the same time, supply shortage and struggle for access to food remain persistent for large cohorts of individuals. Another feature of the nutrition transition in the Southern Mediterranean countries is the change in the share of energy sources derived from added sugars, with increased intake of simple carbohydrates and refined sugars (Drewnowski & Popkin, 1997) and, in particular, a sharp increase in levels of simple sugar consumption through processed industrial products (drinks, biscuits, desserts, etc.) (Padilla, 2008).

Hence nutrition transition and malconsumptionⁱ are the two major food phenomena leading to diet-related diseases in the Mediterranean. Nutrient-poor “*pseudo foods*” (Winson, 2004) with high levels of vegetable oils, animal fats, sugar and salt permeate the global food system (Popkin, 2005). Long-established dietary patterns and traditions using local staples are being replaced with western-style highly processed products (Pingali, 2007). This is the case in emerging economies that are experiencing several phenomena simultaneously, such as increased urbanization, household income growth, greater market penetration by foreign brands, global supermarket and food service chains, expansion of advertising and mass media, and highly competitive prices (Sage, 2012). These dynamics lead to qualitative changes in diets and thus new food security issues, together with changes in lifestyle and work environment, with a growing tendency towards sedentary jobs and physical activity increasingly being limited to leisure time (Gil et al., 1995). These changes in diets contribute, as causal factors, to the rising incidence of nutrition-related non-communicable diseases, such as heart disease, cancer, diabetes and obesity.

The associated issue of environmental unsustainability

These dietary changes and the increasing incidence of related diseases coincide with major transformations in the agricultural and food systems, which have become more

global and complex. These evolutions in food behavior patterns and in industrial production and processing have joint social, economic and environmental impacts. It is a fact that the nutritional characteristics of diets are directly related to environmental conditions, which are consequences of the production system associated with current food consumption patterns. The question is to understand to which extent. The environmental impact of the current agrofood system is a widely debated question. Darmon and Soler (2013), for instance, observe a positive correlation between calorie intake and greenhouse gas emissions. In any case, it should be noted that the Mediterranean agrofood sector represents 25% of the global Ecological Footprint of the region (Global Footprint Network, 2012).

The current shift from diverse farming systems to ecologically simplified ones, mainly based on cereals, contributes to micronutrient deficiency, poorly diversified diets and thus malnutrition in developed, as well as in developing countries (Frison et al., 2006; Graham et al., 2007; Negin et al., 2009; Remans et al., 2011; Welch & Graham, 1999). An important negative outcome of intensive production, in addition to environmental damage such as soil depletion and erosion, and pollution of surface and groundwater, is the narrowing of biodiversity base through the use of only the most profitable varieties.

Many of the processes and much of the equipment used in the food industry have been developed to transform staple foods with specific characteristics (e.g. size, color group, quality category, etc.). As a consequence, despite an apparent diversity of the final products available on the market for consumers, genetic resources diversity tends to shrink. Current industrial production systems favor limited varieties and monocultures to the disadvantage of biological diversity (Esnouf et al., 2013). The issue of biodiversity loss is related both to environmental concerns and to health and nutrition issues, because of its link with insufficient diet diversity, micronutrient deficiency, and unhealthy food habits (Burlingame et al., 2009). The importance of food variety and composition, especially in terms of genetic resources, is increasingly acknowledged. Differences in nutrients between varieties have a major impact on nutrient intakes; higher consumption of one variety over another can lead to adequacy or deficiency in certain micronutrients. For this reason, nutrition research looks at both the food composition and consumption dimensions (Burlingame et al., 2009).

The alarming rate of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation, and the consequent negative impact on food and nutrition security, also provide strong reasons to reconsider the food systems and diet approaches. It is necessary to develop and promote strategies for sustainable food regimes, emphasizing the positive role of biodiversity to reverse or mitigate the phenomena that cogenerate negative effects on human nutrition and health (Burlingame et al., 2012). However, measuring food and nutritional biodiversity is a difficult task; the INFOODS network developed metrics that need a large amount of data, which are difficult to collect.

The environment throughout the entire geographic area of the Mediterranean is at risk, threatened by the intensive exploitation of its natural resources, particularly water (Lutter & Schnepf, 2011; Roson & Sartori, 2010; UNEP, 2006). Considering the increasing issue of drought in the region, the intensification of water requirements for food is a major concern (Capone et al., 2012). The high water demand of the Mediterranean food system reveals a deficit in terms of virtual water exchange for agrofood products (Mekonnen & Hoekstra, 2011)⁸. Water consumption trends are directly related to food consumption patterns since food products bring with them an internal quantity of water that differs by foodstuff origin, quality and quantity. Water requirements for plant and animal products vary widely. Red meat and dairy products, for example, are considered highly water-consuming compared to crop production. Thus, the quantity and types of food demanded strongly implicate the extent of water allocated and used for agriculture and related production activities (Lundqvist et al., 2008). Water consumption is therefore also connected to nutritional composition of food consumed and strictly related to life habits and to drivers of change affecting the food system.

The relationship between unhealthy foods and highly environment-impacting foodstuff is tentatively captured by the Barilla Center's Double Pyramid (Barilla Center for Food and Nutrition, 2010). Some argue that the more frequently

⁸ The concept of virtual water clearly depicts the global shifts of water embedded in products. Virtual water associates consumer goods to an amount of water needed to produce them. For instance the difference in water consumption was measured between a diet rich in meat (5400 liters virtual per day) or vegetarian (2600 liters) for American eaters (Hoekstra, 2002). In particular virtual water indicates the volume of freshwater used to produce a given good, counted at the place where the product was de facto produced (Hoekstra & Chapagain, 2008; Van Oel et al., 2009). The concept of virtual water reveals how much water is needed to produce different goods and services.

recommended healthy food corresponds also to lowest environment impacting products, and vice versa. Consumption of red meat is, for example, often considered the heaviest variable affecting the sustainability of food systems and consumed in excessive amounts in developed countries (FAO, 2006; Lang et al., 2011). However, evidence is mixed with regard to the general alignment of environmental and nutritional recommendations. For instance, Vieux et al. (2013) show that high nutritional quality is not always associated with low greenhouse gas emissions. Certainly no single food can encompass the wide range of both nutritional and environmental recommendations, without even mentioning economic viability and social acceptability constraints. A myriad of factors affecting both actors and activities within the food system explain the nutritional and environmental outcomes of dietary behaviors. Providing a clearer picture of the circular dynamics between environmental, health, economic and social drivers can help not only to measure impacts or progress, but also to understand interactions, and thus aid decision making. We suggest tackling this complex challenge by applying the vulnerability framework to the changes affecting the agrofood system.

Building on Ingram (2011), we defend an approach to metrics, which switches not only from the “*what we get*” (food security outcome approach) to the “*what we do*” approach (food systems-activities approach) (p. 419), but which also considers the “*what happens*” side (food system-drivers interactions). The Mediterranean region presents several factors of change affecting food security and environmental sustainability. The multiple issues related to food insecurity and unsustainability that have been exposed above for the Mediterranean region can be analyzed from a multidimensional perspective, as a series of issues or hotspots of vulnerability of the different national agrofood systems, and integrated within a conceptual framework linking concepts, methods and metrics.

3.3 - Vulnerability for a multidimensional and dynamic system approach

Mechanics of change and sustainability

According to the definition of agro-ecosystem sustainability coined by Conway (1985), “*Sustainability is the ability of a system to maintain productivity in spite of a major disturbance, such as caused by intensive stress or a large perturbation*” (p. 35). Consistently with the literal English usage of the verb “*to sustain*”, Hansen (1996) further interprets sustainability as a system’s ability to continue through time. If sustainability is the dynamic ability of a given system to maintain or enhance its essential outcomes over time and space, then the concept of vulnerability can provide the elements to understand the mechanisms affecting the activities of the system (Turner et al., 2003).

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) defines vulnerability as the “*degree of loss to each element should a hazard of a given severity occur*” (1994, p. 49), i.e. the extent to which an individual or system or geographic area is damaged in relation to a given change. Downing (1991) states that “*Vulnerability is the composite of two prospects: risk of exposure and risk (or magnitude) of consequence*” (p. 11). The exposure to hazardous events is different from the magnitude of the consequences that result from that exposure. The vulnerability approach further evolves with Turner et al., (2003), who established three main components to vulnerability: exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity. Adaptive – or copying – capacity corresponds to the responses that it is possible to implement. The theoretical basis for this evolution is to be found essentially in the theory of abilities and capabilities (Sen, 1981).

The vulnerability assessment is today widely acknowledged as composed of three dimensions (Adger, 2000, 2006; Adger & Vincent, 2005; Allison et al., 2009; Cinner et al., 2011; Gallopin, 2006; Kelly & Adger, 2000; IPCC, 2001; Grafton, 2010; Smit & Wandel, 2006): exposure and sensitivity to single or multiple stressors, and the adaptive capacity to cope with these. Hughes et al. (2012) adopted such a conceptual framework to quantify the anthropic effects on coral reefs and national food security,

developing a national-level vulnerability index. In the case of the fresh fruit and vegetable value chains, the vulnerability approach was adopted to assess the strengths and weaknesses of Mediterranean production zones facing an increasing competition from South East Mediterranean countries (Rastoin et al., 2007). The aim was to build an inter-regional diagnostic comparison by means of a Regional Vulnerability Index (RVI).

Vulnerability is a relative measure, and the exposure of individuals/systems/regions is related to their specific conditions. Similarly, the magnitude of the consequences from this exposure is linked to these particular characteristics and their associated sensitivity. Most adaptive capacity analyses tend to be specific to a place and context while linked across scales (Turner et al., 2003), and vulnerability is most frequently assessed at national levels (Allison et al., 2009; Brooks et al., 2005; Pelling & Uitto, 2001). The benefits of assessing vulnerability at the national level are that results can influence national-level policy responses and adaptive management strategies (Hughes et al., 2012).

A causal-factor approach

One key conceptual element is a clear distinction between causal events and outcomes (Dilley & Boudreau, 2001). Following the introduction by Sen (1981) of the notion of accessibility beyond availability as a main determinant of famine, the analysis of food security shifted from a study of the sole natural causes to the inclusion of societal causes (Blaikie et al., 1994). The vulnerability framework was indicated to describe and assess the multifaceted socioeconomic determinants of famine (Borton & Shoham, 1991; Maxwell & Frankenberger, 1992; Middleton & O’Keefe, 1998; Ribot, 1995; Swift, 1989) (as cited in Dilley & Boudreau, 2001). The vulnerability approach, based on natural disaster assessment, was then transposed to societal causes for the analysis of food insecurity. In particular, Chambers (1989) and Downing (1991) made considerable efforts in converting Sen’s analysis into assessment methods. The main result was the expression “*vulnerability to famine*” (p. 233), which became widely popular. It was understood in direct relation to the final outcome. However, Downing (1991) clearly stated that vulnerability is “*a relative measure, for a given population or region, of the underlying factors that influence*

exposure to famine and predisposition to the consequences of famine” (p. 18), aiming at identifying elements for a causal factor analysis.

In the food security context, the Food and Agriculture Organization specified that vulnerability is the relationship between risks, resulting shocks and resilience to these (FAO, 2004). The coupled risk-shock component affects population wellbeing and food security, while resilience concerns the strategies implemented to mitigate the impact of the shocks. Vulnerability is understood as directly correlated to the impact of shocks and is inversely correlated to resilience (FAO, 2004). While the natural disaster management approach to vulnerability involved the identification of a degree of damage on populations or economic assets, food security specialists applied vulnerability to measure the intensity of the state of food insecurity or famine (Dilley & Boudreau, 2001). Hence, it is possible to define the FAO vulnerability approach to food security analysis as a direct “*outcome approach*”, whilst the natural disaster method is rather a “*causal factor approach*”, describing the interactions leading to the final outcomes.

Given the wide and complex sequence of phenomena involved in food insecurity and environmental unsustainability, the causal factor specification can also help to distinguish several vulnerabilities of specific issues or outcomes. It allows a dynamic analysis of the particular issues of vulnerability, instead of a static identification of vulnerability to a broad and general final outcome. Furthermore, a broad understanding of vulnerability on wide range of sectors or issues would not be sufficiently focused to implement actions (Ionescu et al., 2009; Leurs, 2005). Regarding the multidimensionality of the concepts of food security and sustainability, assessments based on one element or one dimension are no longer considered sufficient (Aubin et al., 2013). There is a rising call for new types of systems analysis and modeling tools (Nicholson et al., 2009). The fragmentation of the broad concept of vulnerability in an integrated general framework is a first response to this need.

Vulnerability has evolved as a term of art and a conceptual framework to implement assessment methods in different research areas, such as climate impact analysis (Timmerman, 1981), disaster management (UNDRO, 1979), food security (Chambers, 1989; Dilley & Boudreau, 2001), and sustainability science (Turner et al.,

2003). The analysis of vulnerability can provide a conceptual and methodological approach to the understanding of sustainability. It offers a logical conceptual basis and method upon which to build a modeling causal framework that raises awareness on: vulnerable people or entities to shocks; how and where the shocks modified the living conditions; which are the response strategies; the identification of the multiple metrics that assess the phenomena. Additionally, Turner et al. (2003) referred to vulnerability assessment as a coupled human-environment system approach and reaffirmed the role of sustainability and global change science in improving the bonds between the science problem and decision-making needs.

3.4 - Methodological steps for the assessment of Vulnerability

A composite indicator

A joint assessment of food insecurity and environmental unsustainability is strictly linked to the identification of a methodological framework functioning as an architectural net. In Rastoin et al. (2007), Cinner et al. (2011), Hughes et al. (2012), as in the vulnerability composite index of food insecurity in Manarolla (1989), vulnerability is calculated through multidimensional score systems. The vulnerability causal framework is modeled through three dimensions: exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity.

Exposure

Building on sustainability and natural disaster sciences, exposure is considered as the degree to which a system experiences environmental or socio-political stress (Adger, 2006), including frequency, magnitude, duration and the areal extent of the hazard (Burton et al., 1993). It can thus be interpreted as the likelihood of experiencing stress or perturbations (Downing, 1991). For the purpose of this work, we define exposure as the degree to which a system or a country is subjected to changes directly causing or indirectly prompting food insecurity and environmental unsustainability. For instance, in a context of dependency on cereal imports, the share of cereals in total consumption can indicate the degree of exposure to cereal price volatility. Exposure is directly correlated with vulnerability.

Sensitivity

Sensitivity can be defined as the consequence of the exposure to a stress. It is the degree to which a system is modified or affected by the perturbations or the outcome of an unwanted event to which the system is exposed (Adger, 2006). It can be understood as the likelihood of experiencing different magnitudes of consequences of exposure to a stress or perturbation (Downing, 1991). For instance, price elasticities for cereals may represent the sensitivity to fluctuating international cereal prices, since they represent the effective impact of the exposure. Indicators of sensitivity are generally measuring impacts. As for exposure, sensitivity is directly correlated with vulnerability.

Adaptive capacity and resilience

The third component of vulnerability, related to adaptive capacity, was defined as the potential of the system to respond to changes (Adger et al., 2004; Burton et al., 2002; IPCC, 2001). Cinner et al. (2012) and Hughes et al. (2012) propose to disaggregate adaptive capacity into several categories such as assets, flexibility, learning, and social organization. In physics, resilience is the resistance of an object to a given shock. According to Rastoin et al. (2007), the concept of resilience is applicable to biology and human sciences as the resistance of an individual or a community to an external stress. For instance, when coupled, exposure and sensitivity negatively affect people's welfare and food security status. In the case of food price volatility, resilience contains all the coping strategies that can be implemented or are already implemented to avoid exposure to risks and minimize impact sensitivity to the shock, in order to overcome detrimental effects. National and global institutions, for instance, by means of food price protection policies, safety nets and subsidies, can encourage these strategies.

In an institutional context, resilience can represent stakeholders' reactive capacity to cope with changes. Stakeholders can respond with coping and adapting strategies to rule economic, finance, social institutional changes (North, 1991). Sen (1985) similarly identifies for individuals the capacity to manage opportunities deriving from risk effects, by means of the concept of capabilities. The stakeholders, searching in their natural, human, physical and social assets, take the opportunity of the

environmental changes, transforming these resources in capabilities, which allows overcoming the shocks' impacts and to be prepared for the next risks. For these characteristics that identify resilience (or adaptive capacity), the concept is often associated with sustainability (Conway, 1985; Strunz, 2012). While vulnerability is directly associated with risks and shocks impacts, resilience is inversely correlated with vulnerability (FAO, 2004). People who overcome negative impacts of changes (and end up in an even better situation) would be resilient; those suffering from the effects of the modifications would be considered as vulnerable (Rastoin et al., 2007).

Calculating a Vulnerability score

In Rastoin et al. (2007), the estimation method is based on the capabilities approach; vulnerability is then assessed solely on the one component of adaptive capacity/resilience. In a more general framework this approach could be also associated with the exposure and sensitivity dimensions. Cinner et al. (2011) and Hughes et al. (2012) calculate vulnerability as $\text{Exposure} + \text{Sensitivity} - \text{Adaptive Capacity}$ (Figure 3). Lower levels of the final score indicate lower level of vulnerability. Following the original structure designed by Hughes et al. (2012), keeping the same logical sequence of signs, Figure 3 outlines several n vulnerabilities. This specification of n different vulnerabilities of different issues to different drivers of change, aims to capture the multidimensional feature of sustainability.




Figure 3 Calculation of Vulnerability (Adapted from Hughes et al., 2012)

The order and the signs used for the methods of calculation of vulnerability, define the relationships between the three components. However, in a metric-identifying approach, the indicators come from different sources and disciplines, and are expressed in different units of measurement. Index values then need to be standardized or normalized. In many cases (Cinner et al., 2011; Hughes et al., 2012; The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2013), data normalization is based on minimum and maximum values in the dataset, and places on a scale from 0 to 1 (from 0 to 100 for the GFSI, 2012) using the typical normalization method “*min-max*” (Adger & Vincent, 2005; OECD, 2008):

$$i(X) = (X - X_{\min}) / (X_{\max} - X_{\min}) \quad (3.1)$$

In this formula X_{\min} and X_{\max} are, respectively, the lowest and highest values for any given indicator. The normalized value is then transformed from a 0 to 1 value to make it directly comparable with other indicators. This means that the indicator with the highest raw data value will score 1, while the lowest will score 0.

In the examples referred to, the indicator scores are normalized and then aggregated across categories to enable a comparison of broader concepts across countries.

Normalization rebases the raw indicator data to a common unit so that it can be aggregated.

Finally, in our specific case the n particular vulnerabilities will be calculated following this formula:

$$V = [(E - E_{min} / E_{max} - E_{min}) + (S - S_{min} / S_{max} - S_{min}) - (AC - AC_{min} / AC_{max} - AC_{min})]. \quad (3.2)$$

Where V = vulnerability, E = exposure, S = sensitivity and AC = adaptive capacity.

Another issue that has to be considered is the quantitative relevance, or weight, that is associated with the different components. Different metric systems often rely on equal weights, leaving to policymakers, practitioners and stakeholders the opportunity to apply a goal- or priority-oriented weighting system (Saaty, 1986; Hammond et al., 1999; McClanahan et al., 2008; The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2013).

Based on this approach, it would be possible to rank the Mediterranean countries in relation to their exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity *vis-à-vis* changes affecting agrofood systems in their food and nutrition security outcomes.

3.5 - Discussion of the approach

Metrics, analysis and prospective

The vulnerability approach stresses the need for methods and metrics that do not just express final results or outcomes, but provides a system of information that can be interpreted in a dynamic framework modeling interactions between different drivers. In particular, the vulnerability framework can be disaggregated in several dimensions according to the different drivers of change considered: vulnerability to climate change, vulnerability to price volatility, vulnerability to demographic transformations, etc. The integrated fragmentation of the broad vulnerability into specific vulnerabilities represents a response to the lack of causal factor analysis.

As mentioned above, each specific vulnerability can be further broken down into exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity. However, both the sensitivity and adaptive capacity dimensions of the system have to be assessed according to specific outcomes or services provided by the food system that need to be maintained over time. For instance, access to food may be jeopardized in the short term by high food price volatility; however, food supply might not be affected in the same way or to the same extent. Thus, problematic issues or hotspots, related to the agrofood system and local context, need to be specified. Three stages of causal factor analysis can be established through the vulnerability framework. In a nutshell, the framework allows organizing evidence-based information and aiding decision-making by clarifying sequential dynamics, while allowing for prospective or forward-looking analysis.

Therefore, it is important to define issues and challenges of food security and sustainability before choosing assessment methods (Aubin et al., 2013). The qualitative identification of the problematic issues, and then of the variables to assess vulnerability, can be obtained through a hierarchical analysis (Rastoin et al., 2007), previous field observations (Cinner et al., 2011; Hughes et al., 2012), a literature review and expert consultation, and using statistical methods such as Principal Components Analysis (Jolliffe, 1986).

The vulnerability framework can lead, for example through participatory methods, to the identification of a system of indicators and appropriate metrics, offering a method to capture complexity and interconnectedness between phenomena (Dilley & Boudreau, 2001; Turner et al., 2003). Furthermore, since indicators inform action (Barrett, 2010), they are essential to establish the communicative link between science and policymakers. One essential aim of the vulnerability analysis remains in the identification of the response opportunities for decision-making (Dilley & Boudreau, 2001; Turner et al., 2003; Rastoin et al., 2007).

To summarize, several functions can be attributed to the vulnerability approach such as: a holistic and novel assessment framework and a dynamic tool for sustainability sciences; a geographical-based approach involving the participation of local stakeholders; a multiple factor analysis allowing interdisciplinary research on complex and systemic phenomena; a scheme to conceptualize and develop metrics, in

a system of information and response opportunities for decision making; a methodology to draw evidence-based knowledge; a predictive framework to anticipate consequences of hazards and changes (Watts & Bohle, 1993; Dilley & Boudreau, 2001; Turner et al., 2003; Adger, 2006; Fussel, 2006; Rastoin et al., 2007; Locatelli et al., 2008; Sonwa et al., 2012). The main advantages of a vulnerability approach to the analysis of sustainability of food system activities are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Advantages of a vulnerability approach

Developing Metrics	
1. Providing information and interpretation of the phenomena for decision making	(Dilley & Boudreau, 2001; Turner et al., 2003; Adger, 2006; Rastoin et al., 2007; Sonwa et al., 2012)
2. Identifying complexity and interconnectedness of the phenomena	(Watts & Bohle, 1993; Dilley & Boudreau, 2001; Turner et al., 2003)
3. Increasing scientific knowledge through vulnerability assessment	(Sonwa et al., 2012; Fussel, 2006; Locatelli et al., 2008)
Analysis	
4. Allowing information analysis through quantitative and qualitative data and novel methods	(Turner et al., 2003)
5. Allowing the multiple factor analysis for an interdisciplinary understanding of vulnerability	(Adger, 2006)
6. Providing a dynamic tool applied to Sustainability science	(Turner et al., 2003)
Prospective	
7. Further opening the causal interpretation rather than analyzing just the final outcomes of a phenomenon	(Dilley & Boudreau, 2001)
8. Representing the opportunity to involve regional stakeholders in a place-based analysis and collaborative assessment (geographical approach)	(Turner et al., 2003)
9. Anticipating and predicting new hazards and changes	(Dilley & Boudreau, 2001; Turner et al., 2003; Adger, 2006; Rastoin et al., 2007)

Identifying issues and dealing with multidimensionality

Limits to this conceptual approach depend strongly on the level of accuracy of the application. The main risk is the lack of a genuine causal factors analysis that can be avoided by disentangling the multiple vulnerabilities and their components. Thus, one crucial element in the application of the vulnerability approach resides in the level of accuracy in defining the problematic issues that are, in our specific case, driven by nutrition and food security concerns of the agrofood system.

Furthermore, scholars and practitioners highly focused in one specific scientific discipline may be skeptical with regard to the large amount of variables. However,

the development of a multidimensional metrics framework can open a stimulating scientific debate involving experiences from several disciplines and feed the scientific knowledge base. Indeed, as observed in sustainability science and resilience thinking, inter- and trans-disciplinary communication is strictly linked to problem solving – instead of puzzle-solving –and related to participative creativity instead of dogmatism (Strunz, 2012). So, the development of the framework aims to create a flexible tool that can be adapted and modeled (as for a weighting system) to different users' and to different policy purposes related to nutrition and food security concerns. The involvement of the stakeholders is key to building up the framework and to assigning hierarchy to the indicators (Aubin et al., 2013).

In conclusion this scheme provides a multidimensional vulnerability framework to jointly assess nutrition and food insecurity and unsustainability. Starting from a specific geographical region, it represents a tool for policymakers. The Mediterranean geographical area, as a physical space where several environmental, social and economic and nutrition hotspots of vulnerability persist over time, offers a first case of application. The last subsection presents an analysis of some representative interactions between drivers of change, and food and nutrition security issues, together with the description of the resulting exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity.

Examples of application

Application of the vulnerability assessment framework requires specifying the context and the issues of concern. These can be identified by literature review or participative expert consultation. The analysis of each specific issue or hotspot of vulnerability (of a given geographical area) allows us to establish from which point of the causal sequence of phenomena, the components of exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity can be applied.

For the sake of illustration, we provide three examples of how to apply the vulnerability model to the specific geographical Mediterranean region. Given the nutrition and food security-driven perspective of this work, three main *issues* critical to the food system, namely supply, accessibility and nutritional value, are assessed, considering the three components of vulnerability. Each issue is analyzed against

three different landscape *drivers* of change, respectively climate change, price volatility and nutritional transition and changing consumption patterns. This selection of driver/issue combinations, restricted to three for the sake of illustration, does not presume that the drivers cannot have impacts on several issues.

Food supply-related vulnerability to climate change.

National food supply rests on food production, stocks and imports (minus exports). It relies also on quantities used from feed, seeds and transformation. Depending on the agrofood policy strategies and on their financial system conditions, a national food system can be vulnerable because of several factors or drivers affecting food supply. The conceptual model provides an approach that develops a series of questions. A pertinent question can be: To which extent are the Mediterranean countries vulnerable to climate change in order to supply sufficient food commodities?

Given the crucial issue around water supply in the Mediterranean region, geographical indicators of the availability and quality of water can be considered a relevant measure of the exposure of a national (or a sub-national) food system to climate change in terms of provisioning of food. Consequently, sensitivity to this exposure can be expressed according to the specific level of consumption of water-demanding commodities by the households or the agro-industry. In response, agrobiodiversity could be an indicator of adaptive capacity to climate change, based on the assumption that biodiversity increases the stocks of crop material to draw upon to select or develop more drought-resistant crops. Ability to import from less exposed agricultural systems to climate change might be another indication of adaptive capacity.

Food accessibility-related vulnerability to international price volatility.

Food accessibility involves both physical access and affordability for individuals to adequate resource of food. A research question that emerges can be the following: To which extent are the Mediterranean countries vulnerable, considering their economic constraints, biophysical conditions and social habits, in their access to adequate food in the face of high price volatility? Given the high cereal import dependency of some Mediterranean countries (for human consumption, industry demand and animal feeding), exposure could be assessed by considering the caloric share of cereals in a

representative household's food basket: The more cereals consumed, the higher the exposure for import-dependent countries. Price elasticities for cereals might offer a proxy for countries' sensitivity to fluctuating international cereal prices. Conversely, analyzing food consumption patterns, and households' capacity to shift towards cheaper or locally available food, while meeting the same caloric and nutritional requirements, may indicate strong adaptive capacities. Cross-price elasticities illustrate substitution possibilities. Countries can enhance this adaptive capacity by implementing food policies that diversify supply sources, by acting directly on food prices (e.g. subsidies), by providing social nets for the population (e.g. food stamps) or promoting diversity in consumption patterns.

Nutritional quality-related vulnerability to nutritional transition and changing consumption patterns.

Utilization encompasses all the factors related to how food is consumed and involves quality elements. In a nutrition-driven approach we consider also nutritional values of foods and adequacy of diets to nutrient recommendations. Therefore, the research question in our specific context can be the following: In which way and to which extent are the Mediterranean countries vulnerable, considering nutritional value and nutrient adequacy, to nutritional transition and changing consumption patterns?

Over the past fifty years the Mediterranean region has undergone important structural demographic and spatial transformations with an increasing share of its population now located in urban centers. Urbanization trends can be suggested as a proxy for exposure to changing food consumption habits, on the assumption that urban and rural consumption patterns are significantly different. Correlated with urbanization, industry and labor structures can be selected to indicate to which extent Mediterranean countries are exposed to nutritional transition. Subsequently, countries and populations manifest sensitivity to these exposures with critical data on the prevalence of health problems directly related to diet, such as obesity or cardiovascular diseases. Governments, policymakers and individuals can implement a set of tools to enhance adaptive capacity, such as ensuring an efficient health system, improving education and promoting food and healthy eating and lifestyle habits, guiding consumption patterns, and raising awareness on these issues within institutions and the private sector.

3.6 - Conclusions

While securing food security is considered a global priority, there is contemporary widespread consensus about the importance of sustainability as a goal for food systems. This chapter provides a conceptual hierarchical framework for modeling the complex relationships between food and nutrition security and sustainability. It initially analyzed the internationally acknowledged concepts of sustainable development and food security, describing the interconnectedness between them that recent notions such as sustainable food security or sustainable diets try to capture.

Relying on an approach of the concept of sustainability as a system property allowing a desirable state to be “*sustained*” over generations, assessment methodologies should reflect the conditions of a system from a holistic and dynamic perspective. Calling on elements from the vulnerability and resilience literature, the proposed framework sequentially disentangles the exposure, sensitivity and coping/adaptive capacities of a specific food system to identified stressors or drivers of change jeopardizing critical food and nutrition security outcomes.

This approach entails also the assessment of sustainability with regard to a suitable temporal and spatial scale. Drivers affecting the sustainability of the food systems have multiple origins. The proposed framework hierarchically clarifies the different scale at which drivers and issues interact in a circular way with feedback loops. While suitable for expressing the global food-related concerns of a geographical region, it points out the need for assessment tools adapted to context-specific questions. Main data and general insights of the situation of the Mediterranean region help underline the main critical issues related to food and nutrition security facing the agro-food system in the region.

A quantitative method is proposed for assessing sustainability of food and nutrition outcomes by means of a precise correlation between the three components of exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacities, which can ultimately be aggregated in a composite index. The joint assessment of food insecurity and unsustainability can be expressed through the language of vulnerability and resilience, as the degree to which

a system is exposed and sensitive to dynamic phenomena, while considering its capability to respond and adapt. This approach provides the concepts fundamental to the development of potential indicators or metrics of sustainable diets and food systems, whose primary goal is to ensure food security and good nutrition for a healthy and active life.

Preface to Chapter 4

The processes underlying environmental, economic and social unsustainability derive in part from a shared food system. Building sustainable food systems has become a key endeavor to redirect our food systems and policies towards better-adjusted goals and improved societal welfare. Food systems act as complex social-ecological systems, involving multiple interactions between human and natural components. Policy needs to strengthen the perception of humanity and nature as interdependent and interacting. The systemic nature of these interactions calls for systems approaches and integrated assessment tools. Identifying and modeling the intrinsic properties of the food system that will ensure that its essential outcomes will be maintained or enhanced over time, across generations, can help organizations and governmental institutions track progress towards sustainability and set policies that encourage positive transformations. This chapter proposes a conceptual model that articulates crucial vulnerability and resilience factors to global environmental and socio-economic changes, postulating specific food and nutrition security issues as priority food systems' outcomes. Acknowledging the systemic dimension of sustainability, the approach allows considering causal factors dynamics. In a stepwise approach, a logical application is schematized to three Mediterranean countries, namely Spain, France and Italy.

Chapter 4

Modeling Sustainable Food Systems⁹

⁹ *This chapter is adapted from:
Prosperi P. & Allen T., Modeling Sustainable Food Systems (Submitted to a peer-reviewed scientific journal on December 2014).*

4.1 - Introduction

Sustainability has become a guiding principle and main goal for human development. Environmental degradation, social distress and economic fluctuation are worldwide concerns challenging conventional views on development and forcing reconsideration of our everyday behaviors. Rapid climate change has been occurring for the past few decades, and is predicted to continue and possibly accelerate (IPCC, 2013). Global biodiversity is declining, with substantial ongoing losses of populations, species and habitats (UNEP, 2012). Increasing land clearance for crop cultivation has been leading to habitat loss and may ultimately result in the loss of plant varieties. Policy needs to strengthen the perception of humanity and nature as interdependent and interacting. This requires revisiting our policies and behaviors, and developing adaptive management approaches acknowledging the systemic and dynamic nature of current changes.

Agriculture and food systems are at the center of the debates around sustainability. The processes underlying environmental, economic and social unsustainability derive in part from a shared food system. The increase in food supply has come with important trade-offs. Processes along the food chain, from agricultural production to food consumption, produce other outputs than food that are returned to the natural environment, such as pollution or waste. Food waste only would represent around 3-5% of global warming impacts, more than 20% of biodiversity pressure, and 30% of all of the world's agricultural land (European Commission, 2014). Meanwhile, 842 million people still suffer from undernourishment (FAO, 2013a) while obesity has become a significant public health issue with 500 million obese adults (Finucane et al., 2011). Building sustainable food systems has become a popular motto and key endeavor to redirect our food systems and policies towards better-adjusted goals and improved societal welfare.

A sustainable food system can be defined as one that *“provides healthy food to meet current food needs while maintaining healthy ecosystems that can also provide food for generations to come, with minimal negative impact to the environment; encourages local production and distribution infrastructures; makes nutritious food*

available, accessible, and affordable to all; is humane and just—protecting farmers and other workers, consumers, and communities” (Story et al., 2009). The food system is highly complex, driven by many economic, socio-cultural and environmental factors, which are both internal and external to its boundaries. The systemic nature of these interactions calls for systems approaches and integrated assessment tools to guide change.

Many intricately related factors are involved in getting food from farm to consumer, including the inputs, processes and outcomes of food systems, including nutrition and health. Food systems act as complex social-ecological systems, involving multiple interactions between human and natural components. Better understanding these drivers and how they interact to influence activities and outcomes of the food system, can help to improve public policies. Efforts to define, measure and model progress towards sustainability have led to the development of a variety of indicators and models that monitor and simulate (some of) these aspects of sustainability. In this chapter, we present an additional approach that consider vulnerability and resilience as the operating concepts to model the systemic factors that lead to final food systems’ outcomes, such as food and nutrition security.

Food and nutrition security remains a crucial policy issue in every country and the current global crisis of malnutrition is an urgent concern both in developed and developing countries. The proponents of the “*Sustainable Diets*” agenda – a closely related concept highlighting the role of consumers in defining sustainable options – provide in particular a food and nutrition security-orientated perspective on the question of the sustainability of food systems (FAO & Bioversity, 2012; Johnston et al., 2014). Transforming the abstract concept of sustainability into descriptive objectives, this chapter proposes a conceptual model that articulates crucial vulnerability and resilience factors to global environmental and socio-economic changes in the Mediterranean region, postulating specific food and nutrition security issues as priority food systems’ outcomes. Identifying and modeling the intrinsic properties of the food system that will ensure that its essential outcomes will be maintained or enhanced over time, across generations, can help organizations and governmental institutions track progress towards sustainability and set policies that will encourage positive transformations. The Latin Arc countries – Spain, France and

Italy – have been selected as the study area for the biophysical and socioeconomic common features of this transnational area.

The first section of the chapter reviews the background and theory of sustainability, recalling that assessment exercises aim at identifying fundamental systemic properties. We discuss in particular the concepts of vulnerability and resilience proposed in social-ecological system frameworks as key concepts for sustainability assessment. Building on dynamic system theory, we then suggest a formal representation of the overall food system to structure its different elements; clarify the distinctions between input, state and output variables; and formalize the scale at which systems' dynamics are operating. In the third section, we present a stepwise application of the model, identifying specific drivers and issues for the Latin Arc and formulating explicit interactions. We finally motivate this approach in the discussion section.

4.2 - Identifying the fundamental sustainability properties of the food system

Sustainability as a system property

The multidimensional nature of sustainable development – which has to satisfy several economic development, social equity, and environmental protection goals – is generally emphasized. Proponents of sustainable agriculture have for instance proposed alternative farming practices, which are less environmentally impacting but also embedded in new sets of values and carrying other visions of organization in society. These renewed approaches to agriculture – such as organic farming, low-input agriculture, biodynamic agriculture, regenerative agriculture, permaculture, agroecology, etc. – are interesting crucial initiatives rooted in the ground. Yet, sustainability in agriculture cannot be defined per se by the simple adherence to one of these approaches; these are propositions of solutions towards sustainability.

The most frequently quoted definition of sustainability comes from Our Common Future, also known as the Brundtland Report (UN, 1987). Human development must

meet “*the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*”. This forward-looking imperative highlights the inter-generational and inter-temporal dimensions of sustainability, which thus infer that stewardship of both natural and human resources is of prime importance to ensure long-term development. When applied to the agricultural and food sector, Conway’s frequently quoted definition of agro-ecosystem sustainability refers to “*the ability of a system to maintain productivity in spite of a major disturbance, such as caused by intensive stress or a large perturbation*” (Conway, 1985). Hansen (1996) further interprets sustainability as a system’s ability to continue over time. The concept of agricultural and food sustainability refers to a property of a system, rather than an approach to agriculture. Only such an understanding can offer a way out of the logical flaw of judging the sustainability of approaches that have been defined in the first place as sustainable, and help assess the contribution of these approaches towards sustainability.

Sustainability is a property of a system that is open to interactions with the external. It is the dynamic preservation, over time, of the intrinsic identity of the system among perpetual change (Gallopín, 2003). Multiple factors influence the course of human-environment interactions, which are further complicated by the presence of co-evolving causal forces. Research in both the natural and social sciences uses the idea of a system to explain complex dynamics. A system is a network of multi variables that are connected to each other through causal relationships. Modern societies depend on complex systems to provide food (Fraser et al., 2005). Food systems encompass an array of activities from sowing through to waste disposal management, including production, processing, packaging and distributing, and retail and consumption (Ingram, 2008). Furthermore, global environmental and socioeconomic changes are occurring concurrently, affecting food activities. Food systems, in turn, have an impact on the environment, as activities and outcomes are also drivers of global environmental change, engendering feedback loops and cross-scale interactions. If assessing sustainability is about understanding these dynamics to gauge the ability of a system to maintain or enhance essential outcomes, it requires viewing the system as a whole. System thinking can be a useful approach to capture causal loops, where the effects of the last element influence the input of the first element. The coupled Human-Environment System or the Social-Ecological System

(SES) (Holling, 1996; Turner et al., 2003; Ericksen, 2008c; Ostrom, 2009) approaches allow moving away from looking at isolated events and their causes, and looking at systems made up of interacting parts. The analysis and the assessment of the sustainability of the food system are here conducted through the application of a SES framework.

A social-ecological framework

SES frameworks originate from ecosystem management and Ecology. SESs can be defined as complex human–nature adaptive systems linked by dynamic processes and reciprocal feedback mechanisms, with a substantial exchange of energy and materials across boundaries (Berkes et al., 2000; Folke, 2006). A crucial challenge towards sustainability of food systems is the management of dynamics originating from both global and internal changes, and their different synergistic impacts on systems' outcomes. Only a better understanding of these processes will help estimating and forecasting resulting tradeoffs between human wellbeing and ecosystem services, economic performances and environmental impacts. Vulnerability and resilience have emerged in recent years as one of the principal SES framing concepts for research on global change (Donning, 2000; O'Brien & Leichenko, 2000; McCarthy et al., 2001; Schroeter et al., 2005; Polsky et al., 2007; Turner et al., 2003). Vulnerability/resilience assessment and modeling are today acknowledged methods to explore sustainability of SES. There are several illustrations of approaches analyzing across food systems their vulnerability and resilience to global socioeconomic and biophysical changes in order to explore sustainability, highlighting key system processes and characteristics (Ericksen, 2008b; Darnhofer et al., 2010; Allouche, 2011).

Vulnerability and resilience constitute different but overlapping research themes (Turner, 2010). Both address the consequences and the responses of system to social and/or environmental changes. Their continuing differences in approach to social-ecological dimensions of change are still in discussion (Miller et al., 2010). For a comprehensive review, please consult Alwang et al. (2001). Ericksen (2008c) argues that the vulnerability approach “*frames the consequences of environmental change for food systems in the context of socioeconomic and political change so as to understand the synergistic effects of the multiple stresses that interact with food systems,*

sometimes making these systems vulnerable” or not. The common ground of (almost) all approaches to vulnerability considers it as an “*intrinsic characteristic of a system*” at risk. The conditions and properties of the exposed system – or element of the system – are the crucial features to be identified and assessed (Birkmann, 2006). In the meantime, vulnerability deals also with features linked to capacities of the system to anticipate and cope with the impact of a change or hazard (Bohle, 2001). This allows flexibility in applying vulnerability for largely different elements, such as structures and physical characteristics of buildings, ecosystems and environmental functions and services, but also communities and social groups.

The concept of resilience, originating in Ecology, is central to visualizing the dynamics of the coupled system. Resilience is interpreted differently by SES scholars but commonly recognized as a multi-attribute concept, composed of: i) ability to cope with disturbance or change and retain control of function and structure; ii) capacity to self-organize; and iii) capacity to learn and adapt (Walker et al., 2002; Berkes et al., 2003; Walker, 2004). Both vulnerability and resilience stress the need for methods and metrics that do not just express final results or outcomes, but provides a system of information that can be interpreted in a causal framework modeling interactions between different variables.

Building on Turner et al. (2003), the conceptualization of sustainability as the dynamic ability of a given system to maintain or enhance its essential outcomes over time, allows vulnerability and resilience theories to provide the elements to understand the mechanisms likely to affect activities within the system. The challenge for SES framework analysis here is to identify the pathways leading to vulnerability, and the characteristics and opportunities ensuring resilience of the food system in a context of change. Since contemporary food systems are characterized by cross-scale interactions and feedbacks across time and space and between the social and ecological components (Cash, 2006), efforts to rate how changes affect the performance of social, ecological and economic systems over time are key for the process towards sustainable development (Gallopín, 2003). At the same time, desired systemic properties can be expanded by investing specific components of systems (Marshke & Berkes, 2006). In particular, the vulnerability framework can be disaggregated in several dimensions according to different drivers of change:

vulnerability to climate change, vulnerability to price volatility, vulnerability to demographic transformations, etc.

Vulnerability/Resilience for the analysis of food system sustainability

Vulnerability in SES depends on the stress to which a system is exposed, its sensitivity, and its adaptive capacity and resilience opportunities. In line with the internationally recognized IPCC definition, De Lange et al. (2010) state that “*Vulnerability is generally considered as a function of exposure to a stressor, effect (also termed sensitivity or potential impact) and recovery potential (also termed resilience or adaptive capacity)*”. This is a clear and synthetic definition of vulnerability in its components that will be fundamental for the modeling exercise. Exposure refers to the existence or presence of elements, in the system, that are susceptible to be adversely affected by the occurrence of environmental or socio-political stresses (IPCC, 2012). It is a necessary but not sufficient first condition for a given system to experience stress or perturbations. Sensitivity is the degree to which a system is potentially affected by its exposure to a stress or perturbation (Adger, 2006). It can be understood as the potential magnitudes of consequences of being exposed (Downing, 1991). Indicators of sensitivity measure generally impacts. See Prospero et al. (2014), or chapter 3, for further clarification.

Recovery potential is composed of adaptive capacities and resilience opportunities. These are related to the potential of the system to respond to changes, including adaptation and transformation (IPCC, 2001; Burton et al., 2002; Adger et al., 2003). Adaptation captures the capacity of a system to learn and adjust to changing processes, and “*continue developing within the current stability domain or basin of attraction*” (Berkes et al., 2003; cited in Folke et al., 2010). Systems will absorb disturbances and retain their original structures and processes. Transformation has been defined as “*the capacity to create a fundamentally new system when ecological, economic, or social structures make the existing system untenable*” (Walker et al., 2004). Transformation is then necessary for the system to maintain its functionalities. Resilience is more specifically concerned with the ability of a system to “*absorb shocks, to avoid crossing a threshold into an alternate and possibly irreversible new state, and to regenerate after disturbance*” (Resilience Alliance, 2010). The ability of a system and its component parts to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from

the effects of a hazardous event in a timely and efficient manner, including through ensuring the preservation, restoration, or improvement of its essential basic structures and functions.




Figure 4 - A causal pathway (Adapted from Fussel & Klein, 2006)

Exposure refers to relational variables, i.e. elements that characterize the relationship between the system and its environment (Gallopín, 2006). It is the first point of contact between the stress or perturbation, and the system. Although commonly included in vulnerability (Chambers, 1989; Adger & Kelly, 1999; Turner et al., 2003; IPCC, 2001; Polsky & Eakin, 2011), exposure has recently been excluded from vulnerability in the last IPCC definition to actually align the understanding of vulnerability as a pure attribute of a system existing prior to and apart from the disturbance. In the earlier IPCC definitions, reference was indeed made as well to information on the change itself (e.g. its magnitude, rate of variation, duration, etc.), as well as on the presence of elements that are exposed. The question whether vulnerability is determined purely by the internal characteristics of a system, or whether it also depends on the likelihood that a system will encounter a particular hazard, is a long-standing dispute (Brooks, 2003). We will consider here the conventional framework for vulnerability. The understanding of exposure as the first interface with a specific driver of change helps differentiating it from the sensitivity

or resilience components, which might be influenced by other drivers of change (Fussler, 2006).

When a food system fails to deliver food security or has the potential to do so in the face of a perturbation, the system can be considered to be vulnerable (Ericksen, 2008a). Foran et al. (2014) state that “*The social-ecological system considers the human-environment interface as a coupled "system" where socio-economic and biophysical drivers of change interact to influence activities and outcomes, of the food system, that subsequently influence drivers of changes in a feedback loops dynamic*”. Such systems can exhibit coherent behaviors. Constituting elements interact in a complex but lawful way. How can we account for the confluence of so many factors simultaneously? Resolving these issues is beyond the scope of traditional, linear, closed-system methods. Viewing food system sustainability from a dynamic systems perspective makes it possible to examine non-linear, complex, and reciprocally causal processes more explicitly. In the next section, we build on system thinking to identify the main variables to formalize and operationalize the abstract and multidimensional concept of sustainable food systems.

4.3 - Formalizing the food system as a dynamic system

What is a dynamic system?

The term “*dynamic system*” – or “*dynamical system*” – refers to a set of interacting elements that change over time. The first assumption of the dynamic approach is that evolving systems are complex, i.e. composed of many individual elements embedded within, and open to, a complex environment. These elements function together as collective units, producing outputs in relation to inputs through processes endogenous to the system. Changes in one variable will impact all other variables of the system, with possible lagged and multi-scale effects. It can include natural as well as human components. Outcomes thus emerge from the complex interactions among system elements and are not just the product of external causes.

The field of dynamic systems is vast. From initial work in cybernetics (Wiener, 1948; Ashby, 1956) and system theory (Kalman et al., 1962; Bertalanffy, 1968), system thinking grows directly from advance in Mathematics and Physics. Psychology also uses system-based approaches to explore human behavioral patterns. The more technical term “*dynamic system modeling*” refers to a class of mathematical equations that describe time-based systems with particular properties. Systems can be classified in different ways. System models can be either continuous or discrete. They can be linear or nonlinear, and time-invariant or time-variant. Systems can be static if its output depends only on its present input. On the contrary, a dynamic system requires past input to determine the system output.

The approach begins with defining problems dynamically, proceeds through modeling stages, then builds confidence in the model and its policy implications. As highlighted in the previous section, the idea of change is key to sustainability. Sustainability is about maintaining and/or enhancing essential functions or outcomes over time, taking into account environmental, social, and economic constraints and assets. Food system sustainability can be viewed as the *ex ante* assessment of potential change in its functioning, given external conditions and internal dialectic. More precisely, sustainability approach and assessment aim at capturing (and protecting) the properties or features of the system crucial to supporting life, and food security in particular as the first reason for being of food systems (Haddad, 2013). This requires examining how the multicausality of dynamic processes within complex system, such as the food system, could help understand changes over time towards food security.

A mathematical representation

Modeling dynamic systems is about representing mathematically the dynamics between the inputs and outputs of the system of interest. Figure 5 shows a simplified graphical representation of a dynamic system such as the food system. It captures a closed-loop system, with feedback from outputs to inputs. A “*controller*” can monitor the output of the system by adjusting control variables u to achieve a specified response. When modeling input-output systems, in addition to an observed set of variables internal to the system that can be levers of action, external drivers can enter the model as inputs (Ionescu et al., 2009). If considered exposed to external influences, the system is said to be non-autonomous (Stankovski, 2014). A dynamical

system can also be possibly perturbed by unobserved forces or noise. For the sake of simplicity, the presentation below is made under deterministic assumptions. For approaches motivated by stochastic models, see Aström (2012) and references therein.

Not all variables that appear in a model are of interest. The behaviors are usually captured by defining appropriate outputs. We choose outputs in order to describe those quantities that get focus. Food security can be considered as the principal outcome of food systems, if these systems are defined broadly and generically (Haddad, 2013; Allen et al., 2014; Burlingame and Dernini, 2011). These outcomes are also determined by decisions and actions taken along the activities of the food system, but also by global socio-economic, political and environmental drivers through their impacts on the food system (Ingram et al., 2010). Such drivers might also impact food security directly.




Figure 5 - Basic representation of a dynamic system (adapted from Rastoin and Ghersi, 2010)

The state of the system at a given time, is the extra piece of information needed, so that given the input trajectory, it is possible to determine the behavior of the system over time. We call x the state variables of the system. These variables provide the minimum amount of information that fully describes the system at any given time t .

A mathematical description of the system in terms of a minimum set of variables x , together with knowledge of those variables at an initial time t_0 and the system inputs for time t , are deemed sufficient to predict the future system states and outputs for all time t .

Output functions are commonly used to characterize the input-output relationships. Dynamics of the system models are usually represented using differential or difference equations (with time as the independent variable). These equations, known as the transition functions, are formulated in state-space form that has a certain matrix structure.

The output equations are commonly written as¹⁰:

$$y_t = h(x_t, u_t, e_t) \quad (4.1)$$

where h is a vector function with n components for the n outputs y of interest. All variables typically vary with time t .

Transition functions map the state of the model today into the state tomorrow. In vector notation, the set of differential equations may be written as:

$$\dot{x} = \frac{dx}{dt} = f(x_t, u_t, e_t) \quad (4.2)$$

where f is any vector function. The system state at any instant t may be interpreted as a point in an m -dimensional state-space¹¹, and the dynamic state response x_t can be interpreted as a trajectory traced out in the state-space (Rowell, 2002).

Another two equations (4.3 and 4.4) can be added to the usual differential equation to map the feedback to inputs (Ionescu et al., 2009). The problem of parameter estimation pertains to the identification of data and determination of numerical values of the elements of these matrices.

¹⁰ The notation below is a vector notation, which allows us to represent the system in a compact form.

¹¹ With m variables determining the state of the system.

$$\dot{e} = \frac{de}{dt} = g(x_t, u_t, e_t) \quad (4.3)$$

$$\dot{u} = \frac{du}{dt} = \emptyset(x_t, e_t) \quad (4.4)$$

Categorizing variables, constructing a composite indicator

As explained in the second section, we are looking for the essential variables describing a system and the variables we can act upon to redirect food system toward looked upon objectives. In the language of dynamic systems, we are looking for x and u , the state and control variables. These are the essential features of the system that determine the trajectory of the system and characterize sustainability. A system can be understood by the response pattern following a perturbation. Perturbation reveals the nature of the system. To capture something of the internal dialectic of system, we suggest fixing some crucial external variables, or drivers of changes e , and seeing how these affect one of the system outcomes, i.e. our outcome of interest: food and nutrition security.

To highlight the internal dialect of food systems, we suggest using the concepts from the already existing vulnerability/resilience framework to clarify what we would like to proxy; literally, vulnerability is the propensity or predisposition of a social-ecological system to be adversely affected by a change. Some global processes are significant drivers of change. There is high confidence that these include population growth, rapid and inappropriate urban development, international financial pressures, increases in socioeconomic inequalities, trends and failures in governance, etc. Vulnerability describes a set of conditions of people that derive from the historical and prevailing cultural, social, environmental, political, and economic contexts

As presented above, vulnerability/resilience is made up of three essential components: Exposure, sensitivity and resilience. Thus, vulnerability V can be regarded as a function of the components recovery potential (RP) and potential impacts (PI), which in turn are expressed by exposure (E) and sensitivity (S).

$$V = f(PI, RP), \quad \text{with } PI = f(E, S) \quad (4.5)$$

The vulnerability/resilience framework can first help structuring the different elements, i.e. categorizing variables with regards to others, and thus constructing a composite indicator in the absence of statistical application able to reveal the structure of the data, though procedures such as Principal Component Analysis (PCA). See (Prosperi et al., 2014) for a proposition of composite indicator. Second, the vulnerability/resilience framework allows articulating the different scales at which food systems are operating or embedded in. While defining system boundaries, attention should be paid to system level and spatial scale. The spatial scale at which the system is defined is crucial, as it will help identify the external variables affecting the system.




Figure 6 - A Sustainable food system framework (adapted from Turner et al., 2003; Ericksen, 2008a; Ingram, 2011).

A map of the feedback structure of the system is a starting point. Building on the GECAFS food systems approach (Ericksen, 2008a,b; Ingram, 2011), coupled with Turner et al.'s (2003) conceptualization of vulnerability, we suggest the framework represented in Figure 6 to model food systems' dynamics. Dynamic systems consider mainly two types of variables: endogenous and exogenous variables. Endogenous variables are the elements that are interactive within the boundaries of the system of interest. In the case at hand, these variables are defined at the national or sub-national level. On the contrary, exogenous variables are factors that are not enclosed by the

system boundary but influence the system. Exogenous variables are on the other hand not directly influenced by variables enclosed within the system. Outcomes from the food system activities may however contribute to these external drivers, but geographically specified food systems are assumed *driver-takers*¹². In our specific case, these external drivers of change are at the broader regional level or global scale. The three components of vulnerability – exposure, sensitivity and resilience – are the intrinsic features of the system that mediate the impact of the drivers of change on the food system’s outcomes. These can be either state or control variables.

In this section, we specifically consider the large body of research on dynamic systems, and aim at applying this modeling approach to the assessment of food system sustainability. To assess the sustainability of the food system, we need to understand what might affect its processes, to which extent the drivers of change impact the food system’s outcomes, and how actors respond to these pressures. Answering the question that was first posed by Carpenter et al. (2001) – “*the resilience of what to what*” or, in a similar vein, “*vulnerability of what to what*” – can provide useful guidance. These questions, in a step-wise approach, can activate the framework and model key issues related to food and nutrition security.

4.4 - Application: Addressing context-specific issues

A stepwise approach

Schroeter et al. (2005) developed an eight step methodological process to conduct vulnerability assessments. Following Schroeter et al. (2005), we propose a similarly structured and systematic method to apply the conceptual elements described in the above sections. These steps are preliminary to the identification of appropriate statistical variables, data application and scenario analysis. They involve proceeding in four stages:

1. Defining a study area and scale of analysis;
2. Identifying essential drivers of change;

¹² In the same way as consumers or producers are considered price-takers, in perfect competition, although price is collectively defined when overall demand and supply meet.

3. Identifying essential food systems' outcomes;
4. Developing of a causal model by selecting essential interactions driver/outcome and examining respective systems' exposure, sensitivity and recovery potential.

Sustainability is usually conceived in place-specific terms. In the proposed framework, exposure to risks is dependent on the geographic context, and sensitivity and adaptive capacity are shaped by social and institutional factor elements (Eakin, 2010). The first step includes choosing a scale of analysis and drawing artificial boundaries around the coupled human-environment system of interest. Every system incorporates some sub-systems, which are themselves based on components, which are in fact sub-systems, etc. Two points are crucial to consider when defining the system level and spatial scale of analysis: i) who are the intended users of the measurement set and ii) what is the degree of granularity of the food system's outcomes to be address.

This work is part of the project “*Advancing through sustainable diets*” that has a focus on France and Spain. Given that the assessment is targeting policy-makers as main users, we opted for analysis at the population scale rather than the individual scale. It has thus been decided that the final level of analysis will be national or sub-national (“*Comunidad autónoma*” in Spain, “*Région*” in France and “*Regione*” in Italy). To draw the geographical boundaries, it has then been argued that the entities had to be subjected to similar type of food system concerns and exposed to similar type of drivers of change or factors of risk. Italy has thus been added to France and Spain as a possible study zone, on the ground that the three countries share similar food and nutrition security issues.

The northern coastal area of the western Mediterranean basin is commonly referred to as the “*Latin Arc*”. It includes the coastal regions from Andalusia to Sicily. It is considered a homogeneous geographical entity closely related to certain summary representations of the European territory, at the regional level, proposed by geographers and urban scholars (Camagni and Capello, 2011; Barrio, 2004; Daviet, 1994; Voiron-Canicchio, 1994; Cortesi et al., 1995; Vanolo, 2007). It is also recognized as a consistent territory by institutions and local stakeholders for

transregional policy and cooperation programmes (e.g. Western Mediterranean and Latin Alps, INTERREG II C Programme, EU: ESPON, 2010; Benoit and Comeau, 2005), sharing common cultural, institutional, socioeconomic and biogeographical determinants.

As mentioned previously, the spatial scale at which the system is defined drives the identification of the external variables likely to affect the system. Sub-global/regional is a natural level for studies of SES. The Mediterranean basin has been identified as one of the most prominent “hotspots” in future climate change projections (Giorgi, 2006), but also in terms of environmental unsustainability due to intense human activity and agricultural exploitation (Salvati, 2014). It has also been recognized as one of the first 25 Global Biodiversity hotspots in the world (Myers et al., 2000).

Identifying global and regional drivers of change affecting the food system outcomes

The second and third steps are crucial in applying the conceptual framework. It involves answering the question “*vulnerability/resilience of what to what*”. It requires identifying the main drivers of change simultaneously as the food system-specific issues of concern that the drivers are likely to affect (Schroeter et al., 2005). Several global and regional drivers of change affect the structure and processes of the food systems, putting at risk context-specific food and nutrition security outcomes. Based on an extensive literature review and discussions conducted over two focus groups gathering a group of seven experts, four critical food and nutrition security issues and four drivers of change have been identified at a sub-regional level. An exhaustive and rigorous literature review, specific for the Mediterranean region, highlighted existing urgent issues and crucial drivers of change (CIHEAM, 2012; SCAR, 2008; PARME, 2011). The selected four main drivers of change are the following:

Water depletion:

Water depletion is “*a use or removal of water from a water basin that renders it unavailable for further use*” (Molden, 1997). The Mediterranean region is greatly concerned by water stress and scarcity (FAO, 2011a; PARME, 2011). The Western and Central Mediterranean areas are particularly subject to increasing water needs for domestic use, touristic and agricultural activities (Sousa et al., 2011). Water demand

doubled in 50 years in Mediterranean countries (UNEP/Plan Bleu, 2006). The food system production and consumption patterns are increasingly water demanding. Irrigated agriculture only accounts for 70% of the consumption of freshwater resources globally (OECD, 2013). In the EU-15, 85% of irrigated land is located in the Mediterranean area (France, Spain, Italy, Portugal, and Greece).

Water availability is closely related to climate change trends altering precipitation patterns and rainwater (Freibauer et al., 2011). Increase in the concentration of agrochemicals, soil nutrients, and a number of water pollutions are also observed, impacting the quality of water and further contributing to water scarcity (Bates et al., 2008).

Biodiversity loss:

Biodiversity¹³ loss is defined as “*the long-term or permanent qualitative or quantitative reduction in components of biodiversity and their potential to provide goods and services, to be measured at global, regional and national levels*” (CBD, 2004). Biodiversity is globally at risk, with 20930 species and ecological communities known to be threatened (IUCN, 2013). The Mediterranean region has been in particular catalogued as one of the 25 biodiversity hotspots of the planet with an exceptional diversity of endemic species within ecosystems that are at great risk, with 19% of the species threatened for extinction (IUCN, 2008).

Biodiversity loss is cogenerated by climate change, environment depletion and water stress. It is strongly related to modern food production and consumption patterns (Altieri, 2000) that have become more intensive and homogenizing. The loss of agrobiodiversity is interlinked also with a number of causal factors, including habitat depletion, change in land use and management, GHG emissions, etc. (Tilman et al., 2002; Frison et al., 2011).

Food price volatility:

Food price volatility refers to large and atypical¹⁴ “*variations in agricultural prices over time*” (FAO, 2011b). Food prices increased sharply in 2008, with the FAO food

¹³ Biodiversity is defined as the existence of species, genetic, and ecosystem diversity in an area (Swingland, 2000).

¹⁴ See FAO report *Price Volatility in Food and Agricultural Markets: Policy Responses* (Annex A, 2011) for a more technical definitions of price volatility.

price index breaking the threshold of 200¹⁵ for the first time (SCAR, 2008). The Mediterranean region is a particularly vulnerable region with regards to price volatility, in particular due to its cereal dependence, nutrition transition, population growth, urbanization and climate change effects (Padilla et al., 2008).

Climate change impacts, changing trade patterns, new dietary trends and growing demand for biofuels are often invoked as among the causes of food price volatility. The rising demand for food and fuel, originated from consumption and industrial purposes, is engendered by both population growth and changes in food consumption patterns (Brown, 2008). Furthermore speculation on commodity markets and reduction of food stocks are also crucial determinants of price variations (Robles et al., 2009).

Changing food consumption patterns:

Changing food consumption¹⁶ patterns refers to the changing structure of global food consumption, related to changing dominant values, attitude and behaviors (Kearney, 2010). Globally, food consumption patterns are changing both in terms of total amount and composition. Worldwide consumers have switched from considering animal protein a luxury food item to considering it a regular part of the diet (Meade et al., 2014).

Food choices are deeply embedded in social norms. Individual food consumption patterns – i.e. diets – are the results of changes in culture, social values and representations attached to food consumption, driving effectively behavioral changes and resulting in modified diets. The global changes in food consumption patterns – some talk about a “*westernization*” of food consumption patterns (Drewnowski & Popkin, 1997) – are largely driven by demographic factors and income growth, and related to changes in dominant values and lifestyle, influenced by globalization, urbanization, changes in occupational status and employment distribution, and more effective dissemination of information (Meade, 2012).

¹⁵ Base 100: 1998-2000.

¹⁶ This social driver is proposed as one regime driver by the EU-SCAR 2nd Foresight exercise report (2009), closely linked to the other social global driver “changing dominant values”, and is exactly phrased “Consumption quantities and patterns”, referring to literally to “food consumption patterns” and “nutritional transition”.

Identifying food and nutrition security issues

It is important at this point to formalize the hypotheses to be explored. The “*what is vulnerable*” is identified by the functions performed by the ecological and social service delivering entity composed of a number of actors, activities and processes. The system will be considered vulnerable if negative food system outcomes emerge. Food, or more precisely feeding population, is agriculture and food systems’ main reason for being (Haddad, 2013). Human nutrition should be considered one of the most fundamental ecosystem services, or alternatively as dependent on several ecosystem services, including provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural services (Deckelbaum et al., 2006).

Food security, defined as the situation that exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life (FAO, 1996), is a policy issue of importance in just about every country. It can be considered the principal outcome of food systems. It is also important to remember that food security is not just about the amount of food but also depends on the nutritional quality, safety and cultural appropriateness of foods (Liverman & Kapadia, 2010). Investigating the influence of socio-economic and environmental drivers on food and nutrition security, with regards to some essential food system characteristics, can provide an approach to think the causal mechanisms that can lead to unsustainability. As mentioned above, four food and nutrition security issues have been identified as crucial for the Latin Arc countries.

Nutritional quality of the food supply:

The Nutritional quality of food supply refers to the nutritional composition of the food products on the market (Oquali, INRA/ANES). The improvement of the nutritional quality of the food supply is one of the eight specific actions defined by the WHO European Action Plan for Food and Nutrition Policy 2007-2012¹⁷. A balanced diet is

¹⁷ The WHO European Action Plan for Food and Nutrition Policy 2007–2012 defines eight specific actions for “ensuring a safe, healthy and sustainable food supply: improve the availability and affordability of fruit and vegetables; promote the reformulation of mainstream food products; promote appropriate micronutrient fortification of staple food items and develop complementary foods with adequate micronutrient content; improve the nutritional quality of the food supply and food safety in public institutions; ensure that the commercial provision of food products is aligned with food-based dietary guidelines; explore the use of economic tools (taxes, subsidies); establish targeted programmes for the protection of vulnerable and low socioeconomic groups;

achieved through personal habits but also requires that the foods on offer to consumers have a satisfactory nutritional composition. In France, a food quality observatory (Oqali) was set up to monitor the quality of the food supply. Increasing availability and consumption of nutrient-poor and energy-dense foods and beverages lead to enhancement of human health problems, including obesity and non-communicable chronic disease.

Affordability of food:

According to Ingram (2011), affordability of food is “*the purchasing power of households or communities relative to the price of food*”. It refers to the “*economic access*” to food (Foran et al., 2014). Affordability is about food being available at prices that people can afford to pay, and in particular, whether low-income consumers can afford to buy enough nutritious food to meet basic needs (Barling et al., 2010). The determinants of food affordability include pricing policies and mechanisms, seasonal and geographical variations in price, local prices relative to external prices, the form in which households are paid, income and wealth levels (Ingram, 2008). Food affordability and food prices are important determinants of food choices (Lee et al., 2013).

Dietary energy balance:

Dietary energy balance refers to the balance between caloric intake and energy expenditure (Patel et al., 2004). Excessive fat accumulation is acknowledged to be a risk factor for various health problems, including CVD, diabetes, cancers and osteoarthritis (WHO, 2014). Obesity has become a significant public health in high and medium income countries, with 500 million adults obese worldwide and more than 1 billion projected by 2030 if no major effort is made (Kelly et al., 2008; Finucane et al., 2011). Body weight results from the integrated effects of food consumption, physical activity and genetics. A range of environmental, social and behavioral factors interact to determine energy intake and expenditure, such as sedentary lifestyles, heavy marketing of both energy-dense foods and fast food outlets, adverse social and economic conditions, the consumption of high-sugar drinks, etc. (Swinburn et al., 2004).

establish intersectoral food safety systems with a farm-to-fork approach and in accordance with the Codex Alimentarius risk analysis framework.”

Satisfaction of cultural food preferences:

Cultural food preferences are environmental factors related to social background, which contribute to food choices and intakes. It is now acknowledged that honoring ethnic and cultural food preferences, compatible with nutritional requirements, is essential for food acceptance and wellbeing. Social and cultural norms have a crucial role in diet (Sobal et al., 1998). Food preferences, socially or culturally determined, are now recognized as a key consideration in food security, as highlighted already in the 1996 definition of food security. Assessing cultural issues surrounding food preferences may also help improve dietary adherence to recommendations.

A causal model

The fourth step is about developing a causal model, formalizing into a model the dynamics of exposure, sensitivity and resilience. The four drivers of change and four food security issues, presented above, are matched to explore their possible causal relationships. The proposed framework aimed at identifying the food system characteristics that make the food system capable of sustaining food and nutrition security outcomes. This can serve to identify warning signals, although the drivers and outcomes of interest will have to be evaluated as well. Results are presented in Table 2.

		<i>Food and Nutrition Security Issues</i>	References
<i>Drivers of change</i>		Nutritional quality of food supply	
WATER DEPLETION	Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributing to decrease of production and productivity of sufficient and nutritious foods. Engendering low dilution capacity and consequent contamination of agrofood products. Impacting the availability of quality foods for poor consumers through higher cost of water. 	(Bates, 2008; SCAR, 2008; Brown, 2008; Ericksen et al., 2010; Wood et al., 2010; PARME, 2011; Dangour et al., 2012; Johnston et al., 2014)
	Recovery potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fostering water productivity and efficiency to guarantee adequate nutritional values of foods. Contrasting water scarcity through agrobiodiversity richness. Enhancing adaptation through food import from water rich countries. Reuse wastewater safely for use as water sources. Focusing on human capacities and institutional framework. 	(Chapagain et al., 2006; SCAR, 2011; Prosperi et al., 2014; UNWATER, 2014)
	Affordability of food		
	Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Altering productivity, prices and trade, and then food availability and affordability. Increasing water prices lead to higher costs of agrofood production and to decrease in food affordability. 	(Ingram & Kapadia, 2010; Wood et al., 2010; SCAR, 2011)
Recovery potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encouraging drought-resistant crops utilization. Fostering food import from water rich countries Improving irrigation efficiency Promoting waste water treatments 	(Hellegers et al., 2008; Waughray, 2011; Yang & Zehnder, 2008; Prosperi et al., 2014)	

		<i>Food and Nutrition Security Issues</i>	References
<i>Drivers of change</i>		Nutritional quality of food supply	
BIODIVERSITY LOSS	Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shifting to ecologically simplified systems based on cereals contributes to poorly diversified diets. Hampering food systems responses against climate change, with consequent impact on productivity. Increasing the dependency on global varieties on external inputs. 	(Randall et al., 1985; Torheim et al., 2000; Pelletier & Frongillo, 2003; Frison et al., 2006; Brunori et al., 2008; Roche et al., 2008; Arimond et al., 2010; Remans et al., 2011; Dangour et al., 2012; SCAR, 2011; Allen et al., 2014; Johnston et al., 2014)
	Recovery potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting agrobiodiverse systems for ecosystem services, food security benefits (nutritional value of foods), the viability of agricultural systems and long-term productivity. Fostering organic farming 	(Thrupp, 2000; Reidsma and Ewert, 2008; Eakin, 2010)
	Satisfaction of cultural food preferences		
	Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Putting at risk cultural traditions and preferences, linked to regional varieties and diets. Homogenizing food production. Contributing to reduce the enormous amount of information, on nutritional and health benefits of the foods that shape the food cultural preferences of people. Decreasing food biodiversity could result in the loss of unique and traditional foods. 	(Kuhnlein et al., 2009; Kearney, 2010; Liverman and Kapadia, 2010; SCAR, 2011; Jacques & Jacques, 2012)
Recovery potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowing how to prepare a more varied diet can influence consumption of different food products. Providing more varied and tasteful diets. Enhancing and keeping traditional food cultures. 	(Termote et al., 2010; Johnston et al., 2014; Khoury et al., 2014)	

		<i>Food and Nutrition Security Issues</i>	References
<i>Drivers of change</i>		Nutritional quality of food supply	
FOOD PRICE VOLATILITY	Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacting food production and consumption. Altering food supply towards disadvantaged groups. Leading to profound changes in the composition and availability of food supplies. Hampering the present agrofood system supply, strongly interlinked with fossil fuels system. 	(DEFRA, 2008; SCAR, 2008; Friel & Lichacz, 2010; WHO, 2014)
	Recovery potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancing dietary diversity for avoiding dependency on few groups of foods. Fostering local provisioning and production, less involved in price variations. 	(Herforth, 2010; Pinstrup-Andersen, 2013)
	Affordability of food		
	Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacting household incomes and purchasing power. Affecting agrofood productivity, and therefore food affordability and availability Exacerbating economic shocks for the poor, who depend on wages and the rest of the economy. Shifting purchasing strategies to lower quality products. 	(Ingram, 2008; SCAR, 2008; UK Cabinet Office, 2008; Wood et al., 2010; HLPE, 2011; SCAR 2011; Lee et al., 2013; Regmi & Meade, 2014)
Recovery potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fostering food industry's focus on consumers and their need for "affordable food of high quality and diversity". Shifting towards cheaper or locally available foods, meeting the same caloric and nutritional requirements. Implement food policies for diversifying supply sources through different strategies (subsidies, food stamps). Promoting diversity in food consumption patterns. 	(European Technology Platform, 2008; Brunori & Guarino, 2010; Prosperi et al., 2014)	

		<i>Food and Nutrition Security Issues</i>	References
<i>Drivers of change</i>		Nutritional quality of food supply	
CHANGES IN FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS	Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Influencing food industry production patterns, overall food security and nutritional characteristics of diets. Shifting the demand towards cereals, simple sugars, animal products and highly processed foods. 	(European Technology Platform, 2008; Brunori & Guarino, 2010; SCAR, 2011; UNEP, 2012; Prosperi et al 2014; WHO, 2014)
	Recovery potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving the understanding of the determinants of consumer choices. Empowering consumers' choice for healthy and safe provided food. Engendering consumption patterns cognizant of the impact of food choice on health. 	(SCAR, 2011; Khoury et al., 2014; Allen et al., 2014)
	Dietary Energy Balance		
	Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing consumption of fats, sugars, sweeteners, animal products, highly processed foods, and in fast foods and vending machines products. Decreasing consumption in plant proteins and of home-prepared foods. Strengthening "obesogenic" environments with little energy expenditure and sedentary lifestyles. Altering frequency and the amounts consumed of foods. Decreasing dietary diversity. 	(Swinburn et al., 1999; UNSCN, 2000; Popkin, 2002; Nielsen & Popkin, 2004; Garrett & Ruel, 2005; Ley et al., 2006; SCAR, 2008; Ericksen et al., 2010; Friel & Lichacz, 2010; Liverman & Kapadia, 2010; PARME, 2011; SCAR 2011; Lozupone et al., 2012; UNEP, 2012; Yatsunencko et al., 2012; Johnston et al., 2014)
Recovery potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fostering public awareness for healthier diets through campaigns and community movements. Enhancing cultural knowledge on preparing varied diets and on nutritional and health benefits of the foods. Promoting weight loss and metabolic health through appropriate changes in the gut microbiota. Supporting guidelines on dietary strategies to counteract overweight and obesity. 	(Barling et al, 2010; Kuhnlein et al., 2009; Obersteiner et al., 2010; Termote et al., 2010; Cardoso et al., 2013; Freeland-Graves & Nitzke, 2013; Lopez-Legarrea et al., 2014)	

Table 2 - Interactions Drivers of change/FNS Issues

These sets of characteristics are indicating how changes in water, biodiversity, food prices and food consumption patterns are transmitted through the food system, including the sequencing of events and the scale of interactions; how the food system is sensitive to these changes; and the adaptive capacity of the food system. This could lead to subsequent work to identify thresholds of change and to model quantitatively the interactions among stressors, attributes, and outcomes, to improve the general understanding of food system sustainability; it more importantly offers the elements that need to be assessed, i.e. the attributes that indicators can be measuring.

4.5- Discussion

Why vulnerability and resilience to assess sustainability?

In this chapter, we propose to analyze and assess the sustainability of food systems using the concepts of vulnerability and resilience. First, vulnerability is not the simple flip side of resilience. Following Turner et al. (2003), we argue that articulating the two – overlapping – concepts provides a more comprehensive framework to capture the features of complex systems, such as food systems, perpetually evolving and re-organizing into unexpected new configurations. The identification of the elements within the system, and assessment of their sensitivity to change, in addition to the capacity of the system to cope, adapt and transform to these changes, are considered key to understanding dynamic systems. Resilience and vulnerability are relatively new, but now fundamental concepts in the contemporary language of sustainability sciences. The links between vulnerability and sustainability have been discussed against the backdrop of a long-standing dispute about the relations between sustainability and resilience. Resilience is commonly accepted as at least a crucial dimension of sustainability. Some argue that resilience of a system constitutes a necessary but not sufficient condition for sustainability (Derissen et al., 2011). How do the concepts of vulnerability and resilience square with the definition of sustainability?

Sustainability is a normative concept that provides a broad framework to guide actions; it requires defining specific goals and their monitoring measures that need to be agreed and acknowledged by all stakeholders (Anderies et al., 2013). The design of legitimate and collective decision processes is crucial to sustainability. On the contrary, resilience and vulnerability as descriptive concepts characterize the dynamic properties of a system, and can thus help define these societal goals. Sustainability and vulnerability/resilience can thus be understood as distinct concepts operating at different levels, the latter concepts providing the elements to inform the decision process intrinsic to the former concept.

Although the concepts of “*vulnerability*” and “*resilience*” have entered the food policy discourse, the influence of SES thinking on policy-maker agendas has otherwise been rather limited (Foran et al., 2014). SES frameworks emphasize complexity and systemic interactions. Applications of these frameworks tend thus to focus on problem identification and improving system understanding (Nadasdy, 2007). As mentioned earlier, food systems are systems of variables connected to each other through causal pathways, which are further complexified by operating at different geographical or time scales. Vulnerability and resilience can be useful approaches to capture these relationships. One key conceptual element of vulnerability/resilience models is a clear distinction between causal events and outcomes (Dilley & Boudreau, 2001); it frames a “*causal factor approach*” that describes the interactions leading to the final outcomes. Exposure, sensitivity and resilience provide the concepts to identify the system’s properties that shape causal pathways towards food system’s outcomes.

Systems behave in a circular organization forming feedback loops. The proposed fragmentation in specific vulnerabilities and resilience factors – through the intersections of different drivers and issues – can induce a certain degree of linearity in causality. Vulnerability and resilience answer questions about mechanisms that operate to produce outcomes under certain specific conditions. As such, it provides policy-makers with a model of highly formalized predictions of the effects of a limited set of variables (Epstein et al., 2013), which can be tested recursively and provide insights into possible feedback. Modelers are generally faced with the dilemma of how comprehensive a model to build: “*one with many variables that ends*

up as a qualitative description, or one with a few key variables that acts quantitatively but lacks comprehensiveness” (Fraser et al., 2005). It has also to be recalled that sustainability as a forward-looking concept requires apprehending the conditions and determinants to maintain systems’ functions over time. By focusing on a number of external forces and highlighting systemic internal dialectic, the vulnerability/resilience model allows a dynamic analysis of some specific issues of the food systems and provides direction for policy-makers.

Why these specific issues and drivers?

Building on Schroeter et al. (2005), two of the four sub-steps proposed to resolve the complexity that arise when integrating social and ecological approaches, imply specifying food systems’ outcomes and external drivers.

It is, therefore, required first to clarify the principal outcomes or functions of a food system, in particular the issues at risk. Food systems serve several purposes and have several outcomes. What are the priority issues? Outcomes might be evaluated and ranked differently by different stakeholders, and at different levels. The proponents of the “*Sustainable Diet*” agenda highlight the food and nutrition security objectives of the food systems selected here as the end-point of the analysis (FAO & Bioversity, 2012). As mentioned above, following a review and after discussion in two focus groups, four food and nutrition security concerns have been retained judged crucial to the context at hand. However, other issues have been debated, such as “*food safety*” or “*dietary quality*”. Other food systems’ outcomes than food and nutrition security issues could also have been considered, such as environmental and socio-economic outcomes related to employment or equity. Food systems are responsible for diverse environmental, economic and social outcomes. Introducing these would have been maybe more in line with the general perception of what sustainability means. The articulation between food systems’ defining elements and their resulting outcomes, the former contributing to predict the latter, could be expanded to other dimensions to further the modelling approach. Sustainability can hardly be modeled parsimoniously, raising then questions in terms of feasibility of the modeling.

The second step is to understand what and how global or regional changes, either socio-economic or environmental, might be transmitted through the activities to

impact the outcomes, because food systems' complexity means that impacts may not always be felt directly. Experts invited to the focus groups mentioned other important drivers of change, such as “*climate change*” or “*technological innovation*”. They also wondered if the model captures completely the internal drivers that are intrinsic to the system. Drivers are interacting with each other. Climate change and biodiversity loss are closely related for instance, with reciprocal influence. This interdependence raises some technical modeling concerns, named variables acting as possible proxy for other variables it is associated with. We thus aimed, as much as possible, to select priority drivers, excluding two drivers that are directly linked. Some analytical clarity and direction are indeed essential to convince policy-makers and have any policy impact.

It is moreover desired to develop interventions that treat the underlying causes, rather than the symptoms of the unsustainability deriving from food systems. The concepts of vulnerability and resilience bring food security into consideration in a different way than in the past. Changes are happening and investigating the sources of adaptive capacity in the system is crucial. This approach also highlights that food security is a matter both for the North and for the South, although with different modes of expression, and cannot be dealt with only by looking at national concerns (SCAR, 2008).

4.6 – Conclusions

Developing policy to ensure sustainable food security is a tremendous challenge that requires a comprehensive and integrated analytical approach. Multiple factors influence the course of human-environment interactions, which are further complicated by the presence of co-evolving causal forces. Understanding these dynamics requires viewing the food system as a whole. Social-ecological system approaches allow moving away from looking at isolated events and their causes and start to look at systems made up of interacting parts. Vulnerability and resilience is suggested in this chapter as a possible approach to capture the food system as a whole, think prospectively and identify the system elements that policy can leverage. The distinction in three components, namely exposure, sensitivity and resilience,

provides the elements of a model that specify what attributes need to be measured and how to structure the different indicators in a coherent framework for improved decision-making and policies.

The concept of vulnerability and of resilience imposes a system thinking approach based on the interdependencies between drivers, system activities and properties, outcomes and feedback loops. Vulnerability and resilience of food systems can have multiple sources, and these sources may interact to generate unexpected responses (SCAR, 2008). As sustainability and food security becomes increasingly central, vulnerability/resilience will be among the principles that will drive the reformulation of research, as well as policies (Brunori & Guarino, 2010). Concepts and methods for global change, vulnerability/resilience assessments represent a new research frontier. More theoretical and empirical research is needed to measure and assess the interplay between human and environment systems, between causal factors and consequences. Appropriate tools have to be developed for monitoring, forecasting and integration in policy support measures.

Chapter 5

Using Delphi expert elicitation survey to define indicators for assessing the Sustainability of the Food Systems

5.1 - Introduction

The scientific and international debate on sustainability of diets and food systems is gaining increasing recognition in the international community (FAO & Bioversity International, 2012). Interconnected environmental sustainability and food and nutrition security topics, and the debate about strengthening the links between food, health, and environmental research, are gaining increasing intensity (SCAR, 2011). However clear consensus on metrics of sustainable diets and food systems is still lacking and a host of efforts are being implemented towards this goal (Fanzo et al., 2012; Vinceti et al., 2013). Understanding what needs to constitute the assessment of the sustainability of food systems and diets is key for providing decision- and policy-making with knowledge of action, and having a systemic rationale and a framework to build a metric system is indispensable (Fanzo, 2014). It is then necessary to investigate the impact of the determinants on the sustainability of diets and identify the appropriate tradeoffs related with recommendations and actions towards the sustainability of the food systems (Johnston et al., 2014).

The coexistence of undernutrition, nutrient deficiencies, overweight and obesity – the tripe burden of malnutrition (Pinstrup-Andersen, 2006) – is inviting us to reconsider health and nutrition as the primary goal of food systems. Moreover, while improving food and nutrition security, agriculture and food industry have generated unintended consequences including environmental losses (UNEP, 2012; Allen et al., 2014). Simultaneously, several regions are experiencing unprecedented weather events caused by climate change and habitat depletion, in turn further destabilizing global food and nutrition security (Thompson & Cohen, 2012; Dora et al., 2014). This confluence of food crises with increasing environmental degradation suggests an urgent need for novel analyses and new paradigms to describe and understand the causes and facilitate adaptation and mitigation.

Participants at the 2010 international conference organized by the FAO and Bioversity International agreed on a common definition of Sustainable Diets that emphasizes the food and nutrition security purpose of food systems, and the need to maintain or enhance this outcome over time – across generations – by preserving

essential human assets and the flows of services they provide (FAO & Bioversity International, 2012). The concept of Sustainable Diets promotes economically, socially and environmentally sustainable food systems that concurrently ensure food and nutrition security (Fanzo et al., 2012; Johnston et al., 2014).

Modern societies depend on complex agro-ecological and trading systems to provide food. The move to sustainable diets calls for changes in the agricultural and food systems. Policy-makers and other stakeholders need evidence-based information and assessment tools to lead public policy interventions (Barrett, 2010). Sustainability in general provides decision makers with development strategies to allow present and future generations meeting their needs within the limits of the earth's capacity. Thus, it is a concept that offers a perspective of the dynamics that regulate the interconnection within social and ecological systems (Carpenter et al., 2009; Rockstrom et al., 2009; Waas et al., 2011). The sustainability of diets and food systems needs to be explored and assessed to provide decision-makers with information on socioeconomic and biophysical determinants and outcomes that regulate the system dynamics over time. In order to translate sustainability from a concept to a tangible strategy, indicators are key tools. Sustainability indicators can represent a set of metrics that measure characteristics or mechanisms that regulate the socio-ecological systems and ensure its continuity and functionality over time (Benitez-Capistros et al., 2014).

Metrics are an organized system combined to provide a perspective and have three principal objectives: inform civil society, industry, public officials and all stakeholders; measuring progress towards defined goals; aid decision making processes (UN, 2007). Indicators are variables that offer information on other variables that are limited (Gras et al., 1989). They synthesize the information (Andersen et al., 2013; Girardin et al., 1999; Mitchell et al., 1995; Rigby et al., 2001; Singh et al., 2012) and provide benchmarks for decision-making (Gras et al., 1989; Thivierge et al., 2014). Indicators are variables that can simplify a complex message and are developed to transfer information to decision makers (Bell and Morse, 2008). Indicators of sustainable development at the national level are often identified through dynamic interactive and participatory approaches with stakeholders such as government representatives, technical experts, and civil society agents.

Conceptual frameworks for indicators allow focusing and defining what to measure, what solutions and findings to gain from the assessment and what kinds of metrics to apply. Different frameworks have been developed for the assessment of sustainability because of different conceptual approaches and views, and different research goals. However, the key differences among different frameworks reside in the interpretations of the dimensions of sustainable development, the interconnections between these dimensions, the structural organization and the concepts by which they justify the hypotheses for the selection and aggregation of the indicators (UN, 2007).

A sound theoretical framework is the starting point in constructing metrics (OECD, 2008). Sustainability – or Sustainable Development – is a necessarily complex concept that can have different understandings. For our purpose, we assume that a sustainability assessment aims at capturing the ability of a system to maintain and enhance its essential functions over time (Conway, 1985; Hansen, 1996). Sustainability addresses threats to preserving life support systems, including their capacity to withstand and adjust (Turner, 2010). It is then key to assess stocks of and changes in human and natural assets (Stiglitz et al., 2009). Derived from sustainability sciences, the vulnerability approach, complemented by inputs from the resilience literature (see Turner et al., 2003), is proposed to analyze the sustainability of critical food and nutrition security outcomes (see chapter 4 and Ericksen, 2008c; Eakin, 2010; Prosperi et al., 2014).

Vulnerability – as the degree to which a system is likely to experience harm due to exposure to a perturbation or stress – is a function of exposure, sensitivity, and resilience. Exposure is the nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change. Sensitivity is the degree to which a system is affected either adversely or beneficially, by a change. Resilience is the ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a potentially hazardous event in a timely and efficient manner, through ensuring the preservation, restoration, or improvement of its essential basic structures and functions (IPCC, 2012).

Several global and regional drivers of change affect the structure and processes of the food systems (SCAR, 2008) putting at risk context-specific food and nutrition security outcomes (Ericksen, 2008a). Based on an extensive literature review, four critical food and nutrition security issues and four drivers of change have been identified. An indicator-based approach is then proposed to assess the sustainability of diets and food systems, through a vulnerability and resilience framework. These indicators can provide a detailed description of observable variables, or interactions of variables, relevant to the food and nutrition security. The selection of indicators is a crucial step and need to be realized beyond individual subjectivity and single value judgments. Once that a framework defines the phenomenon to be measured, ideally the selection of the individual indicators should be based on what is desirable to measure and not on which indicators are available. Furthermore, the transparency of the whole exercise is essential in constructing credible indicators (OECD, 2008).

Several decision support tools have been identified and applied for providing guidance to decision makers for solving problems in social-ecological systems and global change contexts, yet several approaches fail to be validated. Therefore, it is usually recommended to use expert elicitation to offer solutions for decision-making (de França Doria et al., 2009). The Delphi method represents a support tool for decision-making that implies the participation of a broad range of different experts, can be applied on a global scale, is based on anonymous responses, and can generate interactions between experts having different opinions and coming from different geographical backgrounds (Frewer et al., 2011). The Delphi method is a popular social research technique for forecasting and an aid in decision-making, and its aim is to obtain a reliable common opinion from a group of individual experts who can each provide anonymous valuable contributions in order to resolve a complex problem on the basis of free opinions and knowledge, avoiding influences from personality and authority (Landeta, 2006; Linstone & Turoff, 1975).

Aims

The main goal of this research study is to identify a set of metrics of sustainable diets and food systems. The vulnerability and resilience framework was used as an analytical lens to provide a sequential list of sustainability indicators, while the Delphi method was used to determine which indicators are perceived as more

relevant according to a selected group of participants. Delphi is an iterative questionnaire designed to elicit expert's knowledge. The study also investigated whether crucial information and further aspects related to food system sustainability were lacking in the structure proposed, which elements and interlinkages could be added and in which manner.

The system-oriented approach that is proposed, for the assessment of sustainable diets and food systems, incorporates elements from the vulnerability and resilience theories. The Turner et al.'s (2003) vulnerability/sustainability framework is one of the most quoted integrated conceptual models for vulnerability assessment (Gbetibouo et al., 2010). Exposure, sensitivity and resilience provide the concepts to identify the system's properties that shape a causal pathway towards food system's outcomes, and these are the variables that we aim to proxy through the Delphi expert elicitation process (see chapter 4).

There is one crucial question the panel of experts were asked to answer: Vulnerability/resilience of what to what? Four main food and nutrition security issues – i.e. food system outcomes at risk specific to the Spanish, French and Italian context – and four global and regional drivers of change – relevant to the Mediterranean region and likely to impact the identified issues – were identified. Three questionnaires, over three iterative rounds, were used and included the proposed indicators of exposure, sensitivity and resilience of four context-specific food and nutrition security issues, against four drivers of change affecting the food system.

Following the protocol of the Delphi Survey, participants were asked to discuss and complement the framework and underlying assumptions, and test the framework by selecting proxy indicators. Succeeding rounds were designed to bring the group to focus or consensus. The second section of this chapter describes the Delphi approach adopted in this study, the participants, and the process undertaken. The third section describes the main findings of the study including consensus on indicators, drivers, issues, and on the vulnerability and resilience interactions proposed. The fourth section reviews the usefulness and limitations of this study with respect to the results obtained and the methodology applied. We conclude that the Delphi-variant used in this study was useful in providing a clear and transparent means of exploring the

complexities of the assessment of sustainable diets and food systems, and consensus was reached for a number of dimensions. Specifically, this study highlighted the challenges and the interest for further researches, through combining expert elicitation processes and a dynamic and analytical vulnerability and resilience framework, to generate a common working language and a set of metrics supporting decision-making for sustainable diets and food systems.

5.2 - Research design: Materials and methods

The Delphi technique is defined as "*a method of structuring a group communication process so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals as a whole to deal with a complex problem*" (Hugé et al., 2010). It is a procedure for organizing dispersed expert group debate to find answers to complex problems (Linstone & Turoff, 1975). Within several valuable expert elicitation tools, the Delphi approach proved helpful for involving experts in an iterative process of problem definition and analysis, in order to attain unbiased views and estimations on different complex issues (de França Doria et al., 2009), and convert these opinions into one or more communal notion/s through a feedback process (Benitez-Capistros et al., 2014). The Delphi technique is mostly applied by medical and engineering sciences, as well as in social sciences, and especially in different research domains and purposes spanning from medicine and public health (Hwang et al., 2006; Boulkedid et al., 2011), to agrofood systems policy and food safety issues (Wentholt et al., 2009; Frewer et al., 2011), food security (Wolfe & Frongillo, 2001), development and selection of indicators of sustainability (Benitez-Capistros et al., 2014), definition of agri-environmental indicators to assess sustainability (Bélanger et al., 2012) and sustainable aquaculture (Fezzardi et al., 2013 - FAO), topics related to agro-based bioenergy (Rikkonen & Tapio, 2009), meat consumption (Vinnari & Tapio, 2009), educational research (Green, 2014), farm sustainability (Etxeberria et al., 2014), sustainability indicators for tourism (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006) and related weighting (Tsaour et al., 2006), environmental, scientific and policy evaluations and scenarios (Nowack et al., 2011; Swor and Canter, 2011; Wright, 2006), climate change impacts and vulnerabilities (Mastrandrea & Schneider, 2004; Webster et al., 2003; Arnell et

al., 2005; Prato, 2008), adaptation to climate change and adaptive management (Plummer & Armitage, 2007; de Franca Doria et al., 2009), landscape and conservation management (Mehnen et al., 2013), and vulnerability assessment (De Lange et al., 2010).

Generally a Delphi survey starts with an initial structured questionnaire - addressed to experts or participants - that leads to multiple interactions (rounds) between group members (expert panel) and the facilitator through a controlled feedback process. Once completed the questionnaires each expert is provided with a common feedback on the group responses. Often the facilitator indicates, individually to each participant, his/her position within the global feedback of the panel. Provided with this information, the participants complete the survey form again. Then he/she can confirm or amend his opinion on the basis of the information proposed - in the global feedback - by the other participants. Thus, in each round the participants are in some way asked to judge the opinions and elements that were suggested by the group on the preceding round. The process can be reiterated several times in as many different rounds until consensus emerges or is achieved. Usually consensus is reached following two to four rounds. However, a larger number of rounds often generates an important decline in the participation (Keeney et al., 2001).

Facilitators, in order to efficiently manage a Delphi study, have to consider that this iterative process can lead to large questionnaires with long lists of issues and information, that are time consuming to analyze, difficult to manage, and can further complicate consensus (Hasson et al., 2000; de França Doria et al., 2009; Benitez-Capistros et al., 2014).

Building blocks of any Delphi process are participants' anonymity (Landeta & Barrutia, 2011), a rigorous management of group through coalescing opinions and answering expert questions (Dalal et al., 2011), and letting participants the possibility to amend their opinions. In particular anonymity, together with sufficiently extended time frames between rounds, contributes to avoid bias problems typical of group dynamics and allows experts freely presenting their judgments on the topics (de França Doria et al., 2009).

In the present study, the Delphi method was conducted in an online environment, through emails sending and the web-based survey tool SurveyMonkey, an online survey creator (see www.surveymonkey.com). The online-based Delphi was adopted to improve the ergonomics of the process, avoiding unhandiness of paper-based surveys and easiness limitations as observed on other Delphi studies (Cam et al., 2002; Steyaert & Lisoir, 2005).

This Delphi study was conducted mainly focusing consensus around a list of indicators of sustainable diets and food systems over three iterative rounds. Experts were also asked with a number of open and appraisal questions with regards to the contents (drivers of change and issues of food and nutrition security) that compose the framework, in order to confirm or not the importance of the food system dynamics that were proposed to study, and to further open the analysis to other key aspects related to the sustainability of the food system. Before starting the Delphi process the framework, the indicators, the selection of participants, the survey, and the structure of the study were discussed in two exploratory focus groups (see figure 7).




Figure 7 - Structure and pathway of the Delphi study

Participation and Panel composition

Selection of participants to a Delphi survey is critical. An expert is a person who is particularly competent as authority on a certain matter of facts (Flick, 2014). Identifying who is an expert - his/her expertise and knowledge - is challenging (Burgman et al., 2011; Failing et al., 2007), and selection must be performed thoroughly so that the group composition shapes the diversity of valuable knowledge (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004; Steyaert & Lisoir, 2005). For the purpose of this research we considered an expert as a person who, by a verifiable mean (particular scientific role, expertise/knowledge, publications), is known to have information or has access to information with regards to the issues under investigation. In this study, we opted for a two-stage sampling procedure.

In a first step, potential participants were selected by reviewing academic publications and participation to scientific conferences using broad keywords, and through professional networks. The sampling procedure identified experts working or doing scientific research on issues related to the sustainability of the food systems. Then we classified experts as a group of informed individuals, specialists in a field, or those with expertise about specific topics (see Keeney et al., 2001). The group included experts from a multiplicity of disciplines, to guarantee a heterogeneous array of opinions. 213 suitable candidates were finally listed. Information on academic discipline, age and sex was collected. Potential participants were invited to participate by e-mail and then telephoned. Co-nomination was authorized when one of the experts declined (generally due to lack of availability) and suggested a colleague instead. In a second step, background variables (academic discipline, age and sex) were checked, and reminders and personalized emails were sent to individuals belonging to under-represented groups.

A first reminder was sent a week before the deadline for the first round and a second one four days later. On the last day, 41 questionnaires had been filled in. Therefore 18 experts were then contacted by telephone or, if not possible, sent another personalized email to balance the sample. An extra week was given to complete the questionnaire. At the end of this process 51 experts returned the questionnaire. For the second round two reminders were sent, and a few identified experts were further emailed to maintain a balanced panel. For the third round two reminders were also sent and a

few experts were further emailed. The data were collected between March 2014 and July 2014.

Preparation and distribution of Delphi questionnaires

First, an electronic letter of invitation to the Delphi expert consultation was sent to the potential participants. The invitation (see Annex 1) enlightened the goals and methods of the study, and permitted potential participants to self estimate their expertise and aptness to the study (Dalkey et al., 1970). Two weeks later, a non-personalized email was sent to all identified experts with the link to the questionnaire and reading material. This material, distributed to all potential participants, comprehended a document explaining the conceptual background, the specific aim and purpose of the Delphi study (see Annex 2), and the indicator list (see Annex 3). Then, for each of the three consecutive rounds, electronic letters were sent to invite participants to fill in the questionnaire.

The online questionnaire was first created in an MS Excel (XLS) environment and then directly uploaded to SurveyMonkey (see Annex 4). The obtained data was kept and could be downloaded in an XLS format for statistical and text analysis. Reports describing the results of each questionnaire were sent via email after each of the three Delphi rounds, separately to each participant. In the attached PDF file with the results, for each participant his/her individual choice was highlighted.

The time frame asked to respond to each of the three consecutive rounds was of two weeks. However, as predicted, reminders were needed to send to let the maximum rate of participant respond. Extra time was necessary for some experts to fill in the questionnaires, therefore the actual time frame that participants were given has been of three weeks for the first round, and four weeks for the second and third rounds. After the first and the second rounds an additional time frame of eighteen days was required for completing the analysis of data and for providing participants with a modified questionnaire. Overall, the time elapsed between the delivery of the first and the third questionnaires, was approximately 3 months. The final results were given four months and ten days after sending the first letter of invitation to the Delphi expert consultation.

The Vulnerability and Resilience framework

This Delphi process is based on an integration of concepts and scientific approaches to study the broad topic of the sustainability of diets and food systems - including social-ecological systems frameworks, and theories and assessment of vulnerability and resilience - with the aim of identifying a set of metrics for improving decision-making. The vulnerability and resilience framework was applied building on the interactions between drivers of change and food and nutrition security issues - following the vulnerability framework proposed by Prosperi et al. (2014; see also chapter 4) - and disentangling these interactions in exposure, sensitivity and resilience. The vulnerability and resilience framework was chosen because of its proven suitability for drawing linkages between socioeconomic and biophysical causal factors within a given system, for its usefulness in multidisciplinary perspectives, and because it fills in science and policy gaps (Turner et al., 2003). Also, indicators represent one approach to making theoretical concepts, such as vulnerability and resilience, operational. Using available scientific knowledge in form of frameworks, theories or models about the vulnerable system of interest in the selection of indicating variables, and considering literature and expert judgment, relate to what Hinkel (2011) defines "*using deductive arguments*" and "*theory-driven approaches*" in the development of vulnerability indicators.

Following the methodological guidelines of the vulnerability assessment (Schroeter et al., 2005) it has been possible to identify a geographical area of interest (the west Mediterranean Europe countries, France, Italy and Spain), four drivers of change impacting the food system and four units of the food system likely to be vulnerable to changes (food and nutrition security issues); a set of interactions between these two categories (of drivers and issues) were identified (see chapter 4). The drivers of change selected were adapted from the drivers proposed by the second report of the European Union Standing Committee on Agricultural Research (2008) at the European level, such as water depletion, biodiversity loss, food price volatility, and changes in food consumption patterns. The vulnerable context-specific units of the food system were identified within the general food and nutrition security issues (availability, access, utilization) - as main outcomes of a food system - following the main understanding brought by the definition of food and nutrition security (UN, 1996) and the framework of the food system in the context of global change

(Ericksen, 2008a; Ingram et al., 2010), such as nutritional quality of food supply, food affordability, dietary energy balance, and satisfaction of cultural food preferences. The interactions - between drivers and issues - were identified on the basis of the structure of the vulnerability framework (Prosperi et al., 2014), and related indicators were identified through an extensive and context-specific literature review (see Annexes 2 and 3).

Building on the mentioned vulnerability and resilience framework, the base structure for identifying the indicators was a matrix framework displaying the interactions between the "impacting" drivers of change and the "affected" food and nutrition security issues, within a complex interconnected food system (see Annex 2). The indicators were organized - for each vulnerability interaction - in the three components of vulnerability, such as: exposure, sensitivity, and resilience (see Prospero et al., 2014 and chapter 4). The indicators were proposed for each of these three components following previous approaches to vulnerability assessment (Fussler & Klein, 2006; Schroeter et al., 2005).




Figure 8 - Matrix of interactions between global, and regional, drivers of change and context-specific food and nutrition security issues (adapted from Prospero et al., 2014; see chapter 4)

Within a set of sixteen (4 drivers X 4 issues) (see figure 8) potential interactions of the matrix - between the drivers of change and the food and nutrition security issues - only a selected subset of eight interactions were studied, analyzed, and then presented to the Delphi participants, accompanied by a detailed list of 136 indicators, for the

selection of metrics (see Annex 3). These eight interactions involve the following potential impacts of the drivers of change on food and nutrition security issues and the related recovery potential from the food system unit concerned:

1. Impact of Water Depletion on the Nutritional Quality of Food Supply [WD/NQFS]
2. Impact of Water Depletion on the Affordability of Food [WD/AF]
3. Impact of Biodiversity Loss on the Nutritional Quality of Food Supply [BL/NQFS]
4. Impact of Biodiversity Loss on Satisfaction of cultural food Preferences [BL/SCFP]
5. Impact of Food Price Volatility on Nutritional Quality of Food Supply [FPV/NQFS]
6. Impact of Food Price Volatility on the Affordability of Food [FPV/AF]
7. Impact of the Changes in Food Consumption Patterns on the Nutritional Quality of Food Supply [CFCP / NQFS]
8. Impact of the Changes in Food Consumption Patterns on the Dietary Energy Balance [CFCP/DEB]

Following the protocol of the Delphi Survey, participants were asked to discuss and complement the framework and underlying assumptions, and test the framework by selecting proxy indicators. The questionnaires were composed of three sections: the selection of indicators; the appraisal and the proposition of drivers and issues; the open-ended questions. Three questionnaires, over three rounds, were used which included proposed indicators of exposure, sensitivity and resilience of four context-specific food and nutrition security issues, against four drivers of change affecting the food system. Succeeding rounds were designed to bring the group to focus or consensus.

As mentioned above, the suggested framework and the initial shortlist of indicators were developed in discussions with selected experts in two focus groups. In fact, it is strongly recommended for Delphi process to gather an exploratory workshop to refine round one Delphi. The objective is ensuring the best, most comprehensive, and most focused issues for involving participation in a quantitative survey and overcoming

possible limitations of international participation. Furthermore, the experts participating in the focus groups can facilitate the implication of researchers or other experts, within their contacts, for participating in the Delphi process (cascade methodology) (Frewer et al., 2011).

Six experts participated in the focus groups, as senior researchers from multiple disciplinary backgrounds closely related to the sustainability of the food system, including also a specialist of the Delphi method. The meetings with the reduced panel in the focus groups consisted of a presentation of the proposed framework and discussion on the main issues and drivers considered, and on the criteria for reducing the pools of indicators. The goal of these focus groups was to test the questionnaire and to anticipate the likely perception of the large panel of experts. The focus groups meant also to represent a sample for exploring the practical applications in the large survey panel of experts. In the present study, the selection criteria for identifying the indicators were mainly related to keywords for drivers of change and issues, and to the mechanisms and interactions of the food system functioning. These criteria were explained to the experts in the focus groups. The exploratory focus groups allowed improve the ergonomics of the online survey, reduce and ameliorate the list of indicators provided, enlarge the contacts of potential participants to invite, and verify that the food system issues under discussion were particularly relevant.

Data analysis

In each round participants were asked to select the best indicator within each of the 24 components presented (i.e. [exposure + sensitivity + resilience] *times* 8 interactions). Indicators that not received any participant preference were excluded from the framework. New indicators were added if at least two participants proposed the same, or similar, proxy variables to enter in a specific component (only indicators proposed by at least 2 participants were reported - Indicators were considered as close enough when at least 2 words in the title or details of the indicators were common or judged similar [eg. “*Number of crops*”, “*variety of crops*” and “*crop concentration*”]). The questionnaire implied also questions on the appraisal of the framework, other than the selection of the indicators. Thus, participants were asked to judge the importance of the drivers of change and the proposed interactions, and to rank by importance the

issues of food and nutrition security through a Likert scale. It was also asked (not compulsorily) to propose further drivers and issues.

The data analysis of each round was based on descriptive statistics that were returned to experts through an iterative process. For the selection of indicators - in the three rounds - the results were indicated in percentages. For the close-ended questions - such as, Not at all important / Not that important / Important / Very Important - on the appraisal of drivers and interactions, the results were indicated in percentages of rating. With regards to the appraisal of the food and nutrition security issues, a Likert scale was used for the evaluation of a 9-point (with 1 being the lowest and 9 being the highest). Except for the indicator selection, the appraisal of the elements of the framework was conducted through single assessments that were not reiterated in the Delphi process. In the argumentative section, qualitative comments were categorized and reported in each feedback. Higher priority was placed in addressing comments raised by a higher proportion of experts, and in those that were associated with higher disagreements. The purpose of this procedure was to minimize biases attributable to the facilitator during the process.

5.3 - Results

The Delphi sample characteristics

Usually Delphi studies involve on average between 15 and 60 experts, and within this range a Delphi panel is generally considered valid (Hasson et al., 2000). In this Delphi study 51 experts, corresponding to 24% of the all experts who were invited, returned the questionnaire of the first round. However this actually indicates a response rate of 72% of those who acknowledged receiving the invitation (see Table 3). Comparable decreases of participation were observed in other Delphi studies (Frewer et al., 2011; Wentholt et al., 2009). Nonetheless, the number of experts is not always considered key. It is rather required a balanced composition of the panel and an adequate quality level of participants (Powell, 2003). Strong variations of the panel through the Delphi process or disequilibria might lead facilitators to stop the study earlier than expected (Benitez-Capistros et al., 2014).

With regards to the experts who replied to the first round questionnaire, 66% were males and 34% were females. The majority (33%) are economists – although from different sub-disciplines ranging from agricultural and food economics to resources and environmental economics – closely followed by nutritionists (22%). Agronomists and environmental scientists represent 10% and 8% respectively, and food technologists 4%. About 12% of the panel can be associated to sustainability science(s) and another 8% as working specifically on food policy and governance. We focused on agrofood economists and nutritionists, as they are the main groups who have published in the area of sustainable diets and food systems.

In the round two - given the relatively small samples in Delphi surveys - achieving and maintaining a certain degree of participation was crucial to ensure the validity of the study. Overall, 39 experts (out of 51) logged in again and answered to the second round of the questionnaire, i.e. a response rate of 76.5%, above the highest threshold (70%) encountered in the literature (Akins et al., 2005). Two reminders were sent, and a few identified experts were further emailed to maintain a balanced panel. Women represent about one third of the sample (31%). Economists and nutritionists remain within limits (36% and 28% respectively). System agronomists and sustainability scientists represent 10% each, and ecologists and food policy/governance specialists 8%. Only 1 panelist brings in food technology expertise.

In the round three - 36 experts (out of 39 of the second round) responded to this third and last round of the survey, i.e. a response rate of 92%. As for previous rounds, two reminders were sent and a few experts were further emailed to maintain a balanced panel. Final participation indicates that women represent about one third of the sample (31%). Economists and nutritionists are still the best represented (33% and 22% respectively). Agronomists and ecologists represent about 8.5% of the panel each, and declared sustainability scientists 5.5%. Participants suggested two new groups: statisticians (5.5%) and food system specialists (3%). One panelist brings in explicitly food technology expertise. Confirmation about the scientific field of the experts was asked only in the last round, to avoid overload the previous rounds. Still the answers confirmed the heterogeneity level of the panel over the Delphi process

that was maintained through constant monitoring of the multidisciplinary composition (see Table 4).

Table 3 - Global response and participation rates

	INVITATIONS SENT	NOT AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE (IN THEORY)	CONFIRMED RECEIVED	ROUND 1	ROUND 2	ROUND 3
Response rate	213	25	188	71 (38%)	51 (72%)	39 (76%)	36 (92%)

Table 4 - Participation rate by composition of the panel (from invitation to the final round)

DISCIPLINE	INVITATIONS SENT		ROUND 1		ROUND 2		ROUND 3	
Economics	48	23%	17	33%	12	31%	11	31%
Nutrition	35	16%	11	22%	9	23%	8	22%
Ecology/Environmental resources	34	16%	4	8%	3	8%	3	8%
Agronomy	27	13%	5	10%	3	8%	3	8%
Food sec/policy	26	12%	6	12%	5	13%	5	14%
Food systems	15	7%	3	6%	2	5%	1	3%
Sustainability	14	7%	2	4%	2	5%	2	6%
Food tech	9	4%	1	2%	1	3%	1	3%
Statistics	5	2%	2	4%	2	5%	2	6%
Global / Response rate	213	-	51	24%	39	76%	36	92%

Progression of consensus on the indicators

Delphi round 1

In this initial step of the survey it is normal to observe largely distributed inputs for indicator preferences. Majority ($\geq 50\%$) is reached only for 4 indicators and dimensions, while in 12 dimensions we observe one or more indicators reaching 35% and in 8 dimensions all indicators are still below 35%. 4 initial indicators were not selected and were then excluded from the list for the round 2. On the other hand 14 new indicators were proposed by participants and, therefore, introduced for selection in round 2. A descriptive analysis of the results of this stage is still not appropriate for indicators.

Delphi round 2

Consensus is clearly emerging for 10 of the 24 desired indicators (i.e. more than 60% of agreement on one indicator); however no indicator has yet met the defined high threshold consensus criteria (80%). For some interactions and components, panelists

seem to be balancing between two main options (7 components, out of 24, present two indicators displaying more than 30% agreement each). 31 indicators, that were proposed in the round 2, were not selected and were then excluded from the list for the round 3. Experts suggested 4 new indicators that were integrated to the questionnaire for selection in round 3.

Delphi round 3: final results

Consensus is finally reached for 14 of the 24 desired indicators: 8 indicators have met the high threshold consensus criteria (80%), 3 other indicators have met the medium threshold consensus criteria (70%) and other 3 ones have achieved the low threshold consensus criteria (60%). 4 indicators have been selected by the majority of the participants (above 50%). These values that define the different rates of consensus criteria were proposed by Keeney et al. (2011) and are largely acknowledged in Delphi studies. Furthermore, according to Hasson et al. (2000) and de Franca Doria et al. (2009), it is also suggested that consensus between 51% and 80% should be considered acceptable.

For 5 dimensions (out of 24), clear bipolarity can be reported (two indicators above 35%). In some of these cases, several experts have recommended constructing a composite indicator. 3 dimensions remain unresolved with a wide dispersion of expert opinions among indicators and little improvement of the consensus through the rounds. Furthermore, “*Don't know*” rates (the default option) are high only for these 3 dimensions. 23 proposed indicators were not selected in this round by any of the participants. Globally 56 (4 + 31 + 24) indicators were - in the first, second and third rounds - completely rejected by the panel by a rate of respectively 3%, 21% and 20% over the total indicators proposed in each round.

On average, 93% of the experts who selected the favorite indicator per dimension (at least 50%) in the second round confirmed their choices in the third round. Although there is no specific statistical test to measure the stability of responses between rounds for qualitative nominal variables, this observation indicates that a certain degree of stability of the consensus has been achieved.

Furthermore, 75% (18 out of 24) of dimensions reached, at least, a majority consensus ($\geq 50\%$) on one indicator, and in all these cases the indicator which was the most chosen in the round 3, was been also the most chosen in the round 1 and in the round 2 (see Table 5). This additional observation contributes also to demonstrate a certain degree of stability of consensus. The progression of consensus is thus ascending over the three rounds (see Figure 9).




Figure 9 - Share of consensus (expressed in %) of the most selected indicator for each of the 24 vulnerability components considered (exposure, sensitivity, resilience) within each interaction over the three rounds (in ascending order of consensus)

Table 5 - Consensus rate (%) of the most selected indicator/s per vulnerability component in the three Delphi rounds

	ROUND 1		ROUND 2		ROUND 3
<i>NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY / WATER DEPLETION</i>					
<i>EXPOSURE</i>	Water Footprint of nutrient-dense foods	35	Water Footprint of nutrient-dense foods [m3/kg]	56	Water Footprint of nutrient-dense foods [m3/kg] 75
<i>SENSITIVITY</i>	Intensity of use of actual water resources	35	Intensity of use of actual water resources	49	Intensity of use of actual water resources 61
<i>RESILIENCE</i>	Irrigation Water Efficiency Index	51	Irrigation Water Efficiency Index	64	Irrigation Water Efficiency Index 83
<i>AFFORDABILITY OF FOOD / WATER DEPLETION</i>					
<i>EXPOSURE</i>	Water Footprint for an average diet	39	Water Footprint for an average diet	67	Water Footprint for an average diet 86
<i>SENSITIVITY</i>	Price index for 10 most water-demanding foods AND Price elasticity of demand for 1 most water-demanding foods	27	Price index for 10 most water-demanding foods	51	Price index for 10 most water-demanding foods 53
<i>RESILIENCE</i>	% of farmers who grow drought-resistant crops	25	Cross-price elasticity of demand of high/low water demanding foods	36	Cross-price elasticity of demand of high/low water demanding foods 47
<i>NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY / BIODIVERSITY LOSS</i>					
<i>EXPOSURE</i>	% of total acreage of top 5 varieties	41	% of total acreage of top 5 varieties	44	% of total acreage of top 5 varieties 64
<i>SENSITIVITY</i>	Nutritional Functional Diversity	41	Nutritional Functional Diversity	69	Nutritional Functional Diversity 83
<i>RESILIENCE</i>	Crop Agrobiodiversity Factor	53	Crop Agrobiodiversity Factor	74	Crop Agrobiodiversity Factor 89
<i>SATISFACTION OF CULTURAL FOOD PREFERENCES / BIODIVERSITY LOSS</i>					
<i>EXPOSURE</i>	Time available for food preparation	24	Import Dependency Ratio	33	Import Dependency Ratio 47
<i>SENSITIVITY</i>	% of diets locally produced	49	% of diets locally produced	62	% of diets locally produced 72
<i>RESILIENCE</i>	Integration of biodiversity considerations in business	29	Integration of biodiversity considerations in business	49	Integration of biodiversity considerations in business 53
<i>AFFORDABILITY OF FOOD / FOOD PRICE VOLATILITY</i>					
<i>EXPOSURE</i>	% of food household expenditure	39	% of food household expenditure	62	% of food household expenditure 81
<i>SENSITIVITY</i>	Sensitivity to price volatility	55	Sensitivity to price volatility	74	Sensitivity to price volatility 86
<i>RESILIENCE</i>	Presence of food safety net programs	45	Presence of safety net programs	46	Presence of safety net programs 53
<i>NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY / FOOD PRICE VOLATILITY</i>					
<i>EXPOSURE</i>	% of nutrient intakes from 10 most volatile foods	35	% of nutrient intakes from 10 most volatile foods	64	% of nutrient intakes from 10 most volatile foods 72
<i>SENSITIVITY</i>	Price elasticity of 10 most nutrient-dense foods	31	Price elasticity of 10 most nutrient-dense foods	44	Price elasticity of 10 most nutrient-dense foods 47
<i>RESILIENCE</i>	Household Dietary Diversity Score	59	Household Dietary Diversity Score	74	Household Dietary Diversity Score 92
<i>NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY / CHANGES IN FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS</i>					
<i>EXPOSURE</i>	Food Purchasing Power Index	35	Food Purchasing Power Index	46	Food Purchasing Power Index 64
<i>SENSITIVITY</i>	Household Dietary Diversity Score	35	Household Dietary Diversity Score	64	Household Dietary Diversity Score 83
<i>RESILIENCE</i>	Existence of national dietary guidelines	22	% of public expenditure on food subsidies	23	% of public expenditure on food subsidies AND Existence of national dietary guidelines 28
<i>DIETARY ENERGY BALANCE / CHANGES IN FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS</i>					
<i>EXPOSURE</i>	At-risk-of-poverty rate	41	At-risk-of-poverty rate	46	Caloric share of ready-to-consume products 47
<i>SENSITIVITY</i>	Prevalence of overweight & obesity	33	Prevalence of overweight & obesity	41	Prevalence of overweight & obesity 58
<i>RESILIENCE</i>	Literacy rate of adults	29	Existence of policy plan for overweight/obesity	36	Existence of policy plan for overweight/obesity AND Funding allocated to nutrition education 28

Appraisal of Interactions, Drivers, and Issues

Drivers

Four drivers of change were included in the initial framework, such as Water Depletion, Biodiversity Loss, Food Price Volatility and Changes in Food Consumption Patterns (see Chapter 4). In the first round experts were asked to propose other drivers likely to affect each of the suggested food and nutrition security issues. 65% of the panel made 139 propositions. 25% of them proposed drivers that already emanate from the framework and 75% were original suggestions. Each driver was classified according to the 2nd EU-SCAR Foresight Exercise's typology of drivers likely to significantly impact food systems' prospects (SCAR, 2008).

We were able to associate most of the participants' propositions with a shortlist of 12 broad drivers of change: Agrifood patterns (including industry and market structure) (25%); Policies (including Agri/Energy/Rural/Trade/Food policies) (25%); Technological innovation (including Genetics/Machinery/Breeding/Food technology/Nanotechnology) (11%); World population (including Migration flows) (9%); Soil degradation (7%); Global economy trends (including Income distribution) (6%); Climate change (5%); Energy prices (4%).

As regards additional potential drivers affecting the nutritional quality of food supply, participants highlighted the importance of considering potential impacts from Technological innovation and Soil degradation (24% and 17% respectively). Climate change, Policies and Agrifood patterns (i.e. agrofood industry and market structure) are the second most quoted drivers, with around 10% of the proposals.

As regards additional potential drivers affecting affordability of food, two main drivers were suggested: Policies (30%) and Agrifood patterns (24%). Energy prices and Global economy trends were proposed by 11% and 8% respectively of respondents.

As regards additional potential drivers affecting dietary energy balance, Policies stands out as a main driver to consider (43%). World population (29%) and Agrifood patterns (14%) would come second. Changing dominant values and diversity in

lifestyles – included in the global Changing food consumption patterns driver – have been frequently repeated.

As regards additional potential drivers affecting the satisfaction of cultural food preferences, Policies (36%), Agrifood patterns (27%) and World population (18%) are the most added drivers.

In order to prepare the questionnaire for the second round, the proposed drivers were added to the initial set.

Interactions

In the second round experts were asked to rank the importance of the eight initial interactions (between a driver of change and a food and nutrition security issue). All the eight proposed interactions have been judged “important” or “very important” by more than 80% of the panelists. Agreement on importance ranges from 85% (impact of biodiversity loss on nutritional quality of food supply) to 97% (impact of changing food consumption patterns on dietary energy balance) (Figure 10).




Figure 10 - Expert appraisal of the eight interactions proposed in the Delphi study for the selection of the indicators

In the second round, the two first proposed drivers, per issue, were submitted to the participants for ranking according to importance.

Overall, the newly proposed drivers have not reached the same high degree of consensus on importance for food and nutrition security as the initial set. Mainly three have attained comparable levels for some issues (near or above 80%), namely: Changing agrofood patterns, Policy actions and Technological innovations (See figure 11). In particular, population dynamics appear not to be considered a priority concern for food and nutrition security.

It has to be reported that Climate change, proposed by 5% of the respondents in the first round, has been highlighted again in the open ended questions as an important driver to consider per se, in addition to Water depletion and Biodiversity loss.




Figure 11 - Expert appraisal of the emerged interactions between the initial set of food and nutrition security issues and the newly proposed drivers of change

Food and nutrition security issues

In the second round participants were invited to propose new food and nutrition security issues judged important for the geographical context considered (Spain, France and Italy), in addition to the four food and nutrition security context-specific issues proposed in the framework. 18 experts (45%) answered to this non-compulsory question and respondents suggested 5 additional issues. Two of these (environmental externalities and social equity) are not generally considered as conventional food and nutrition security issues, as usually encountered in the literature (Pangaribowo et al.,

2013). Discussions should now focus on whether these two issues would actually fall within the sustainable food and nutrition security realm.

Accessibility has been suggested as another food and nutrition security issue by 3 participants, “*next to affordability*”. An expert specified that “*physical access*” was a particular concern to consider. Another stated that “*allocation of food within society/household*” is an issue when discussing accessibility. Food safety was another issue mentioned. One expert mentioned “*food system sovereignty and governance (transparency in decision-making, ability of consumers and producers to influence food system drivers and outcomes)*”. Other panelists talked about “*food production patterns*” and “*re-orientation of industry [organization] or technological improvement*” along the value chains. Several experts added “*environmental impacts*” or “*externalities*”. Others specifically mentioned “*greenhouse gas emissions*” or “*biodiversity*” or “*water use*” or “*energy consumption*”, as food and nutrition security issues. An expert highlighted the importance of “*increased inequality in wealth/income distribution*”, while others added “*inequitable (and unethical) healthy food distribution*” or “*equity*” as food system outcomes that need to be considered. Another expert mentioned labor regulations and corporate social responsibility as crucial elements for the future of the food systems.

The propositions of the experts have then been analyzed and categorized in five additional issues, namely: (Physical) accessibility, food safety, governance, environmental externalities and equity.

Participants were then asked to rate the priority of these nine issues using a scale of 1 to 9 (with 1 being the lowest and 9 being the highest) (see figure 12). The four initial issues appear within the first five priority challenges for food and nutrition security identified in the region. “*Nutritional quality (of food supply)*” is ranked the most important current issue (5.8). Two new challenges – “*Environmental externalities*” and “*social equity*” – come second and third (5.6 and 5.3 respectively). As already highlighted, these two crucial questions are not conventional food and nutrition security issues, as usually encountered in the literature (Pangaribowo et al., 2013). “*Satisfaction of cultural food preferences*” (5.2) is judged the fourth most important issue, closely followed by “*affordability of food*” and “*dietary energy balance*” ex-

aequo (5). The other three proposed issues fall below the median value of the scale (i.e. 5).




Figure 12 - Expert appraisal of the initial set of food and nutrition security issues and of the newly proposed ones (Likert scale 1 - 9)

5.4 - Discussion

Discussion of the results

Discussion in terms of participation

The size of the expert group can vary depending on the complexity of the study and the management of the process. Generally the minimum number of participants required should imply at least four people (Thangaratinam & Redman, 2005), and there is not a maximum threshold, within the ability to ensure a sound and efficient management of the Delphi process. This is not only for the number of participants, but also the rate of participation in relation with the initially invited experts can sensitively vary. In a recent Delphi study - aimed at the identification of drivers, pressures, and indicators of the environmental impacts on the Galapagos Islands (Benitez-Capistros et al., 2014) - 42 participants were initially invited, only 10 (24%) actually participated in the first round and 5 responded to the third and final round. In another Delphi study - focused on finding an agreement on a definition of climate

change adaptation (de Franca Doria et al., 2009) - 38 experts were invited and 23 (61%) effectively participated in the first round, and it was also specified that this number corresponded to 85% of those who initially accepted to participate (27). A third example of a Delphi study - on the identification of emerging food risk in the current food safety systems (Wentholt et al., 2012) - involved the invitation of 1931 experts, of whom only about 500 (22%) participated in the first round. Generally, as previously mentioned, a panel size within the range of 15–60 experts is considered appropriate for the application of the Delphi method (Hasson et al., 2000). In this Delphi study, the results obtained for the participation, both in absolute and percentage terms, largely fall within the standard recommendations for the implementation of the Delphi technique.

However, if on the one hand the number of experts is not always deemed fundamental, on the other hand balancing the panel may be considered compulsory and the validity of the Delphi study may be evaluated also on the basis of the quality of the experts (Powell, 2003). Often Delphi specialists recommend facilitators to end the process if the panel balance and quality are not sufficiently accurate (Benitez-Capistros et al., 2014). In this Delphi study the multidisciplinary composition of the Delphi panel was accurately monitored over the progression of the three rounds. In fact the rate of participation of each disciplinary group was maintained constant from the first round to the third one. The standard deviation - observed for the variations of the participation within each disciplinary group over the three rounds - ranges from a minimum degree of 0.004 for food technologist to a maximum degree of 0.016 for food system specialists. With regards to economists and nutritionists, both the most represented disciplinary groups, their rate of participation over the global panel participation proceeds constantly (see Table 6).

Table 6 - Participation rate and degree of variation of the Delphi disciplinary groups over the three rounds

DISCIPLINARY GROUP	INVITED	ROUND 1	ROUND 2	ROUND 3	ST DEV
Agronomy	13%	10%	8%	8%	0.012
Ecology / Environmental resources	16%	8%	8%	8%	0.004
Economics	23%	33%	31%	31%	0.015
Food security/policy	12%	12%	13%	14%	0.011
Food systems	7%	6%	5%	3%	0.016
Food tech	4%	2%	3%	3%	0.004
Nutrition	16%	22%	23%	22%	0.005
Statistics	2%	4%	5%	6%	0.008
Sustainability	7%	4%	5%	6%	0.008

Furthermore, the comparative analysis of the disciplinary composition rate - between the panel of the first round and the initial group of invited experts - shows that both economists and nutritionists increased their relative rate of participation. This might suggest that these groups are strongly interested in, and sensitive to, the general topic proposed in this "*Metrics of Sustainable Diets and Food Systems*" initiative. Also, as previously mentioned, both economists and nutritionists appear to tackle - in numerous scientific publications - the relevant issues related to sustainable diets and food systems through an holistic and multidimensional approach (Gussow & Clancy, 1986; Wilkins, 2005; Burlingame & Dernini, 2011; Guyomard et al., 2012; Johnston et al., 2014; MacDiarmid et al., 2012; Esnouf et al., 2013; Vieux et al., 2013; Burlingame, 2014; Masset et al., 2014). This was the main reason why they were mostly invited in the Delphi panel. Differently, the group of specialists in Ecology and Environmental resources, that was the second most invited category with nutritionists, may appear to be less sensitive to this initiative. In fact, from the starting point of the Delphi process, the results of the participation rate of this group has fallen largely below the attrition rate observed for the other groups. Although many of the experts invited from this group had long experience and considerable competence in vulnerability and resilience approaches and analysis of social-ecological systems framework, it is possible to suppose that some of them did not perceived to have common scientific interests and competences with a potential "*Sustainable Diets*" community.

However first it is necessary to consider that this sample, for its size, implies limitations of statistical analysis and then the details on participation rate progression

may not be representative. Second, the Ecology and Environmental resources' group is composed by several subgroups of scholars working on various fields related to ecology research and natural resources management, and this avoids strong generalizations about the reasons of their results of participation rate. Third, in Delphi studies it is key to take into account the role of the scientific network and contacts (cascade approach) for balancing the heterogeneity of the panel. Despite the multidisciplinary aim of this study, the availability of professional contacts has not likely been exempted from the risk of bias because of the specific scientific environment and the background in which the initiative actually raised. Therefore - similarly as in several Delphi studies (Frewer et al., 2011) - the panel composition is mainly turned towards two groups (in our case economists and nutritionists) who bring important orientations and multidisciplinary diet-focused approaches. However, the involvement of several disciplines is key for further understanding and developing of systemic conceptual frameworks and assessment methods. Further analyses on participation rate by disciplines may rather belong to social, behavioral and cognitive science, and are not the main objective of this study.

Discussion on the indicators

According to Hasson et al. (2000) and de Franca Doria et al. (2009) consensus between 51% and 80% should be considered acceptable. Thus, in this Delphi study - as described in the results section - acceptable consensus on indicators was obtained on 18 interactions out of 24, which means an acceptable consensus on 75% of cases. Consensus on different indicators has been also categorized according to the threshold proposed by Keeney et al. (2011), namely majority ($x > 50\%$), low ($x > 50\%$), medium ($x > 70\%$) and high ($x > 80\%$) consensus. This shows that the Delphi technique is usually adapted and modified depending on research contexts and goals.

In 6 interactions (25%) an acceptable consensus on one indicator was not reached, and in particular on 3 interactions a clear bipolarity was reported (two indicators above 35%). With regards to the dimensions where consensus on a single indicator was not achieved, it is still possible to find constructive elements for discussion. In fact, although the main goal of the indicators section is to identify a common consensus on one indicator, the Delphi technique still represents an opportunity to identify innovative solutions for unraveled problems. For some of the interactions that

presented a manifest bipolarity of consensus, a number of experts proposed to integrate the two indicators into a composite one. This proposition could be potentially extended to all the interactions that presented bipolarity within the conceptual possibility of aggregation.

In Delphi studies stability of results is an essential criteria to assess the accuracy of the process. The main purpose of this study was to go through consensus for indicators that are qualitative nominal values, and there is no specific statistical test to measure the stability of responses between this kind of variables. Hence stability can be assessed through a descriptive statistical analysis that allow observing that, on average, 93% of the experts who selected the favorite indicator per dimension (at least 50%) in the second round confirmed their choices in the third round. This observation indicates that a certain degree of stability of the consensus has been achieved. Furthermore, as mentioned above 75% (18 out of 24) of dimensions reached, at least, a majority consensus ($\geq 50\%$) on one indicator, and in all these cases the indicator which was the most chosen in the round 3, was been also the most chosen in the round 1 and in the round 2. This additional observation contributes also to demonstrate a certain degree of stability of consensus.

With respect to the selection of the indicators proposed to the experts, it is possible to identify one hypothesis behind each indicator. These hypotheses lie on the causal mechanism of the vulnerability and resilience framework proposed. Thus, within a given interaction and belonging to one of the components of vulnerability (exposure, sensitivity, resilience) the hypothesis behind each indicator is formulated through the description of a functional relationship between indicator and vulnerability, as in a causal model similarly proposed by Gbetibouo et al. (2010). In table 7 these hypotheses are formulated for the indicators that reached low, medium and high consensus from the panel of experts in the third round, and presented within the related interactions, and with descriptions and details.

Table 7 - Analytical details of the formulation of the most selected indicators

Interaction ¹⁸	Determinants of vulnerability	Component indicators	Description of the indicator	Hypothesized functional relationship between indicator and vulnerability	Unit	Data source	Sources	Consensus reached
WD / NQFS	EXPOSURE	Water Footprint of nutrient-dense foods [m3/kg]	Volume of freshwater appropriated to produce a product, taking into account the volumes of water consumed and polluted at the different steps of the supply chain. This indicator refers to a specific application of the Water Footprint to nutrient-dense food items. The selection of the relevant nutrient-dense foods is left open for now. The Nutrient density score (SAIN) is suggested to identify them (Darmon and Darmon, 2008).	The higher the appropriation of water to produce food items that respond to adequate nutritional requirements, the higher the vulnerability level [In this case the nutritional quality of the food supplied would be further exposed to water demanding production processes]	m3/kg	WFN	Authors' proposal (adapted from Water Footprint Network)	75% Medium
	SENSITIVITY	Intensity of use of actual water resources [%]	Percentage of TARWR (Total actual renewable water resources) that is used (sum of total withdrawals/abstraction).	The higher the intensity of appropriation of water, the higher the vulnerability level [In this case nutritional quality of the food supplied would be more sensitive to the effects of water withdrawal]	%	FAO	FAO	61% Low
	RESILIENCE	Irrigation Water Efficiency Index [%]	Product of assessed efficiency of irrigation water transport and distribution and theoretical plot irrigation efficiency.	The higher the efficiency of irrigation, the lower the vulnerability level [In this case, in order to insure an adequate nutritional quality of food supply, there would be further adaptive/transformational/coping capacities and opportunities for water management]	%		UNEP/MAP/Blue Plan	83% High
WD / AF	EXPOSURE	Water Footprint for an average diet [m3/yr]	Total volume of freshwater that is used to produce the goods consumed in a specific diet. It is the sum of direct and indirect water use of domestic and foreign water resources through domestic consumption.	The higher the appropriation of water to produce an average diet, the higher the vulnerability level. [In this case the ability to afford food usually consumed and acquired would be further exposed to an increasing water resource withdrawal]	m3/year	WFN	Water Footprint Network; Vanham et al., 2013	86% High
BL / NQFS	EXPOSURE	% of total acreage of top 5 varieties	Share of major varieties in total surface cultivated.	The higher the homogeneity of crop cultivated area, the higher the level of vulnerability [In this case the nutritional quality of the food provided would be further exposed to the increasing loss of biodiversity]	%	FAO	FAO, 2002	64% Low
	SENSITIVITY	Nutritional Functional Diversity	Measures the capacity of a given farm/system/ecosystem to provide the diversity of nutritional elements required. The nutritional FD metric is based on plant species composition on a farm/system/ecosystem and the nutritional composition of these plants. It is correlated to species richness.	The higher the capacity of a given agro-ecosystem to provide the diversity of nutritional elements required, the lower the level of vulnerability [In this case the nutritional quality of the food provided would be affected by a biodiversity loss to a lesser extent]	score [0-100]		Remans et al., 2011	83% High
	RESILIENCE	Crop Agrobiodiversity Factor	The CAF indicates the relationship between the number of major crops in a given area and the number of crops that are ecologically adapted to the prevailing management system.	The higher the ratio between the number of major crops and the number of crops that are ecologically adapted to the prevailing management system (in a given area), the higher the vulnerability level. [In this case there would be less resilience opportunities to insure an adequate nutritional quality of the food provided]	score [0-1]		Icrisat; Renkow, 2010	89% High
BL / SCFP	SENSITIVITY	% of diets locally produced	Share of diets that are locally produced (Authors' note: either in kcal or expenditure; a spatial criteria characterizing what is a local production needs to be defined).	The higher the share of diets that are locally produced, the higher the vulnerability level [In this case there would be a manifest sensitivity of the satisfaction of food preferences face to a loss of the biodiversity in the food system]	%	-	CIHEAM/FAO, 2012	72% Medium

¹⁸ WD = Water Depletion ; BL = Biodiversity Loss ; FPV = Food Price Volatility ; CFPC = Changes in Food Consumption Patterns
NQFS = Nutritional Quality of Food Supply ; AF = Affordability of food ; DEB = Dietary Energy Balance ; SCFP = Satisfaction of Cultural Food Preferences

Interaction ¹⁹	Determinants of vulnerability	Component indicators	Description of the indicator	Hypothesized functional relationship between indicator and vulnerability	Unit	Data source	Sources	Consensus reached
FPV / NQFS	EXPOSURE	% of nutrient intakes (Vit. A, Zn, I, Fe) from 10 most volatile foods	Percentage of total nutrient intakes derived from the 10 most volatile food commodities. One nutrient (Vit. A, Zn, I, Fe) needs to be selected or a composite indicator developed.	The higher the contribution in nutrient inputs to the household basket of the 10 foods presenting highest price variations, the higher the vulnerability level [In this case the nutritional quality of the food supplied would be further exposed to fluctuations of food prices]	%	-	Authors' proposal	72% Medium
	RESILIENCE	Household Dietary Diversity Score	Measure of the number of unique foods or food groups consumed by household members over a given period. At household level, it is meant to proxy the average economic ability of a household to access a variety of foods.	The higher the number of unique foods or food groups consumed by household members over a given period, the lower the vulnerability level. [It would mean further opportunities for adapting to a vulnerability of the nutritional quality of the food supplied face to changing consumption models]	score		FANTA/FAO	92% High
FPV / AF	EXPOSURE	% of food household expenditure	Monetary value of acquired food, purchased and non purchased (including non-alcoholic and alcoholic beverages as well as food expenses on away from home consumption in bars, restaurants, food courts, work canteens, street vendors, etc.) over total household consumption expenditure (monetary value of acquired goods for consumption, food and non-food items, consumed by members of household).	The higher the share of a household expenditure for food, the higher the vulnerability level [In this case the ability of the household to afford food would be further exposed to fluctuations of food prices]	%	FAO	FAO	81% High
	SENSITIVITY	Sensitivity to price volatility	The score brings together the essential determinants of sensitivity to price volatility: price formation mechanisms, market power and price volatility upstream and downstream of the food industry, as well as the ability to pass on price variations downstream.	The higher the score of sensitivity of the agrofood sector to price fluctuations, the higher the vulnerability level.	score	-	Deloitte/PIPAME (France), 2012	86% High
CFCP / NQFS	EXPOSURE	Food Purchasing Power Index	Compares the evolution of the total cost of the food basket to the lowest monthly salary.	The higher the total cost of the food basket vis-a-vis the lowest monthly salary, the higher the vulnerability level. [In this case the nutritional quality of the food supplied would be further exposed to changing consumption models, since through complex non-linear system dynamics the food supply would follow the demand trends]	index		FAO; UN-ECOSOC, 1996	64% Low
	SENSITIVITY	Household Dietary Diversity Score	Measure of the number of unique foods or food groups consumed by household members over a given period. At household level, it is meant to proxy the average economic ability of a household to access a variety of foods.	The higher the number of unique foods or food groups consumed by household members over a given period, the lower the vulnerability level. [In this case the nutritional quality of the food supplied would be sensitive to changing consumption models to a lesser extent]	score		FANTA/FAO	83% High
CFCP / DEB	SENSITIVITY	Prevalence of underweight, overweight & obesity [%]	Percentage of population with a body mass index (BMI) of 25 kg/m2 or higher + percentage child and adult underweight	The higher the rate of obesity+overweight+underweight within a given population, the higher the vulnerability level. [In this case the equilibrium of energy intake would be further sensitive to changing consumption models]	%	WHO	WHO	69% Low

¹⁹ **WD** = Water Depletion ; **BL** = Biodiversity Loss ; **FPV** = Food Price Volatility ; **CFCP** = Changes in Food Consumption Patterns
NQFS = Nutritional Quality of Food Supply ; **AF** = Affordability of food ; **DEB** = Dietary Energy Balance ; **SCFP** = Satisfaction of Cultural Food Preferences

Even if an indicator list was provided, including a precise definition for each indicator and details about unit and bibliographical references, the hypotheses for each indicator were not integrated in the materials provided to the experts. The inclusion of this information in the indicator list would probably have helped participants for further understanding the framework and the selection process based on this causal model. However this would have also implied overloading participants with material to examine (it is reminded that experts were asked to make 24 choices within a list of 136 indicators) and it is acknowledged that an excessive burden of information exposes a Delphi process to loss of participation and to the risk of early termination (Landeta, 2006). Also focus groups' experts warned about this risk and advised to keep a limited amount of information to provide to participants.

Furthermore, whether this selection of indicators provided acceptable results in terms of consensus and further perspectives for research, quantitative aspects still represents a limiting factor for several indicators in view of potential application. In fact data availability is usually one of the key criteria to consider in the selection of indicators and in the identification of composite indicators. However, in this Delphi study, several indicators that are not yet measured gain in interest and consensus. Indeed, searching for appropriate metrics implies to go through what is desirable to measure and not which indicators are available (OECD, 2008). These findings might suggest that some of the indicators reaching consensus - that are not yet measured - are desirable to be measured. For instance, in table 7, the indicator "*% of diets locally produced*" (CIHEAM & FAO, 2012) - interaction BL/SCFP - reached a medium consensus (72%) as proxy variable for the sensitivity of the satisfaction of cultural food preference in a condition of biodiversity loss. The hypothesis supporting this indicator states that the higher the share of diets that are locally produced, the higher will be the vulnerability level. This hypothesis is based on the fact that in case of high level of diets that are produced locally, the fulfillment of the food preferences (strongly dependent on this local production) will likely be more impacted by an erosion of biodiversity in the agrofood system, since the performance of the local production may be closely related to the good conditions (high biodiversity) of the local agrofood system. Experts expressed a medium consensus on this indicator instead of choosing one of the other indicators proposed in the sensitivity component of the same interaction (see Appendices 3).

Within these less-selected indicators some of them are quite easy to be measured. For instance the "*Mediterranean Adequacy Index*" (Alberti-Fidanza et al., 1999; Bach-Faig et al., 2011) or the "*Consumer interest in ethical imports*" (DEFRA, 2008) are two indicators that can be measured and are also widely acknowledged and well conceptually structured. Probably these two indicators were not favored since they are not enough appropriate for the specific interaction in which they have been proposed. However this option can also be interpreted as a call for assessing factors that have not yet been measured, and for which there are still not available data. Hence it emerges one more reason for including or not, in the indicator list, further details on data availability; experts have been let choose freely for indicators without being influenced by the related availability of data. Is this the way "*the best argument should win?*"? Are panelists making "*some tacit knowledge explicit?*" According to Tapio et al.'s (2003) ideal outcomes for a traditional Delphi, these are two essential questions that a Delphi study can help to answer.

Discussion on the drivers of change

The drivers of change proposed in the framework (Water Depletion, Biodiversity Loss, Food Price Volatility, Changes in Food Consumption Patterns) were not described - as well as the food and nutrition security issues - in the concept note of the technical brief that was provided to the experts. Drivers and issues were in fact considered enough widely acknowledged and understandable, also considering the level and the academic background of the experts invited. Moreover, during the exploratory focus groups it was suggested not to make the concept note overly heavy (namely "*no more than 2 pages*") to avoid attrition of participation. Finally, there were not critical remarks on the general meaning of these drivers and issues from the experts who participated in the three Delphi rounds.

Relating to the appraisal of the drivers proposed, importance of biodiversity loss reached a weaker consensus among panelists; however it was the driver the most often ranked as "*very important*" as to its impact on the nutritional quality of food supply. While some experts considered that "*changes in environmental resources will likely have impacts on nutritional quality of the food supply, (...) the primary driver of nutritional quality is not environmental. There is a substantial 'buffer' in the system*

that is associated with cultural/political/economic factors (...), for example, how food is processed and how the nutritional content of food is determined". There seems to be a certain opposition between panelists on the importance of biodiversity. One expert wondered if "*biodiversity [was] related with the number of foods favourable to nutrition? The selection of adequate plants or livestock [sic], for example costless in water and with a good nutrients value, may be more efficient for sustainability*". On the contrary, other experts explicitly highlighted that "*both domestic and wild biodiversity*" and "*intraspecific variation in nutrient content across varieties [are] extremely important*" for nutritious food supply and healthy diets, an expert adding that "*(...) plant variety breeding is going too far and in the wrong direction (...)*". An expert stressed the need to distinguish biodiversity and agrobiodiversity, and questioned whether "*separate indicators*" were required. It has to be reported that Climate change, proposed by 5% of the respondents in the first round, has been highlighted again in the open ended questions as an important driver to consider per se, in addition to Water depletion and Biodiversity loss.

Discussion on the interactions

As mentioned in the results section, the categorization of drivers - likely to significantly impact food systems - presented in the 2nd EU-SCAR Foresight Exercise (2008) was used to group the drivers added by participants, through the analysis of the text.

Experts proposed a number of driver/issue interactions and the two most quoted per dimension were submitted for ranking importance. Hence, it was given the opportunity to propose new interactions, above those provided by the framework. This exercise is part of the goal of a Delphi study; it represents the possibility for the group to create a common understanding on wicked problems (Landeta, 2006). Once that the most quoted interactions have been identified and ranked by importance, they constitute eight additional typologies of impact of specific changes on the outcomes of the food systems. Also, they can represent eight more research hypotheses to explore the sustainability problems of the food systems. These newly emerged interactions are already acknowledged and established, at different extent and in different geographical contexts. The meaning of these interactions can be analyzed by providing general definitions of the interplay mechanisms.

Policy-actions constitute a driver of change that has been proposed by experts for impacting the affordability of food, the dietary energy balance, and the satisfaction of cultural food preferences. These interactions were mainly considered important by the Delphi panel. In this context, policy-actions comprehend the development and the implementation of governance tools and measures aiming at regulating the future growth of the food system through cross-sectoral gains including nutrition, health, trade, agriculture etc. With regards to the impact of policy actions on the affordability of food policy actions are generally identified to stabilize food prices and keep consumers more food- and nutrition-secure (Dube et al., 2012). Governments, civil society, media and intergovernmental organizations (for instance WHO, OECD, etc.) discuss on economic tools to address the affordability of food and change incentives for purchase, in different geographical contexts (Hawkes et al., 2013). Through the regulation of prices, policy actions can have a strong impact on obesity and food related non-communicable diseases (Webb, 2010). For instance, several international bodies advocate economic and fiscal policies to endorse the consumption of healthier foods, ameliorate the nutritional quality of diets, and fund population health programmes (Lee et al., 2013). More broadly, in order to regulate the affordability of foods on the basis of their healthy attributes, food prices can be generally controlled by governments through a number of complex policy approaches. Pricing strategies, at a national level, can comprehend taxes on specific foods (soft drinks), exemption of value added tax for selected food groups (vegetables), and subsidies (agricultural and transport subsidies, voucher systems for high-risk groups) (Powell & Chalouppka, 2009; Sassi et al., 2009). With regards to the impact of policy actions on the dietary energy balance and the satisfaction of cultural food preference, it is likely that the direct impact affects first the affordability of food through regulation of prices.

Furthermore, experts proposed a wide range of drivers that is possible to identify in the broad set of Changing agrofood patterns. This driver relates to the dynamics that shape the structure of the food systems and the relationships within the food value-chain elements and stakeholders including the steps of production, trade, distribution, consumption, and waste (SCAR, 2008). The quality and concentration of markets and supply, and the power relationship between stakeholders within the value-chain are essential for achieving adequate food system outcomes. These factors also shape

production capacity and patterns and have an impact on both the demand and production elements of food systems (Eakin, 2010). For instance, with regards to the typology of food production and the distribution structure, the increasing level of processed food sales it is a symptom of a double phenomenon. If on the one hand the food sector is able to meet and follow the food preferences of consumers and their purchasing power level through providing highly processed foods, on the other hand - since food consumption is increasingly turned towards this products (Regmi & Gehlhar, 2005) - marketing can strongly influence youngest food preferences putting these generations at risk of obesity, diabetes and food-related health problems (Nestle, 2006; Liverman & Kapadia, 2010). However technological innovations are largely applied for producing highly processed foods, that can have a negative impact on health and be, in the meantime, nutrient-poor.

Participants also suggested analyzing the impact of technological innovation on the nutritional quality of food supply. Technological innovation in the food system relates to advancements converging between bio, nano and information technologies. The productivity of agriculture will be improved through appropriate advanced technology and management techniques for resources and land. New technologies and techniques can lighten pressure on environmental and economic resources and help solving sustainability problems (SCAR, 2008). Thus, technological advances can be powerful drivers of change in term of resilience of the nutritional quality of the food provisioned (Misselhorn et al., 2010).

Soil degradation was the only environmental driver, within the newly proposed drivers of change, that was analyzed in this section (see figure 11). It was, therefore, suggested to explore the interaction between soil degradation and nutritional quality of food supply. Soil degradation affects human nutrition and health through reduction in the quantity and quality of food produced. Furthermore soil degradation implies pollution of soil and water with resultant impacts on human health. Hence, soil quality is considered as a key aspect of nutrition-sensitive agriculture, since it can help improving human nutrition (Keding et al., 2013).

Several experts also mentioned the interest for analyzing the potential impact of world population dynamics on dietary balance. Finally, this interaction was mostly ranked as

not important even though urbanization and migration, two of the most representative population dynamics, are widely acknowledged to be responses to poverty and lack of employment. For instance, observing that obesity increases as long as time passes after migration, it is now acknowledged that the impact on people's weight is consistent with an improved income level. This is similarly observed for diabetes prevalence. In UK, US and Canada it has been observed that the children of immigrants may be at even higher risk of obesity and diabetes than their parents (Cairney & Ostbye, 1998; Kaplan et al., 2004; Candib, 2007). Thus, the reason why experts did not find important the impact of world population dynamics on dietary energy balance, may it refer to the geographical context of this Delphi study (France, Italy and Spain)? It has to be reported that France, Italy, and Spain fall within the 11 countries most inhabited by foreign-born population in the world (UN, 2014).

The reflection that emerged from the proposition and the appraisal of these new interactions shows that there is no unique interpretation for each impact of a driver of change on a food and nutrition security impact. Often impacts can be either positive or negative. Thus, geographical- and context-specificity of food security issues remains key, vis-à-vis global or regional drivers of change. The contribution of inputs from experts through a Delphi study can significantly help identifying and understanding these contradictions.

Discussion on Food and nutrition security issues

Delphi participants were asked to propose further food and nutrition security issues - specific to the geographical context considered (Spain, France and Italy) - beyond the four issues presented in the initial framework. Respondents suggested 5 additional issues comprehending environmental externalities, social equity, physical accessibility, food safety, and food governance. In a following step experts assessed the all set of initial and newly proposed food and nutrition security issues.

Whether environmental and social welfare are two of the three main food system outcomes, which include food and nutrition security issues such as availability, access and utilization (Ericksen, 2008a; Ingram et al., 2010), these two newly proposed issues - environmental and social - cannot be considered as conventional food and nutrition security issues, as usually encountered in the literature (Pangaribowo et al.,

2013). Since the mid-80's, several scholars and international organizations have been proposing the concept of “*sustainable food security*” (UN, 1987; Speth, 1993; UN, 1996) or “*sustainable food and nutrition security*” today – as an enlarged concept of food and nutrition security considering environmental and social issues. Simultaneously, the term “*sustainable food and nutrition security*” has been used literally “*to address the longer term, root causes of hunger and malnutrition*” (Thompson et al., 2009) as a forward-looking concept characterizing the ability of food systems to sustain food and nutrition security. The connections between these two understandings are not clear. And further analysis and debate would be necessary to acknowledge, not only conceptually but also in practice, the introduction of environmental and social concerns into food and nutrition security issues and the related tradeoffs to adopt towards the sustainability goals.

Experts provided appraisal on the importance level of the global set of issues, and each disciplinary group may have provided different opinions. As mentioned above the sample does not allow a representative analysis between disciplinary groups. However - with regards to the most represented disciplinary groups (Economists and Nutritionists) - through a descriptive analysis, it is possible to perceive differences in the appraisal of the issues between these groups (see Table 8).

Table 8 - Appraisal of Food and Nutrition Security issues for Economists and Nutritionists' groups by Average Deviation

FNS ISSUES	ECONOMISTS	NUTRITIONISTS
Nutritional quality (of food supply)	- 0.005	+ 0.013
Affordability of food	- 0.255	+ 0.087
Dietary energy balance	+ 0.109	- 0.038
Satisfaction of cultural food preferences	+ 0.145	- 0.075
Environmental externalities	+ 0.023	+ 0.094
Social equity	+ 0.081	+ 0.167
Accessibility	- 0.466	+ 0.203
Food safety	+ 0.190	- 0.167
Food governance	+ 0.127	- 0.284

On average, both groups contributed positively to the judgment of environmental and social issues and nutritionist appear to be more concerned by social equity. It is interesting to observe that each of the two groups seems to consider less important the issues that should be rather related to their own disciplinary background. For instance economists contribute negatively - on average - to the level of importance of the

issues "*affordability*" and "*accessibility*" of food. Besides, nutritionists in comparison with other experts rank the importance of the issues "*dietary energy balance*", "*food safety*", and "*satisfaction of cultural food preferences*", under the average of the global panel. On the other hand nutritionists fostered rather "*affordability*" of food and "*accessibility*". The main discrepancies between the two groups are manifest with respect of the judgment for "*accessibility*", "*food safety*", and "*food governance*". Should we think nutritionists are more aware about the problems encountered by people living in areas that are considered "*food deserts*" and about all the related nutritional consequences? Do nutritionists have more information about the level of "*food safety*" in the geographical region considered and are enough confident with it? Are the economists more concerned by the economic risks of a safety-driven food crisis? Are nutritionists disappointed by the outcomes of previous food policies, or they are totally satisfied with them and think there is no need for further improving "*governance*"? Do the economists, instead, think that "*food governance*" can really contribute to food and nutrition security and further efforts are still necessary?

In interdisciplinary studies participants provide various skills to research efforts and it is essential to consider the values that different experts bring to the debate on food sustainability. This may help for exploring the food systems and for resolving some differences and making progress.

Geographical context

The choice of the geographical area of study, the Latin Arc (see pages 110-111), was driven by both institutional and research reasons. This thesis, in fact, is closely related to the research project "Metrics of Sustainable Diets and Food Systems", which is jointly implemented by Bioversity International-CGIAR (Nutrition and Marketing Diversity Programme - Italy and France) and CIHEAM-IAMM (France). In the meantime, this thesis is supervised by the Department of Agriculture, Food and Environment of the University of Catania (Italy), and the UMR Moïsa-Montpellier SupAgro (France). All these institutions lead scientific research in various geographical areas, including the Mediterranean Region. CIHEAM-IAMM is an international center of research on agrofood issues working essentially on the whole Mediterranean area. Bioversity International's initial institutional focus, for this project, was on France and Spain. The Department of Agriculture, Food and

Environment of the University of Catania works, at national and international level, especially on the Mediterranean countries, and the UMR Moisa-Montpellier SupAgro's geographical area of study covers various regions of the world, with a central focus on France and the Mediterranean. Spain, Italy, and France are border countries, contouring the same biogeographical region of the Mediterranean, and are all country members of the European Union and OECD, presenting relatively similar socioeconomic and policy-related aspects and characteristics.

However, these three countries have different features at a more specific level. The northern, continental and Atlantic areas of France are commonly not considered part of the biogeophysical Mediterranean region. Also, the Atlantic regions of Spain are not included in the Mediterranean area. Italy is rather considered a Mediterranean country, still presenting a considerably vast Alpine and continental area (Natura 2000).

The Latin Arc sub-region proposed, therefore, as it has already been suggested to be an interesting area for research in local cooperation at a regional, European and transnational level in the aforementioned European research projects (Western Mediterranean and Latin Alps, INTERREG II C Programme, EU: ESPON, 2010; Camagni and Capello, 2011; see pages 112-113 of this document), was identified also as a potential focus area that can both fulfill specific scientific research needs and institutional targets.

Methodological considerations

Suitability of the Delphi as a method

The Delphi method is a structured process for collecting knowledge from a group of experts by means of a series of questionnaires interspersed with controlled opinion feedback (Adler and Ziglio, 1996). In socio-ecological vulnerability assessment it is highly recommended to conduct expert judgment through the Delphi method, in order to ensure maximum objectivity (De Lange et al., 2010).

Expert opinion is often the only source of evidence when no data are available and when data are difficult to attain at affordable costs, time and due to given the complexity of environmental systems (Brooks et al., 2006; Burgman et al., 2011; Krueger et al., 2012; Vrana et al., 2012). In this research the Delphi method was

applied because of its expert elicitation capabilities for complex systems and for the possibility to conduct a selection of indicators avoiding - through anonymity and control feedback - the problems of freely interacting groups such as the dominant individuals and the pressures to conform the majority of opinions. Providing individualized feedback from each round (Steyaert & Lisoir, 2005) allows informing participants on the majority of opinions and this can generate the modifications of the opinion of the minorities (Bolger & Wright, 2011). In this way consensus usually increases after each round (Orsi et al., 2011).

In this research, several elements might have contributed to achieve appropriate levels of participation and to generate consensus.

With regards to participation, this might have been encouraged because of having an institutional support (see Annexes 1 and 2) that guarantees the beneficial purpose for society and not an exclusively profit-seeking aim for the team running the study (Landeta, 2006). It was also mentioned that a Technical workshop, effectively held in Montpellier on November 2014, would have been organized at the end of the Delphi study and that participants would have been invited for further scientific discussion on the results of the elicitation process. Experts' collaboration might have been also positively influenced because of an appropriate setting of a plural team with a very good knowledge and understanding of the problems of the sustainability of the food systems; experts can feel to make an effective contribution to the theme being studied and this enhance their motivation to participate (Landeta, 2006). Allowance of co-nomination between colleagues might have also contributed to the latter point (Tapio, 2009). Furthermore, excessive attrition of participants has been avoided also thanks to the valuable recommendations for managing, motivating, feedback administrating obtained from the pilot application that was carried in two preliminary focus-groups (Jairath and Weinstein, 1993). Sending qualitative personalized feedback with comments, explanations, and suggestions from the experts might have helped to create a real interaction of the group and then keeping adequate participation (McKenna, 1994; Rowe et al., 2005). The utility of Internet approaches to Delphi in allowing for consulting large, geographically dispersed, expert communities (Frewer et al., 2011), was confirmed in this Delphi study. Also English as base language of the survey contributed to involve international and multidisciplinary participation; also,

from this survey it does not seem that English represented a barrier for non-native English speakers. Another factor that might have contributed to Delphi participation is the double-edged sword of providing scientific contents and materials to participants. In fact, if on the one side it is recommended not to overload participants with materials, on the other side it is considered essential that experts be aware of the seriousness and relevance of the study (Landeta, 2006; McKenna, 1994). Related with this last point, the Delphi survey was structured to make each round less time-consuming than the previous one.

With regards to the elements that might have contributed to generate consensus in this Delphi study, it has to be reminded that consensus was globally reached on the set of indicators, drivers, issues and interactions, but for some indicators bipolarity and dissension emerged. The reasons of consensus (and of dissension) may lie on the several hypotheses and scientific arguments that led to the identification of the various research questions proposed, and on the experts' skills, background, and scientific perspective of sustainability of the food systems. However, there are general factors that have been reported as influencing the capacity of a group to reach consensus. In fact it is usually acknowledged that in Delphi group dynamics low status group members tend to 'go along with' the opinion of group members with a higher status and a group or a dominant group member tend to exert undue influence on the opinion of the group (Gupta & Clarke, 1996; van Zolingen & Klaassen, 2003, p. 318; Bolger and Wright, 2011). Moreover this factor further highlights the importance of the anonymity in Delphi studies as a main advantage that encourages experts to make statements on the basis of their personal knowledge (Snyder-Halpern, 2001).

Disadvantages of the Delphi technique have also been identified in literature and scholars have questioned the reliability, validity and credibility of this research methodology. Sackman (1974), for example, has noted that anonymity may lead to a lack of accountability because responses may not be traced back to the individual. Today's Internet approaches allow tracking responses of participants, but for evident scientific and ethical reasons facilitators are not allowed to divulgate this information. In addition, it has been suggested that a consensus approach can lead to a diluted version of the best opinion and the result represents the '*lowest common denominator*' (Powell, 2003, p. 378). It could be argued, however, that all approaches (for example,

working groups, nominal groups) to gaining consensus run this risk. Others have argued that this approach is time- consuming, labor intensive and, therefore, expensive (Fitzsimmons & Fitzsimmons, 2006) although there is not agreement about this (Powell, 2003). A number of methodological issues arising in respect of Delphi have the capacity to threaten the credibility of the study and these include issues around panel expertise, number of rounds, questionnaire development, analysis and achievement of consensus (Hanafin, 2004).

Considerations of a Delphi application to a vulnerability and resilience indicator-approach

In this study the Delphi method has been applied to generate a common understanding, and a consensus, within a scientific research group to provide assessment tools for policy making on sustainable diets and food systems, through a vulnerability and resilience framework. However there are a host of existing decision support tools that provide decision makers with evidence-based support on how to make decisions under risk and uncertainty (Keeney & Raiffa, 1993; Zeckhauser et al., 1996). Meanwhile these approaches did not completely proved appropriate to manage the complex issues associated with global change (Webster, 2002; Wilby et al., 2002; Tol, 2003). Thus it is highly recommended consulting with experts and users in finding solutions for social-ecological systems' problems (de Franca Doria et al., 2009).

The Delphi technique offers a structured approach to collecting data in situations where the only available alternatives may be subjective approaches (Broomfield & Humphries, 2001). The main purpose of a Delphi application to the selection of indicators was to go beyond choosing indicators on the basis of the availability of data or through subjective and value judgment decisions of an individual (Linstone & Turoff, 1975). Other group approaches to reaching consensus have been found to be less appropriate to the development of sets of indicators. The main disadvantages with technique such as nominal groups (Carney et al., 1996), brain-storming (Hasson et al., 2000), focus groups (Morgan, 1997) and analytic hierarchy process (AHP) technique (Lai et al., 2002), and working groups is their risk of considering only the perceptions of the most outspoken or opinionated members of that group or only focusing on interesting or controversial elements. Similarly, the review of methods currently used

to assess vulnerability, both in ecological studies as in social-ecological studies, reveals that assessments strongly depend on expert judgment. This can be seen as an advantage, e.g. by the use of state-of-the-art knowledge which can be adapted when new insights become available (De Lange et al., 2010). However, it can also be regarded as a disadvantage, because it is not clear how experts arrive to their judgments. This drawback can be overcome by using a standardized method, such as the Delphi method (Dalkey and Helmer, 1963).

The Delphi's participatory nature and the rigorous queries can enable close collaboration between researchers, with the aim of informing decision makers. This could enhance the scientific and policy relevance of the structured results of this application of the vulnerability and resilience framework. This adaptation of the vulnerability and resilience framework can represent an instrumental approach to be used with the Delphi method for similar future research on the assessment of the sustainability of diets and food systems. In the larger context of social-ecological systems frameworks, this approach is often associated to shortcomings especially derived from a lack of agency in programmes and scarce communication from researchers to policy-makers (Foran et al., 2014). Starting from this Delphi study - its anonymity, iterative characteristics, and the statistical consensus - the pitfalls of the vulnerability and resilience approach applied to the sustainability of the food systems could be overcome by favoring a critical verifiable generation of group communication and information.

Use of Delphi method is not free from criticism. Keith (1996) proposes, for analyzing uncertainty issues in climate change, to focus on alternative ways in which policy-makers use science rather than eliciting expert to inform them. Testing the appropriateness of expert elicitation still remains a challenge (de Franca Doria et al., 2009).

The indicator approach that we applied is based on the vulnerability and resilience framework and uses a specific set or combination of indicators (proxy indicators) proposed to measure and explore the sustainability of diets and food systems. This approach is here applied at subnational level, but can be applied at any scale (e.g., household, county/district, national, system) through a context-specific selection of

indicators. The major limitation of the indicator approach is its inability to capture the complex temporal and social dynamics of the various systems being measured. Differently from similar indicator-base approaches (Gbetibouo et al., 2010) the subjectivity in the selection of variables was avoided by applying the Delphi method. However further efforts will be needed to establish or not relative weights, to identify the availability of data at various scales or the need for further retrieval, to test or validate the different metrics (Luers et al. 2003), and to respect the essential criteria for validation indicators (OECD, 2008). However, the indicator approach is valuable for monitoring trends, exploring, and operationalizing conceptual frameworks.

Indicators are the indicating variables that allow the operationalization of the theoretical concept of vulnerability and resilience through the methodology of vulnerability assessment. Building on Hinkel (2011), for identifying vulnerability indicators three kinds of substantial arguments are available and they are defined namely as *deductive*, *inductive*, *normative*, and *non-substantial* ones. Inductive arguments are based on using data for building statistical models. Normative arguments build on value judgments in the selection and aggregation of indicating variables. Non-substantial arguments are based only on the data structure of the indicating variables and do not imply knowledge about vulnerability, nor on value judgments. Differently, deductive arguments consist of using available scientific knowledge in form of frameworks, theories or models about the vulnerable system of interest in the selection and aggregation of indicating variables, and imply also *expert judgment* argument, that is considered a weak approach (Hinkel, 2011). Since this work strongly builds on the operationalization of the theories of vulnerability and resilience, within the social-ecological system framework, through an expert-based selection of metrics of the sustainability of the food systems it is possible to classify this research effort within the group of deductive arguments for developing vulnerability and resilience indicators. Normative arguments also imply using individual or collective value judgments. It is, therefore, unclear whether expert value judgments have to be classified, according to Hinkel's classification (2011), within deductive or normative arguments. Whatever be the best argument classification of this work's approach, the deductive arguments or an integration of deductive and normative ones, the Delphi method represents a rigorous and reliable method to

handle with collective value judgments of experts (Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Landeta et al., 2011).

The indicator approach is the most common method adopted for quantifying vulnerability in the global change community (Gbetibouo et al., 2010). Leichenko and O'Brien (2002) highlighted the opportunity to capture the multi-dimensionality of vulnerability in a comprehensible form through composite indices. Vulnerability indicators are necessary for practical decision-making processes not only to provide policy makers with appropriate information for the identification of zones of vulnerability, but also to improve their understanding and knowledge of action on the causal mechanisms that are underneath the sustainability of the food systems and that emerge through a vulnerability and resilience analysis (Prosperi et al., 2014). The indicator approach is then used to develop a better understanding of the socio-economic and biophysical factors contributing to vulnerability (Hebb & Mortsch 2007). This Delphi study represents also an opportunity to test in practice a vulnerability and resilience framework adapted from the Turner et al.'s (2003) vulnerability/sustainability framework, and to improve the agency of the application through selecting indicators. This kind of framework is often considered to difficult and complex to apply (Turner et al., 2003; Gbetibouo et al., 2010), however a system analysis still needs to take into account the non-linear mechanisms that regulate complex systems, and a multidisciplinary expert elicitation represent a way to tackle such a challenging issue.

Why choosing the Delphi method instead of other techniques

There are a host of existing decision support tools that can guide decision makers in formulating decisions under uncertainty (Keeney & Raiffa, 1993; Zeckhauser et al., 1996). For instance, in eliciting views on complex climate issues, various research tools, involving experts in an iterative process of problem definition and analysis have proven useful, including Delphi approach and other expert elicitation tools (De Lange et al., 2009).

As mentioned above, the Delphi method was applied in this study for several reasons (pages 134-136 and 168-172 of this thesis), according also to several similar studies, including research on global changes, sustainability of systems, and identification and

selection of sustainability indicators, in which this methodology proved to be key (pages 134-135 of this thesis).

However, there are a number of methodologies that could have been applied, as alternatives to the Delphi method.

For example Structured Knowledge Acquisition Techniques represent a set of methodologies that involve task analysis, protocol analysis, structured interviews and simulation activities, and can be used with expert participation, individually or in small groups. In particular, McGraw and Seale (1988) provided a review on how three knowledge acquisition methods proved useful for the elicitation processes, engaging multiple expert team, such as brainstorming, consensus decision-making and the nominal group technique.

Brainstorming was found useful especially for initial meetings with several experts within a group dynamics, allowing the identification of unattended and unconventional valuable responses and solutions to a critical issue. However, since the identification of solutions is realized in an open manner within a group dynamics, it is important to consider the potential effect of academic authority or strong personalities of participants.

Consensus decision-making allows analyzing strengths and weaknesses of any solutions identified, for a specific issue, through assessment and weighting from the multiple expert team members. The knowledge engineer provides the group with a descriptive background to orient the team towards the consensus and, therefore, his/her personal and professional characteristics and behavior are central for the success of the process. It is crucial that he/she considers all the possible effects of the status, rank, and background among each expert of the panel.

The Nominal group technique can avoid the disequilibria of a face-to-face approach within the group dynamics, through and elicitation process where group members can function independently and anonymously.

These three methodologies imply the organization of a number of meetings to get the first findings for decision-making and also the engagement of an experienced and specialist knowledge engineer who could avoid unbalances within the group dynamics (especially in brainstorming and consensus decision-making) (McGraw & Seale, 1988).

Other methodologies for decision-making and knowledge elicitation refer to Soft Systems approaches (Checkland, 1981). These methodologies can imply traditional elicitation approach in the social sciences and using of semi-structured and one-to-one interviews conducted with key stakeholders. In particular this kind of techniques were applied through the "Imagine" methodology to reach a list of sustainability indicators (Bell and Coudert, 2005), in the Blue Plan Coastal Area Management Programme (CAMP) project, via participation with a range of local stakeholders. The "Imagine" methodology was initially based on the soft systems approach of Peter Checkland (Checkland, 1981) and on the approaches of a "systemic sustainability analysis" (Bell & Morse, 1999) that help in getting the complexity of sustainability and the related multiple perspectives, through identifying sustainability indicators with the participation of key involved stakeholders.

Also, in the in the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013), in particular in the POINT (Policy Influence of Indicators) project, the Triple Task methodology was adopted for implementing participatory action research and stakeholder analysis, not only to reach solutions to research problems but also to understand the factors actually involved in identifying those solutions. This methodology implies the organization of five to six workshops, involving about 20 people (Bell and Morse, 2010).

The adoption of these techniques allowed producing a holistic perception of the specific systemic contexts in an inclusive and participatory manner (Plan Bleu, 2002; Cassar et al., 2013). They are participant-led rather than researcher-led and, therefore, can provide unobvious and valuable innovative understandings (Campbell, 2002). However such approaches are time-consuming (2 days for each workshop), costly, and do not help identifying comparisons between each participant, while any input provided by individual participants have been also framed by their interaction with others (Cassar et al., 2013).

There are two main sets of explanations why the Delphi method was preferred, for this specific project, to other elicitation methodologies:

- 1) Institutional and resource availability reasons that implied making choices considering the timeframe and the number of experts to involve;
- 2) Reasons linked to the academic level of the experts involved and the related influence on the group dynamics, and the consequent required role of the knowledge engineer.

Basically the Delphi method was favored because it better fitted the time and resource constraints of the project, allowing gathering a group of 50 experts and working with rigorous and a well defined technique applicable also by non-specialist users.

First, institutional and funding-related intentions needed to be fulfilled with the organization of a conclusive event, including the presentation of results to create awareness and visibility within the research community, and gathering a community of experts working on food systems trying to discuss and identify the different understanding of sustainability for the food system.

Initially, within the aforementioned project, the intent was to elicit groups of experts through a number of meetings at different stages. The objective was to involve a maximum of a dozen of experts, in order to get views and consensus on a set of indicators to study the sustainability problems of the food system, through a resilience and vulnerability adapted framework. At this stage, the methods that could have been envisioned to elicit experts would have involved a number of various and different techniques such as Soft-System Methodology, Consensus methodology, Delphi method etc.

Then, as the conceptual and findings were based on solid and recognized conceptual frameworks, and allowed to envisage further interesting research development, the partnerships between the institutions could imply a greater motivation and involvement of means. The purpose was, therefore, to augment the participation of experts to a larger number of people of about 50 participants, and also to give more institutional visibility, in order to create further awareness and visibility on the food system sustainability problems addressed by the project. A main goal was also to explore the common understanding of the sustainability of food systems, within a high level academic community. Furthermore, the objective was also to create a community of expert, also for exploring further perspectives of common research and action for sustainable development. These goals, therefore, involved the need to

present and discuss the final results, from the shared indicator selection, in a unique event that would give the opportunity to expert to discuss, analyze, and judge the findings, and to gather efforts for further partnerships. The institutional support was then linked to this event, that could justify, in the end, the employment of means and resources. The choice of the methodology was, therefore, also conditioned by the availability of resources, at a given time, for a conclusive event of restitution of results. The perspective of a conclusive event, seminar, is also considered key to encourage the participation of experts in a lengthy elicitation process (Landeta, 2006). The Delphi method was identified as a methodology that provides a rigorous scientific process, that is time consuming, and that, if conducted appropriately, can lead to quantitative and consistent results, at the end of the process. On the other hand, the application of Soft System methodologies would have implied the organization of a number of meetings, and this would have needed the availability of means at an early and intermediary stage, and also a constant support over the meetings, before obtaining quantitative results on the indicator selection.

Second, given the high academic level of the participant, knowledgeable elicitors and knowledge engineers are strongly challenged to guarantee equilibrium within the group debate, avoiding unbalances created by authority and personality effects, and assuring high level skills in group dynamics and leadership, gaining consensus and resolving conflict (McGraw & Seale, 1988). These prerequisites could be avoided through remotely managed methods and anonymous consultation and elicitation, that can be lead by non-specialists elicitors who would rather be able to apply and follow rigorous methods and guided processes for expert elicitation. The Delphi method, for its highly defined scientific rigor, is a methodology that can be learnt and is frequently applied by non-specialists scholars.

Furthermore, an EFSA study on "Expert Knowledge Elicitation in Food and Feed Safety Risk Assessment" (2014) compared the Delphi method with two other elicitation methodologies, such as the Sheffield and the Cook techniques. Many differences emerged between those methods. The analysis of this comparative evaluation confirms the validity of the factors that have been identified for the choice of the Delphi method, as mentioned above.

Differently from the methodologies that imply the organizations of meetings and workshops, where experts gather in groups and discuss on the solution of critical problems, the Delphi method is rather applied remotely and with written materials. This prevents direct interactions of experts that would be biased by unequal knowledge of the English spoken language (EFSA, 2014), in addition to the above mentioned authority effects.

The approaches analyzed in this study, that involve the organization of experts, comprehend 6 to 10 participants (EFSA, 2014), while the Delphi method allows gathering dozens of experts, as it was actually envisaged for the specific project related to this thesis.

In addition, Delphi is considered the least demanding approach for the experts, because of the written format and the adaptable timeline, avoiding requiring attendance at workshops or at individual face-to-face sessions (EFSA, 2014). This factor allows keeping constant and acceptable participation of experts (about 50 people), and does not require implying resources for supporting intermediary workshops. Thus, the use of Delphi method initially concentrates the resources on staff costs, rather than for organizing intermediary workshops.

5-5 Conclusions

The aim of this section of the thesis was to identify a consensus on a reduced set of indicators of exposure, sensitivity and resilience - within a larger set proposed to a panel of expert - to find solutions and tools for the assessment of sustainable diets and food systems. This goal was achieved through combined use of the participatory Delphi method and the vulnerability and resilience framework. The identification of these indicators, and the understanding of the drivers of change, and of the food and nutrition security issues, would allow retrieving basic information to describe and measure the sustainability of the food systems face with global and regional socioeconomic and biophysical changes.

Following the guidelines for conducting Delphi research we obtained acceptable response and participation rates, and a balanced composition of the panel of experts from different disciplines. The Delphi study was conducted over three iterative rounds and high, medium, low and majority of consensus was progressively obtained on 75% of the interactions proposed. The drivers of change and food and nutrition security issues proposed in the framework were widely judged important, as well as the interactions presented. Furthermore, participants contributed to enlarge the set of drivers and issues and the related new interactions. The panel highlighted the importance of a number of these new propositions of interactions that will generate further hypotheses and will likely be considered for further research on problems related to the sustainability of the food systems through a vulnerability and resilience framework.

Further analysis of the socioeconomic and biophysical aspects of the sustainability of diets and food system could use or adapt the results of this Delphi study, not only by using the indicators, but also adapting the framework and the approach to other problems affecting the sustainability of the social-ecological systems at global, regional, national or local level. These efforts could be focused on support for decision-making.

This study has proved that the participatory approach – through the Delphi method – is a tool to gather opinions and forge group consensus. Delphi has demonstrated to be an efficient, versatile method capable of integrating knowledge of a panel of researchers. However, evaluation of the actual interest of the outputs of Delphi surveys into policies remains a topic that needs additional attention in order to demonstrate the actual effectiveness of the Delphi method.

The limits of this study, beyond the application of a vulnerability and resilience framework that is widely acknowledged and cited but also criticized, relate basically to the reduced number of interactions proposed, to the composition of the panel, and to the availability of the data for the indicators. However, the topics tackled by this framework can be opened to further research questions related to the sustainability of the food system. Furthermore, the preference for indicators that are not yet measured can encourage further retrieval of data for supporting decision-making. Although

participation rate was acceptable and composition of the panel was constantly diversified all over the Delphi process, these aspects of a Delphi study can always be improved.

Chapter 6

General conclusions

This thesis aimed at developing a multidimensional framework, to identify metrics for assessing the sustainability of food systems and diets, applicable at a subregional level. Building on Social-Ecological Systems frameworks, the Mediterranean Latin Arc presents several socioeconomic and biophysical drivers of change making the food system vulnerable in its functions. A vulnerability/resilience approach was applied to analyze the main issues related to food and nutrition security. Formalizing the food system as a dynamic system, a model originates from this framework. Several causal models of vulnerability were identified, describing the interactions where drivers of change directly affect food and nutrition security outcomes, disentangling exposure, sensitivity, and resilience. This theoretical modeling exercise allowed the identification of a first suite of indicators. A reduced pool of metrics was then obtained through an expert-based elicitation process (Delphi Survey), moving beyond subjective evaluation and reaching consensus.

Vulnerability per se is considered unobservable; since it does not express an observable phenomenon it is a theoretical concept that cannot be measured (Patt et al., 2008). Before measuring vulnerability, therefore, it is necessary to make the concept operational providing a method for framing it into observable concepts. This operational definition can be identified as vulnerability assessment, and indicators represent an appropriate approach to operationalize the theoretical concepts (Hinkel, 2010). Indicators are the functions of indicator-based approaches. In this thesis the arguments for identifying vulnerability indicators were *deductive* arguments (based on existing theories, models and frameworks). In particular it was adapted the general framework of Turner et al. (2003), for social-ecological systems, to the food system framework of Ericksen (2008), fostering the operationalization of the theories of vulnerability and resilience through a set of causal models and the combination with

literature review and *expert judgment* (another deductive argument for vulnerability indicators) (Hinkel, 2011). Since data availability has not been the central criterion for identifying indicators, this work is based on a *theory-driven* approach (instead of a *data-driven* one) (Niemeijer, 2002).

The general aim of this thesis was to analyze and explore the sustainability of the food system through identifying a set and a system of metrics at the Mediterranean level. This general aim involved three specific goals that have been identified through a sequential logic. The first specific goal was to develop a multidimensional framework to evaluate the sustainability of food systems and diets, applicable to countries of the Mediterranean region. At this stage it was essential to develop a conceptual framework to link concepts, methods, and metrics, for a multidimensional joint analysis and a broad understanding of food and nutrition security and food system sustainability. The second specific goal was to identify the main variables to formalize and operationalize the abstract and multidimensional concept of sustainable food systems. It was key to identify the food system characteristics and fundamental systemic properties that make the food system capable of sustaining food and nutrition security outcomes. The third specific goal was to identify metrics for assessing the sustainability of food systems and diets, at a subregional level, combining a vulnerability and resilience framework and a Delphi elicitation process.

I. A conceptual hierarchical framework was identified for modeling the complex relationships between food and nutrition security and sustainability for the development of potential indicators of sustainable diets and food systems. Developing a conceptual multidimensional framework, to explore the sustainability of the food systems, implied adopting a broad sustainability approach that was reached through an extensive literature review on problems related to food and nutrition security (**Chapter 1**). The understanding of the food systems as a social-ecological system helped answering questions about the sustainability problems that affect the functions of the food system (Food system framework: Ericksen, 2008a). Food and nutrition security is considered the principal outcome of any food system and is a multidimensional concept and relies on several properties of food systems, categorized as a range of activities (Ingram et al., 2010). Various elements of food systems are altered by, and actively impact, the socioeconomic and environmental

conditions of the system across local, regional and global levels. These interactions are featured by, and bring with themselves high uncertainties, that can be explored through a vulnerability and resilience analysis, being vulnerability the propensity or predisposition of a system to be adversely affected by a change (IPCC, 2014). Food systems can be vulnerable, and resilient, to a set of stressors (Adger, 2006) such as environmental pressures, socioeconomic instabilities and institutional and policy factors, and its vulnerability can be defined and observed through exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity (Vulnerability framework: Turner et al., 2003; Ericksen et al., 2010). A food system is considered vulnerable when it fails in delivering one or many of its intended outcomes, because of even small stresses that might bring to significant social-ecological consequences (Adger, 2006; Eakin, 2010). Fulfilling the food system outcomes remains challenging because of socioeconomic and biophysical stressors affecting the food system. Food systems are then considered social-ecological systems that comprise biophysical and social factors linked through feedback mechanisms (Ericksen, 2008a). Theories of vulnerability and resilience, within the wider context of social-ecological system frameworks, proved helpful in several researches to understand the complex dynamics involving socioeconomic and biophysical aspects (especially in ecosystem management), to implement sustainable development strategies and research programs. However the operationalization of social-ecological systems frameworks remains challenging and still interests mainly researchers and, to a lesser extent, decision- and policy-makers. Foran et al. (2014) suggest that the reason why practitioners do not tend towards these approaches resides on the systemic characteristics of these approaches. Practitioners, therefore, would prefer applying more focused tools rather than too broad and systemic approaches. In the meantime this kind of frameworks are adaptable and then able to be integrated with other methodologies and assessment tools, in order to be more operational (Binder et al., 2013). Systemic understanding of the sustainability of the food systems can thus be further implemented also enlarging the research to multiple disciplines, multidimensional approaches, and integrated assessment and simulation tools to guide change (*Chapter 2*).

Hence, using the lens of a broad sustainability perspective, a multidimensional framework has been developed based on the vulnerability and resilience theories and assessment (*Chapter 3*). A causal-factors approach has been applied to study the sequential causal pathway defined by the relationship between exposure, sensitivity

and resilience. Understanding the causal mechanisms that regulate the interactions between drivers of change and vulnerable food and nutrition security issues can help analyzing and interpreting available information, developing metrics, and anticipating new hazards and changes. The investigation on causes, effects and response to socioeconomic and biophysical changes can provide analytical tools to further understand the problems that affect the sustainability of the food system (Turner et al., 2003). This approach proved helpful for a general causal analysis of the vulnerability of the food system outcomes at a regional level, in the Mediterranean area. However it is still needed to clarify how the variables - belonging to exposure, sensitivity, and resilience - actually behave in a dynamic food system faced with several unattended socioeconomic and environmental drivers of change at multiple temporal and spatial scales.

II. Therefore, the research targeted the identification of the main variables to formalize and operationalize the abstract and multidimensional concepts of sustainable food systems. A feedback-structured framework of the food system (*Chapter 4*) formalized eight causal models of vulnerability and resilience, and identified intrinsic properties of the food system, shaping the interactions where external drivers of change directly affect food and nutrition security outcomes at a subregional level. The previously mentioned causal pathway to vulnerability was then clarified. The challenge for social-ecological system frameworks analysis, here, is to identify the pathways leading to vulnerability, and the characteristics and opportunities ensuring resilience of the food system in a context of change. The identification of a causal pathway (adapted from Metzger and Schroeter, 2006; Fussler and Klein, 2006) allowed locating the role of the three variables (such as exposure, sensitivity and resilience), with exposure referring to relational variable and characterizing the relationship between the system and its environment. Hence exposure represents the first point of contact between the stress or perturbation, and the system. The understanding of exposure, as the first interface with a specific driver of change, helps differentiating it from the sensitivity or resilience components, which might be influenced by other drivers of change. Building on the GECAFS food systems approach (Ericksen, 2008a,b; Ingram et al., 2010), coupled with Turner et al.'s (2003) conceptualization of vulnerability, it is suggested a framework representing the modeling of food systems' dynamics, with feedback from outputs to

inputs. Dynamic systems consider mainly two types of variables: endogenous and exogenous variables. In the case at hand, these variables are defined at the national or sub-national level. On the contrary, outcomes from the food system activities may however contribute to these external drivers. The three components of vulnerability – exposure, sensitivity and resilience – are the intrinsic features of the system that mediate the impact of the drivers of change on the food system’s outcomes. These can be either state or control variables. This formalization of the food system dynamics allowed shaping eight causal models, in the geographical area of the Latin Arc, where the drivers of change and the food system outcomes of interest have been evaluated through the analysis of their potential causal relationships. These sets of characteristics are indicating how changes in water, biodiversity, food prices and food consumption patterns are transmitted through the food system, including the sequencing of events and the scale of interactions; how the food system is sensitive to these changes; and the adaptive capacity of the food system. This could lead to subsequent work to identify thresholds of change and to model quantitatively the interactions among stressors, attributes, and outcomes, to improve the general understanding of food system sustainability. It more importantly offers the elements that need to be assessed, i.e. the attributes that indicators can be measuring.

III. The identification of crucial interactions within a complex food system, involving global and regional socioeconomic and biophysical drivers of change against a set of context-specific food and nutrition security issues, and the identification of a causal model where variables are the characterizing properties of a formalized food system, allow the definition of a set of metrics for assessing the sustainability of the food systems (*Chapter 5*). The aim is to select metrics for assessing the sustainability of food systems and diets, at a subregional level, combining a vulnerability and resilience framework and a Delphi elicitation process. Part of the aim is also to involve the participation of the scientific community in the selection of metrics. Whether several expert elicitation processes exist, Delphi studies are considered performing tools that provide a common understanding and consensus on unraveled problems, avoiding problems related to institutional or authority influence between the experts. The vulnerability and resilience framework was used as an analytical lens to provide a sequential list of sustainability indicators, while the Delphi method was used to determine which indicators are perceived as more relevant according to a

selected group of participants. The Delphi study was conceived, and managed, according to the recommendations of several scholars (Landeta, 2006; Frewer et al., 2011). In particular this Delphi process was structured to achieve the main aim of this specific research: a consensus on a set of metrics of sustainable diets and food systems. This involved also the selection of the invited researchers on the basis of their characteristics. A crucial factor was the selection of metrics for the initial set of metrics. Each indicator was identified following a hypothesis. Each specific hypothesis would describe the behavior of a specific variable (of exposure, sensitivity, or resilience) lying underneath the causal mechanism that is occurring in each interaction between a driver of change and a food and nutrition security issue. The results, in terms of global response and participation rates and consensus on indicators, were judged acceptable (Landeta, 2006). These results confirmed the validity of the conceptual framework and methodology applied. However strengths and weaknesses of this approach appear belonging to the same aspects. If on the one hand it happened that the panel has selected metrics that are not measured with data - so there are not yet quantitative means to test them - on the other hand this is also one of the purposes of the expert elicitation: to open the understanding, reflection and debate, and let experts freely propose innovative solutions. Then, there might be a subsequent call for measuring specific indicators that are not yet assessed. Furthermore, experts proposed also to enlarge the fields of the study through further drivers of change and food and nutrition security issues of the food system. There might be various perspectives for further research from these results, however, the Delphi method need to be managed in a way that could really be helpful for solutions, providing concrete and applicable outcomes, in order to offer decision-makers, stakeholders, and practitioners the possibility to fruitfully work throughout social-ecological systems frameworks for improving action on sustainable food systems.

Scientific standing

This thesis deals with several research domains and mainly pertains to three research fields such as: assessing sustainability of diets and food systems, operationalizing of vulnerability and resilience theories, and the Delphi expert consultation method.

With regards to assessing sustainability of diets and food systems, it still does not exist a shared consensus on a set of metrics (Vinceti et al. 2013). Research institutions, and governmental and non-governmental bodies produced a host of

valuable efforts, both at national and international level, for identifying metric tools for the assessment of the sustainability of food systems (Feenstra et al., 2005; DEFRA, 2009; FAO, 2013b; UNSDSN, 2014). This work is meant to propose a scientific contribution, to the assessment of sustainable diets and food systems, building on robust theories (vulnerability and resilience within the social-ecological systems frameworks) and methods (vulnerability assessment and Delphi process) that already proven appropriate for food systems or social-ecological systems analyses. In this study, the analysis of the causal mechanisms underneath the sustainability problems of food systems is led through a theory-driven approach, based on deductive arguments. This scientific standing is different from the data-driven approaches (based of inductive arguments) applied to study the sustainability of the food systems. In fact, the understanding of the changes affecting the sustainability of the outcomes of the food systems need to be studied through a systemic investigation of the dynamics that regulate the interactions between the different variables of a complex system. This discrepancy (from a data-driven approach) explains why, in this study, the selection of indicators belongs on single hypotheses built on theories, frameworks, and then on expert opinions, and does not originate from the general quantitative criteria that are generally proposed within the main and broad guidelines for indicators identification, such as SMART criteria (Doran, 1981), or the principles of the European Statistics Code of Practice's (OECD, 2008), or the precepts of the indicators of Sustainable Consumption and Production (Watson et al., 2010).

However, a statistical robustness of data remains key in the process of quantitative assessment of indicators. Hence, a following phase contributing to further knowledge and assessment of sustainable diets and food systems needs to be supported, through a statistical validity of the measurement. Building on the selected metrics and on the identified data gaps and needs, an appropriate set of criteria to assess the overall quality of the indicators will need to be identified. With regards to the indicators defined and selected in this study to proxy the variables that describe the sustainability dynamics of the food systems, thanks to the rigorous approach applied, it might be possible to acknowledge their relevance to the sustainability problems of the food systems, their representativeness of the specific geographical context considered, as well as their interpretability through the identification of the hypotheses formulated. Nevertheless, the validity, reliability, consistency, availability,

measurability, monitorability, cost effectiveness, and timeliness of the related data will still need to be tested in a next phase. A suitable approach, providing minimal quality criteria for measurement, can be found in the conceptual framework proposed by Cafiero et al. (2014) for food security assessment, that is based on the recognition of the *validity* of a measurement tool and the *reliability* of the measures it produces (including *accuracy* and *precision*). This approach has already been fruitfully tested (Cafiero et al., 2014) through reviewing the validity, reliability and feasibility of a selection of food security indicators.

Limitations

The limitations of this work can be mainly identified in the theoretical approach, in the methodological framework, and in the results obtained.

The theories of vulnerability and resilience pertain to the social-ecological systems frameworks. With regards to the application of these theories to the analysis of the sustainability of the food systems, it is acknowledged that this theoretical approach interests mainly the scientific community rather than the community of development practitioners; its systemic nature would complicate and discourage the agency options (Foran et al., 2014). However, in some cases practitioners might tend to consider metrics to measure sustainability as more important than scientists might do (Dicks et al., 2013).

This specific limitation of the approach calls for further efforts, of application to food system studies and analyses, aimed at overcoming the pitfalls encountered. Within this broad systemic approach, that is hard to apply, this thesis attempted to provide a reductionist and operational analytic approach, refined through multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholders dialogue and interaction (i.e. the Delphi study), and aimed at contributing to the perspective of a science for sustainability (Holling, 1998; Scoones et al., 2007) in food systems. However, the proposed fragmentation in specific vulnerabilities and resilience factors, through the intersections of different drivers and issues, induces a certain degree of linearity in causality. Then, as systems behave in a circular organization, this linear fragmentation could be deemed as excessively reductionist and not considering unattended feedback loops occurring within the food system. This factor may generate doubts from the scientific community because of the need of further and time-consuming modifications of the approach. In any case, a

whole food system approach is often exposed to several critics for being too ambitious, or, to risks of insufficient analysis or applicability.

Analyzing the sustainability of the food systems through the identification of a set of metrics has the natural goal of contributing to a quantitative assessment. This study wants mainly to fill the theoretical and methodological gaps that are generally beneath a numeric assessment of sustainable diets and food systems. As it has already been mentioned, this work lies on a theory-driven approach and on deductive arguments and expert judgment, differently from data-driven processes and inductive and non-substantial arguments (Hinkel, 2011). While robust theoretical and conceptual principles could represent a prior solid basis for a following statistical analysis, the contrary could appear less pertinent in any kind of measurement; "*What is badly defined is likely to be badly measured*" (OECD, 2008). In particular, this work reviews methods of assessment, cites data on food security issues and sustainability problems especially in the Mediterranean context, proposes a quantitative calculation, and selects metrics for sustainable diets and food systems but it does not actually quantify the variables emerged. Efforts are, thus, totally concentrated on the operationalization of the theories of vulnerability and resilience for defining a set of metrics of sustainable diets and food systems and for an expert-based selection. Taking seriously these latter fundamental issues, accuracy is further challenged for subsequent data retrieving and statistical robustness. Moreover several selected indicators are not yet computed in the geographical area analyzed. Further research, therefore, could stem from the outcomes of this work and lead to quantitative results, still considering suitable criteria for adopting valid and reliable metrics (Cafiero et al., 2014). Starting from the elements that need to be assessed and knowing the attributes that indicators can be measuring, subsequent work could identify thresholds of change and model quantitatively the interactions among stressors, attributes, and outcomes, to improve the general understanding of food system sustainability.

In addition, other food systems' outcomes than food and nutrition security issues could also have been studied, such as environmental and socio-economic outcomes related to employment or equity. Food systems, in fact, are responsible for various environmental, economic and social outcomes. Incorporating these issues would have maybe matched better the general understanding of sustainability. The set of food

systems' outcomes and defining elements could, therefore, be extended to other dimensions to further develop the modelling approach, since sustainability can hardly be modeled parsimoniously. This would then originate questions in terms of feasibility of the modeling.

Implications for further research

The theoretical background, the results, and the limits of this work can help identify further research perspectives. This research may offer a set of opportunities for further analyses on the sustainability of the food systems, thanks to a dynamic framework, together with robust theory-driven approach and deductive arguments for selecting the indicators, combined with a rigorous Delphi study.

The framework comprehends four main drivers of change, such as Water depletion, Biodiversity loss, Food price volatility, and Changes in food consumption patterns that are acknowledged for being key in affecting the sustainability of the food systems. The interactions between these drivers and a set of major food and nutrition security issues, such as Nutritional quality of food supply, Affordability of food, Dietary energy balance, and Satisfaction of cultural food preferences, are tested as they are considered crucial in the geographical region considered (see chapter 4). On the one hand this framework provides the opportunity to further investigate these current key socioeconomic and biophysical changes, acting on the food systems, and the food and nutrition security problems specific to the limited geographical context of the Latin Arc. Some of these elements have been studied in literature more than others. However the set of interactions might provide further original and inspiring research developments. For instance, describing and assessing the links between all the drivers of change with the nutritional supply (and not the caloric supply), the interplay between the loss of biodiversity and the food preferences, and the interaction between water scarcity and food access, represent challenging questions that are emerging in food systems' research and might lead to interesting scientific novel contributions for the assessment and understanding of the food system sustainability problems. On the other hand, as already stated and also attempted in the Delphi study (see chapter 5), the framework proposed is a dynamic structure that is open to further applications and integration with different drivers and issues. New research could originate from this framework and investigate further sustainability challenges for the

food systems, starting from the expert consultation results that call for a deeper analysis of environmental externalities and social equity, as well as food safety and governance issues, and their potential interactions with current drivers of change such as technological innovation, policy actions, or changing agrofood patterns and structures.

With regards to the availability of data, according to the list of 15 selected indicators presenting low, medium, and high consensus, at least 9 of them are not computed in the geographical area considered. In fact, experts were let free to choose for indicators without being influenced by the availability of data. Furthermore, since searching for appropriate metrics implies to go through what is desirable to measure and not which indicators are available (OECD, 2008), this might encourage further retrieval of data for these indicators, in order to assess the drivers, issues, and the related interactions proposed that are not yet measured.

The selection of metrics presented might be used for evaluating the sustainability of diets and food systems for the drivers and issues considered, in the Mediterranean Arc, through a vulnerability and resilience assessment. Once that metrics are identified and then selected on both theoretical and consensus bases, several studies recommend to validate the indicators through a set of criteria that have been mentioned above (Cafiero et al., 2014). Therefore, as it is proposed in this work (see chapter 3) and confirmed in other vulnerability assessments (Gbetibouo et al., 2010), data will need to be standardized and weights might also be attached to the indicators. Weight assignment is generally led through expert judgment (deductive arguments) (Brooks et al., 2005; Moss et al., 2001), arbitrary choice of equal weight (normative arguments) (Lucas & Hilderink, 2005; O'Brien et al., 2004; Patnaik et al., 2005), and statistical methods such as principal component analysis or factor analysis (inductive or non-substantial arguments) (Cutter et al., 2003; Thornton et al., 2008). Principal component analysis can help generate weights for the selected indicators in agriculture vulnerability assessment (Gbetibouo et al., 2010) and in spatially-explicit vulnerability assessments (Abson et al., 2012). In both cited cases the principal component analysis was successfully applied for establishing weights within a set of indicators for different oriented vulnerability indices and allowed spatially differentiating geographical areas with regards to context-specific vulnerabilities;

however it was not applied for providing absolute measures of vulnerability or for selecting indicators. The opportunity of mapping social-ecological vulnerability to understand and assess the sustainability of diets and food systems should imply not only indicating which areas are vulnerable, but also identifying to what is driving that vulnerability for informing decision-making. Furthermore, whether the indicator approach, that can use a specific set of indicators as proxy variables to measure vulnerability indices and weighted averages, may be applied at any scale (household, county/district, or national level) (Gbetibouo et al., 2010), choosing the best spatial scale at which to undertake such assessments remains a crucial challenge for further research (Abson et al., 2012).

In this work a subnational level was proposed in order to analyze the vulnerability of a set of common and context-specific food and nutrition security issues vis-à-vis a combination of global and regional drivers of change (see chapter 4). Sub-continental regions are considered a natural spatial level for studies of social-ecological systems (such as food systems) for being often defined by shared cultural, political, economic and biogeographical contexts, contributing to food security research (Liverman & Ingram, 2010). This study, therefore, focused on the analysis of vulnerability and resilience of context-specific food system issues at the Mediterranean level (see chapter 1 and 3). Since food and nutrition security issues are based on social-ecological interactions, it is necessary to define different scales and levels of analysis that open to regional-level, subregional-level, and cross-level questions (Ingram & Izac, 2010). The specificity of the food and nutrition security issues tackled in this work raised mainly subregional-level and cross-level questions and asked for a smaller geographical focus that was found in the Latin Arc geographical entity (see chapter 4 and 5). Moreover, at a national level, this south-west Mediterranean area of Europe presents levels of population density that are considerably different from other subregions of the Mediterranean Basin, such as the north-west Mediterranean Africa, and in particular several socioeconomic data (as described in chapter 3) show considerable gaps between countries in terms of food and nutrition security related issues (such as the share of DES derived from cereals, adult literacy, child-stunting, -wasting, -underweight, global obesity, and overweight). These implications may open further research efforts on the assessment of the sustainability of food systems in other subregions of the Mediterranean, such as North-west Africa, the Middle-East, or

the Euro-Mediterranean Balkans, that are likely to be affected by common global and regional drivers of change and sustainability problems (water scarcity, biodiversity loss, etc.) that act on different context-specific food and nutrition issues at a national or subnational level (food preferences, food access, etc.).

Additional elements for further research can be developed building on the framework proposed for analyzing the food system dynamics. In particular the circularity of the food system framework, thus the presence of feedback loops (see above and chapter 4), could be further developed through an advanced specification of the hypotheses that allow identifying the indicators, such as the hypotheses presented in table 7. This could help overcome the risk of linearity of the framework and better define the role of the variables of exposure, sensitivity, and resilience (see figure 4 in chapter 4); it might represent a further contribution aiming at successfully operationalizing the social-ecological systems frameworks and the theories of vulnerability and resilience, for the assessment and understanding of the sustainability problems affecting the food systems, and for identifying the resilience opportunities to support decision-making.

Analyzing the scientific context, the limitations, and the research perspectives of a theoretical approach, a framework, and a selection of indicators for the assessment of sustainable diets and food systems is key to define further research implications. However, it is paramount to ensure that indicators are useful and have a specific scope, such as satisfying a specific demand or contributing to set up policy actions. Moreover, it is key to define the real users of the indicators (Bell & Morse, 2011). These are crucial and challenging issues to be considered at any further step working on indicators for sustainable food systems.

In conclusion, food systems are systems of variables connected to each other through causal pathways, which are further complexified by operating at different geographical or time scales. It is, therefore, desired to develop interventions that treat the underlying causes, rather than the symptoms of the unsustainability deriving from food systems, and the concepts of vulnerability and resilience can bring food security into consideration in a different way than in the past. Through the vulnerability and resilience theories and approach it is suggested to capture the food system as a whole, think prospectively and identify the system elements that policy can control or

mitigate. The distinction in three components, namely exposure, sensitivity and resilience, provides the elements of a model that specify what attributes need to be measured and how to structure the different indicators in a coherent assessment framework for improved decision-making and policies. The design of legitimate and collective decision processes is then crucial to sustainability.

References

Abson, D.J., Dougill, A.J. and Stringer, L.C. (2012) 'Using Principal Component Analysis for information-rich socio-ecological vulnerability mapping in Southern Africa', *Applied Geography*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp.515-524.

Adger, W.N. (2006) 'Vulnerability', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp.268-281.

Adger, W.N. and Vincent, K. (2005) 'Uncertainty in adaptive capacity', *Comptes Rendus Geoscience*, Vol. 337, No. 4, pp.399-410.

Adger, W.N. (2000) 'Institutional adaptation to environmental risk under the transition in Vietnam', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 90, No. 4, pp.738-758.

Adger, W.N., Arnell, N.W. and Tompkins, E.L. (2005) 'Successful adaptation to climate change across scales', *Global environmental change*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp.77-86.

Adger, W.N., Brooks, N., Bentham, G., Agnew, M. and Eriksen, S. (2004) *New indicators of vulnerability and adaptive capacity*. [online] Technical Report 7, Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, Norwich, England. http://www.tyndall.ac.uk/sites/default/files/it1_11.pdf (Accessed 01 March 2015)

Adger, W.N., Huq, S., Brown, K., Conway, D. and Hulme, M. (2003) 'Adaptation to climate change in the developing world', *Progress in development studies*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp.179-195.

Adger, W.N. and Kelly, P.M. (1999) 'Social vulnerability to climate change and the architecture of entitlements', *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, Vol. 4, Nos. 3-4, pp.253-266.

Adler, M. and Ziglio, E. (1996) *Gazing into the oracle: the Delphi method and its application to social policy and public health*, Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London, England.

Akinnifesi, F.K., Kwesiga, F.R., Mhango, J., Mkonda, A., Chilanga, T. and Swai R. (2004) 'Domesticating priority miombo indigenous fruit trees as a promising livelihood option for smallholder farmers in Southern Africa', *Acta Horticulturae (ISHS)*, Vol. 632, pp.15-30.

Akins, R.B., Tolson, H. and Cole, B.R. (2005) 'Stability of response characteristics of a Delphi panel: application of bootstrap data expansion', *BioMed Central Medical*

Research Methodology, 5(37) [online]
<http://www.biomedcentral.com/content/pdf/1471-2288-5-37.pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Alberti-Fidanza, A., Fidanza, F., Chiuchiu, M., Verducci, G. and Fruttini, D. (1999) 'Dietary studies on two rural Italian population groups of the Seven Countries Study 3. Trend Of food and nutrient intake from 1960 to 1991', *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 53, No. 11, pp.854-860.

Allen, T., Prosperi, P., Cogill, B. and Flichman, G. (2014) 'Agricultural biodiversity, social-ecological systems and sustainable diets', *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, Vol. 73, No. 4, pp.498-508.

Allison, E. H., Perry, A. L., Badjeck, M. C., Neil Adger, W., Brown, K., Conway, D., Halls, A.S., Pilling, G.M., Reynolds, J.D., Andrew, N.L., Dulvy, N.K. (2009) 'Vulnerability of national economies to the impacts of climate change on fisheries', *Fish and Fisheries*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp.173-196.

Allouche, J. (2011) 'The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade', *Food Policy*, Vol. 36, pp.S3-S8.

Altieri, M.A. (1999) 'The ecological role of biodiversity in agroecosystems', *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, Vol. 74, No. 1, pp.19-31.

Altieri, M.A. (2000) 'Multifunctional dimensions of ecologically-based agriculture in Latin America', *The International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.62-75.

Alwang, J., Siegel, P.B. and Jorgensen, S.L. (2001) *Vulnerability: a view from different disciplines*, Social Protection Discussion Paper Series, No. 115, Social Protection Unit, Human Development Network, The World Bank, Washington DC, USA. http://ipcc-wg2.gov/njlite_download.php?id=5287 (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Anderies, J.M. and Janssen, M.A. (2013) 'Robustness of Social-Ecological Systems: Implications for Public Policy', *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp.513-536.

Andersen, P.S., Vejre, H., Dalgaard, T. and Brandt, J. (2013) 'An indicator-based method for quantifying farm multifunctionality', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 25, pp.166-179.

Arimond, M. and Ruel, M.T. (2004) 'Dietary diversity is associated with child nutritional status: evidence from 11 demographic and health surveys', *The Journal of Nutrition*, Vol. 134, No. 10, pp.2579-2585.

Arimond, M., Wiesmann, D., Becquey, E., Carriquiry, A., Daniels, M. C., Deitchler, M., Fanou-Fogny, N., Joseph, M.L., Kennedy, G., Martin-Prevel, Y. and Torheim, L.E. (2010) 'Simple food group diversity indicators predict micronutrient adequacy of women's diets in 5 diverse, resource-poor settings', *The Journal of Nutrition*, Vol. 140, No. 11, pp.2059S-2069S.

Arnell, N.W., Tompkins, E.L. and Adger, W.N. (2005) 'Eliciting information from experts on the likelihood of rapid climate change', *Risk Analysis*, Vol. 25, No. 6, pp.1419-1431.

Ashby, W.R. (1956) *An introduction to cybernetics*, Chapman & Hall, London, England.

Åström, K.J. (2012) *Introduction to stochastic control theory*, Courier Dover Publications, New York, USA.

Aubin, J., Donnars, C., Supkova, M., Dorin, B., Gaillard, G., Garcia, F., Gauthier-Deltour L., Henry E., Labouze E., Le Perchec S., Lemeilleur S., Macombe C., Mahé T., Renaud J.P. and Rojot C. (2013) 'A critical panorama of methods used to assess food sustainability', in Esnouf, C. et al (Eds.) *Food System Sustainability. Insights from duALIne*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, pp.198-232.

Ayres, R.U. (2000) 'Commentary on the utility of the ecological footprint concept', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp.347-349.

Bach-Faig, A., Fuentes-Bol, C., Ramos, D., Carrasco, J. L., Roman, B., Bertomeu, I. F., Cristià, E., Geleva, D. and Serra-Majem, L. (2011) 'The Mediterranean diet in Spain: adherence trends during the past two decades using the Mediterranean Adequacy Index', *Public Health Nutrition*, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp.622-628.

Barbier, E. and Conway, G. (1990) *After the Green Revolution: Sustainable Agriculture for Development*, Earthscan Publications, London.

Barilla Centre for Food and Nutrition. (2010) *Double Pyramid: healthy food for people, sustainable food for the planet*, Barilla Centre for Food and Nutrition, Parma, Italy.

Barling, D., Lang, T. and Rayner, G. (2009) 'Current trends in food retailing and consumption and key choices facing society', in Rabbinge, R. and A. Linnemann (Eds.), *European Food Systems in a Changing World*, European ScienceFoundation/COST Forward Look, Wageningen, The Netherlands, pp.117-135.

Barling, D., Lang, T. and Sharpe, R. (2010) 'The re-emergence of UK National Food Security on the policy agenda: sustainability challenges and the politics of food

supply', in Lawrence, G. et al (Eds.), *Food security, Nutrition and Sustainability: New Challenges, Future Options*, Earthscan, London, England, pp. 61-78.

Barrett, C.B. (2002) 'Food security and food assistance programs', in Gardner, B.L. and Raussler, G.C. (Eds.), *Handbook of Agricultural Economics*, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, pp. 2103-2190.

Barrett, C.B. (2010) 'Measuring Food Insecurity', *Science*, Vol. 327, No. 5967, pp.825–828.

Barrio, A.M. (Ed.) (2004) *Environmental Challenges in the Mediterranean 2000–2050*, Springer Science & Business Media, Dordrecht Heidelberg London NewYork.

Bates, B., Kundzewicz, Z.W., Wu, S. and Palutikof, J. (2008). *Climate change and water*. [online] Technical Paper VI of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC Secretariat, Geneva, Switzerland. <http://ipcc.ch/pdf/technical-papers/climate-change-water-en.pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Bauler, T. (2012) 'An analytical framework to discuss the usability of (environmental) indicators for policy', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 17, pp.38-45.

Baumgärtner, S., Dyckhoff, H., Faber, M., Proops, J. and Schiller, J. (2001) 'The concept of joint production and ecological economics', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp.365-372.

Bausch, J.C., Bojórquez-Tapia, L. and Eakin, H. (2014) 'Agro-environmental sustainability assessment using multicriteria decision analysis and system analysis', *Sustainability Science*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp.303-319.

Beddington, J.R., Asaduzzaman, M., Clark, M.E., Bremauntz, A.F., Guillou, M.D., Jahn, M.M., Lin, E., Mamo, T., Negra, C., Nobre., C.A., Scholes, R.J., Scharma R., Van Bo, N. and Wakhungu, J. (2012) 'The role for scientists in tackling food insecurity and climate change', *Agriculture & Food Security*, 1(10) [online] <http://www.agricultureandfoodsecurity.com/content/pdf/2048-7010-1-10.pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Bélanger, V., Vanasse, A., Parent, D., Allard, G. and Pellerin, D. (2012) 'Development of agri-environmental indicators to assess dairy farm sustainability in Quebec, Eastern Canada', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 23, pp.421-430.

Bell, S. and Coudert, E. (2005) *A practitioner's guide to 'Imagine', the systemic and prospective sustainability analysis* [online] Blue Plan Paper Vol. 3, UNEP, Valbonne, France http://planbleu.org/sites/default/files/publications/cahiers3_imagine_uk_0.pdf (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Bell, S. and Morse, S. (1999) *Sustainability Indicators. Measuring the Immeasurable*, Earthscan, London, England.

Bell, S. and Morse, S. (2003) *Measuring Sustainability Learning from Doing*, Earthscan, London, England.

Bell, S. and Morse, S. (2008) *Sustainability indicators: measuring the immeasurable?*, Earthscan, London, England.

Bell, S. and Morse, S. (2010a) 'The role of Sustainability Indicators within evidence-based policy for sustainable development in the European Union'. Paper Presented at the *16th Annual International Sustainable Development Research Conference*. 30 May - 01 June 2010. Hong Kong, PRC.

Bell, S. and Morse, S. (2010b) 'Triple task method: systemic, reflective action research', *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, Vol. 23, No. 6, pp.443-452.

Bell, S. and Morse, S. (2011) 'An analysis of the factors influencing the use of indicators in the European Union', *Local Environment*, Vol., No. 3, pp.281–302.

Bell, S. and Morse, S. (2013) 'Towards an understanding of how policy making groups use indicators', *Ecological Indicators*, Vo. 35, pp.13-23.

Bell, S. and Morse, S. (2014) 'Groups and Indicators in Post-Industrial Society', *Sustainable Development*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp.145-157.

Benitez-Capistros, F., Hugel, J. and Koedam, N. (2014) 'Environmental impacts on the Galapagos Islands: Identification of interactions, perceptions and steps ahead', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 38, pp.113-123.

Bennett, E., Cumming, G. and Peterson, G. (2005) 'A systems model approach to determining resilience surrogates for case studies', *Ecosystems*, Vol. 8, No. 8, pp.945-957.

Benoit, G. and Comeau, A. (Eds.) (2005) *A sustainable future for the Mediterranean: the Blue Plan's environment and development outlook*, Earthscan, London, England.

Berkes, F., Colding, J. and Folke, C. (2003) *Navigating social-ecological systems: building resilience for complexity and change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.

Berkes, F. and Folke, C. (1998) *Linking social and ecological systems for resilience and sustainability*. <http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/4352/Berkes->

linking_social_and_ecological_systems_for_resilience_and_sustainability.pdf?sequence=1 (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Bertalanffy, L. (1968) *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*, Braziller, New York, USA.

Binder, C.R., Hinkel, J., Bots, P.W. and Pahl-Wostl, C. (2013) 'Comparison of Frameworks for Analyzing Social-ecological Systems', *Ecology and Society*, 18(4) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol18/iss4/art26/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Bioversity International and CIHEAM-IAMM (2014) *Identifying appropriate Metrics of Sustainable Diets and Food Systems: a Delphi expert consultation*. Technical Brief 1.0-2014, Bioversity International & CIHEAM, Montpellier, France.

Birkmann, J. (2006) 'Measuring vulnerability to promote disaster-resilient societies: Conceptual frameworks and definitions', in Birkmann, J. (Ed.) *Measuring vulnerability to natural hazards: Towards disaster resilient societies*, United Nations University Press, Tokyo, Japan, pp.9-54.

Bohle, H.G. (2001) 'Vulnerability and criticality: perspectives from social geography', *International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change update*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.3-5.

Bolger, F. and Wright, G. (2011) 'Improving the Delphi process: lessons from social psychological research', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 78, No. 9, pp.1500-1513.

Borton J., and Shoham J. (1991) *Mapping vulnerability to food insecurity: Tentative guidelines for WFP offices*, Relief and Development Institute, London, England.

Boulanger, P.M. (2007) 'Political uses of social indicators: overview and application to sustainable development indicators', *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp.14-32.

Boukdedid, R., Abdoul, H., Loustau, M., Sibony, O. and Alberti, C. (2011) 'Using and reporting the Delphi method for selecting healthcare quality indicators: a systematic review', *PLoS ONE*, 6(6) [online] <http://www.plosone.org/article/fetchObject.action?uri=info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0020476&representation=PDF> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Brooks, N. (2003) 'Vulnerability, risk and adaptation: A conceptual framework', *Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research Working Paper*, 38 [online] <http://www.tyndall.ac.uk/sites/default/files/wp38.pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Brooks, N., Adger, N.W. and Kelly, M.P. (2005) 'The determinants of vulnerability and adaptive capacity at the national level and the implications for adaptation', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp.151-163.

Brooks, T.M., Mittermeier, R.A., da Fonseca, G.A., Gerlach, J., Hoffmann, M., Lamoreux, J.F., Mittermeier, C.G., Pilgrim, J.D. and Rodrigues, A.S. (2006) 'Global biodiversity conservation priorities', *Science*, Vol. 313, No. 5783, pp.58-61.

Broomfield, D. and Humphries, G. M. (2001) 'Using the Delphi technique to identify the cancer education requirements of general practitioners', *Medical Education*, Vol. 35, No. 10, 928-937.

Brown, D.R. (2000) *A review of bio-economic models*, Cornell University, Ithaca, USA.

Brown, O. (2008) *From Feast to Famine: After Seven Good Years What Now for Commodity Producers in the Developing World*, International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Manitoba, Canada.

Brunori, G. and Guarino, A. (2010) 'Security for whom? Changing discourses on food in Europe in times of a global food crisis', in Lawrence, G. et al (Eds.), *Food security, nutrition and sustainability*, Earthscan, London, pp.41-60.

Brunori, G., Jiggins, J., Gallardo, R. and Schmidt, O. (2008) *The Second SCAR Foresight Exercise, Synthesis Report 'New challenges for agricultural research: climate change, food security, rural development, agricultural knowledge systems'*, EU Commission Standing Committee on Agricultural Research (SCAR), Brussels, Belgium.

Brussaard, L., Caron, P., Campbell, B., Lipper, L., Mainka, S., Rabbinge, R., Babin, D. and Pulleman, M. (2010) 'Reconciling biodiversity conservation and food security: scientific challenges for a new agriculture', *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.34-42.

Burch, D. and Lawrence, G. (2010) 'The "wellness" phenomenon: Implications for global agri-food systems', in Lawrence, G. et al (Eds.), *Food security, nutrition and sustainability*, Earthscan, London, pp. 175-187.

Burchi, F., Fanzo, J. and Frison, E. (2011) 'The role of food and nutrition system approaches in tackling hidden hunger', *International journal of environmental research and public health*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp.358-373.

Burgman, M.A., McBride, M., Ashton, R., Speirs-Bridge, A., Flander, L., Wintle, B., Fidler, F., Rumpff, L. and Twardy, C. (2011) 'Expert status and performance', *PLoS ONE*, 6(7) [online]

<http://www.plosone.org/article/fetchObject.action?uri=info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0022998&representation=PDF> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Burlingame, B. (2014) 'Grand Challenges in Nutrition and Environmental Sustainability', *Nutrition and Environmental Sustainability*, [online] <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnut.2014.00003/full> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Burlingame, B., Charrondiere, R. and Mouille, B. (2009) 'Food composition is fundamental to the cross-cutting initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition', *Journal of food composition and analysis*, Vol. 22, No. 5, pp.361-365.

Burlingame, B., Charrondiere, U.R., Dernini, S., Stadlmayr, B. and Mondovi, S. (2012) 'Food biodiversity and sustainable diets: implications of applications for food production and processing', in Boye, J.I. and Arcand, Y. (Eds.), *Green Technologies in Food Production and Processing*, Springer, New York Dordrecht Heidelberg London, (pp. 643-657).

Burlingame, B. and Dernini, S. (2011) 'Sustainable diets: the Mediterranean diet as an example', *Public Health Nutrition*, Vol. 14, No. 12A, pp.2285-2287.

Burton, I., Huq, S., Lim, B., Pilifosova, O. and Schipper, E.L. (2002) 'From impacts assessment to adaptation priorities: the shaping of adaptation policy', *Climate policy*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp.145-159.

Burton, I., Kates, R. and White, G. (1993) *The Environment as Hazard*, Guilford Press, New York, USA.

Buttriss J. and Riley H. (2013) 'Sustainable diets: Harnessing the nutrition agenda', *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 140, No. 3, pp.402-407.

Cabell, J.F. and Oelofse, M. (2012) 'An indicator framework for assessing agroecosystem resilience', *Ecology and Society*, 17(1) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol17/iss1/art18/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Cafiero, C., Melgar-Quinonez, H.R., Ballard, T.J. and Kepple, A.W. (2014) 'Validity and reliability of food security measures', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 1331, No. 1, pp.230-248.

Cairney, J. and Ostbye, T. (1998) 'Time since immigration and excess body weight', *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 90, No.2, pp.120-124.

Callo-Concha, D. (2014) 'Approaches to managing disturbance and change: Resilience, vulnerability and adaptability', *ZEF Working Paper Series*, 133 [online]

http://www.zef.de/uploads/tx_zefportal/Publications/ZEF_Working_Paper_133_02.pdf (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Cam, K.M., McKnight, P.E. and Doctor, J.N. (2002) 'The Delphi method online: Medical expert consensus via the Internet' in *Proceedings of the AMIA 2002 Symposium*, American Medical Informatics Association, San Antonio, TX, USA, pp.990.

Camagni, R. and Capello, R. (2011) *Spatial Scenarios in a Global Perspective: Europe and the Latin Arc Countries*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, England.

Campbell, J. (2002) 'A critical appraisal of participatory methods in development research', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp.19–29.

Candib, L.M. (2007) 'Obesity and diabetes in vulnerable populations: reflection on proximal and distal causes', *The Annals of Family Medicine*, Vol. 5, No. 6, pp.547-556.

Capone, R., Lamaddalena, N., Lamberti, L., Elferchichi, A. and El Bilali, H. (2012) 'Food consumption patterns and sustainable natural resources management in the Mediterranean region', *Journal of Food Science and Engineering*, Vol. 2, No. 8, pp.437-451.

Cardoso, G.A., Salgado, J.M., de Castro Cesar, M. and Donado-Pestana, C.M. (2013) 'The effects of green tea consumption and resistance training on body composition and resting metabolic rate in overweight or obese women', *Journal of medicinal food*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp.120-127.

Carney, O., McIntosh, J. and Worth, A. (1996) 'The use of the nominal group technique in research with community nurses', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 23, No. 5, pp.1024-1029.

Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Anderies, J.M. and Abel, N. (2001) 'From metaphor to measurement: resilience of what to what?', *Ecosystems*, Vol. 4, No. 8, pp.765-781.

Carpenter, S., Bennett, E.M. and Peterson, G.D. (2006) 'Scenarios for ecosystem services: an overview', *Ecology and Society*, 11(1) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss1/art29/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Carpenter, S., Folke, C., Scheffer, M. and Westley, F. (2009) 'Resilience: accounting for the noncomputable', *Ecology & society*, 14(1) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss1/art13/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Carpenter, S., Stanley, E. H. and Vander Zanden, M.J. (2011) 'State of the world's freshwater ecosystems: physical, chemical, and biological changes', *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, Vol. 36, pp.75-99.

Cash, D.W., Adger, N., Berkes, F., Garden, P., Lebel, L., Olsson, P., Pritchard, L. and Young, O. (2006) 'Scale and cross-scale dynamics: governance and information in a multilevel world', *Ecology and Society*, 11(2) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss2/art8/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Cassar, L.F., Conrad, E., Bell, S. and Morse, S. (2013) 'Assessing the use and influence of sustainability indicators at the European periphery', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 35, pp.52-61.

Cawley, J. and Meyerhoefer, C. (2012) 'The medical care costs of obesity: an instrumental variables approach', *Journal of health economics*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp.219-230.

Chambers R. (1989) 'Editorial Introduction: Vulnerability, Coping and Policy', *Institute of Development Studies Bulletin*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp.1-7.

Chapagain, A., Hoekstra, A. and Savenije, H. (2006) 'Water saving through international trade of agricultural products', *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp.455-468.

Checkland, P.B. (1981) *Systems thinking, Systems Practice*, Wiley, Chichester, England.

Chelleri, L. and Olazabal, M. (2012) *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Urban Resilience: A Workshop Report*, Basque Centre for Climate Change, Bilbao, Spain.

Chess, C., Johnson, B.B. and Gibson, G. (2005) 'Communicating about environmental indicators', *Journal of Risk Research*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp.63-75.

Choi, H.C. and Sirakaya, E. (2006) 'Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism', *Tourism management*, Vol. 27, No. 6, pp.1274-1289.

CIHEAM (2012) *Mediterra 2012*, Sciences Po, Paris, France.

CIHEAM and FAO (2012) *Towards the development of guidelines for improving the sustainability of diets and food consumption patterns: the Mediterranean Diet as a pilot study*, CIHEAM, Bari, Italy.

Cinner J.E., McClanahan T.R., Graham N.A.J., Daw T.M., J.M., Stead S.M., Wamukota, A. and Bodin Ö. (2012) 'Vulnerability of coastal communities to key

impacts of climate change on coral reef fisheries', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp.12-20.

Clark, W.C. and Dickson, N.M. (2003) 'Sustainability science: the emerging research program', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 100, No. 14, pp.8059-8061.

Conway, G. (1985) 'Agroecosystem analysis', *Agricultural Administration*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp.31-55.

Conway, G. and Barbier, E. (1990) *After the Green Revolution: Sustainable Agriculture for Development*, Earthscan, London, England.

Conway, G. (2007) 'A doubly Green Revolution: ecology and food production', in May, R.M. and McLean, A.R. (Eds.), *Theoretical ecology: principles and applications*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, England, pp.158-171.

Cordell, D. and Neset, T.S. (2014) 'Phosphorus vulnerability: a qualitative framework for assessing the vulnerability of national and regional food systems to the multi-dimensional stressors of phosphorus scarcity', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 24, pp.108-122.

Cortesi, G. (1995) *Urban Change and the Environment: The Case of the North-Western Mediterranean*, Guerini, Milan, Italy.

Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., De Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S., O'Neill, R.V., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R.G., Sutton, P. and van den Belt, M. (1997) 'The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital', *Nature*, Vol. 387, No. 6630, pp.253-260.

Cummins, S., Petticrew, M., Higgins, C., Findlay, A. and Sparks, L. (2005) 'Large scale food retailing as an intervention for diet and health: quasi-experimental evaluation of a natural experiment', *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, Vol. 59, No. 12, pp.1035-1040.

Cutter, S.L., Boruff, B.J. and Shirley, W.L. (2003) 'Social vulnerability to environmental hazards', *Social science quarterly*, Vol. 84, No. 2, pp.242-261.

Cutter, S.L., Barnes, L., Berry, M., Burton, C., Evans, E., Tate, E. and Webb, J. (2008) 'A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp.598-606.

Dalal, S., Khodyakov, D., Srinivasan, R., Straus, S. and Adams, J. (2011) 'ExpertLens: A system for eliciting opinions from a large pool of non-collocated

experts with diverse knowledge', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 78, No. 8, pp.1426-1444.

Dale, V.H. and Beyeler, S.C. (2001) 'Challenges in the development and use of ecological indicators', *Ecological indicators*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.3-10.

Dalkey, N. and Helmer, O. (1963) 'An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts', *Management science*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp.458-467.

Dalkey, N.C., Brown, B.B. and Cochran, S. (1970) *The Delphi Method, IV: Effect of Percentile Feedback and Feed-In of Relevant Facts*, The RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, USA.

Dangour, A. D., Green, R., Häsler, B., Rushton, J., Shankar, B. and Waage, J. (2012) 'Linking agriculture and health in low-and middle-income countries: an interdisciplinary research agenda', *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, Vol. 71, No. 2, pp.222-228.

Darmon, N. and Soler, L.G. (2013) 'Carbon footprint and nutritional quality of diets in France', in Esnouf, C. et al (Eds.), *Food system sustainability: Insights from duALIne*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, pp. 51-68.

Darnhofer, I., Fairweather, J. and Moller, H. (2010) 'Assessing a farm's sustainability: insights from resilience thinking', *International journal of agricultural sustainability*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp.186-198.

Daviet, S. (1994) 'Introduction. L'arc latin, histoire et problématiques d'un concept' *Méditerranée*, Vol. 79, Nos. 1-2, pp.3-6.

de França Doria, M., Boyd, E., Tompkins, E.L. and Adger, N. (2009) 'Using expert elicitation to define successful adaptation to climate change', *Environmental Science & Policy*, Vol. 12, No. 7, pp.810-819.

De Lange, H., Sala, S., Vighi, M. and Faber, J. (2010) 'Ecological vulnerability in risk assessment—a review and perspectives', *Science of the Total Environment*, Vol. 408, No. 18, pp.3871-3879.

de Ruyter, H., Kastner, T. and Nonhebel, S. (2014) 'European dietary patterns and their associated land use: Variation between and within countries', *Food Policy*, Vol. 44, pp.158-166.

Deckelbaum, R.J, Palm, C., Mutuo, P. and DeClerck F. (2006) 'Econutrition: Implementation models from the Millennium Villages Project in Africa', *Food & Nutrition Bulletin*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp.335-342.

DeClerck, F., Ingram, J.C. and Rumbaitis del Rio, C.M. (2006) 'The role of ecological theory and practice in poverty alleviation and environmental conservation', *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, Vol. 4, No. 10, pp.533-540.

DeClerck, F., Fanzo, J., Palm, C. and Remans, R. (2011) 'Ecological approaches to human nutrition', *Food & Nutrition Bulletin*, Vol. 32, No. 1S, pp.41S-50S.

Delpeuch F., Maire B., Monnier E. and Holdsworth M. (2009) *Globesity: a planet out of control?*, Lavoisier, Paris, France.

Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs. (2008) *Ensuring the UK's food security in a changing world*, DEFRA, London, England.

Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs. (2009) *Indicators for a Sustainable Food System*, DEFRA, London, England.

Derissen, S., Quaas, M.F. and Baumgärtner, S. (2011) 'The relationship between resilience and sustainability of ecological-economic systems', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 70, No. 6, pp.1121-1128.

Diamond, J. (1997) *Guns, Germs, and Steel*, Northon & Co, New York, USA.

Dicks, L.V. et al. (2013) 'What do we need to know to enhance the environmental sustainability of agricultural production? A prioritisation of knowledge needs for the UK food system', *Sustainability*, 5(7) [online] <http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/5/7/3095/pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Dilley M. and Boudreau T.E. (2001) 'Coming to terms with vulnerability: a critique of the food security definition', *Food Policy*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp.229-247.

Dora, C., Haines, A., Balbus, J., Fletcher, E., Adair-Rohani, H., Alabaster, G., Hossain, R., de Onis, M., Branca, F. and Neira, M. (2014) 'Indicators linking health and sustainability in the post-2015 development agenda', *The Lancet*, Vol. 385, No. 9965, pp.380-391.

Doran, G.T. (1981) 'There's a SMART way to write management's goals and objectives', *Management Review*, Vol. 70, No. 11, pp.35-36.

Downing T.E. (1991) *Assessing socioeconomic vulnerability to famine: Frameworks, concepts, and applications*, Alan Shawn Feinstein World Hunger Program, Brown University, Providence, USA.

Downing, T.E. and Patwardhan, A. (2005) *Assessing vulnerability for climate adaptation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.

Drewnowski A. and Popkin B.M. (1997) 'The Nutrition Transition: New Trends in the Global Diet', *Nutrition Reviews*, Vol. 55, No. 2, pp.31-43.

Dubé, L., Pingali, P. and Webb, P. (2012) 'Paths of convergence for agriculture, health, and wealth', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 109, No. 31, pp.12294-12301.

Eakin, H. (2010) 'What is Vulnerable?', in Ingram, J. et al (Eds.), *Food security and global environmental change*, Earthscan, London, pp.78-86.

Eakin, H. and Luers, A. L. (2006) 'Assessing the vulnerability of social-environmental systems', *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, Vol. 31, pp.365-394.

Ebert, A.W. (2014) 'Potential of Underutilized Traditional Vegetables and Legume Crops to Contribute to Food and Nutritional Security, Income and More Sustainable Production Systems', *Sustainability*, 6(1) [online] <http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/6/1/319/pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Economist Intelligence Unit. (2013) *Global food security index 2013: An annual measure of the state of global food security*, [online] <http://foodsecurityindex.eiu.com/Index> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority). (2014) 'Guidance on Expert Knowledge Elicitation in Food and Feed Safety Risk Assessment', *EFSA Journal*, 12(6) [online] <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/3734.pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Elmqvist, T., Fragkias, M., Goodness, J., Güneralp, B., Marcotullio, P.J., McDonald, R.I., Parnell, S., Schewenius, M., Sendstad, M., Seto, K.C., Wilkinson, C. (Eds.) (2013) *Urbanization, biodiversity and ecosystem services: Challenges and opportunities*, Springer, Dordrecht Heidelberg London NewYork.

Engelberger, L., Schierle, J., Marks, G. and Fitzgerald, M. (2003) 'Micronesian banana, taro, and other foods: newly recognized sources of provitamin A and other carotenoids', *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, Vol. 16, pp.3-19.

Epstein, G., Vogt, J. M., Mincey, S. K., Cox, M. and Fischer, B. (2013) 'Missing ecology: integrating ecological perspectives with the social-ecological system framework', *International Journal of the Commons*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp.432-453.

Ericksen, P. and Woodley, E. (2005) *Using multiple knowledge systems: benefits and challenges*, Chapter 5, *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Sub-global, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment* [online] <http://www.unep.org/maweb/documents/document.343.aspx.pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Ericksen, P. (2006) 'Assessing the Vulnerability of Food Systems to Global Environmental Change: A Conceptual and Methodological Review', *GECAFS Working Paper*, 3 [online] http://www.gecafs.org/publications/Publications/GECAFS_Working_Paper_3_Ericksen_July_2006.pdf (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Eriksen, S.H. and Kelly P.M. (2007) 'Developing credible vulnerability indicators for climate adaptation policy assessment', *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp.495-524.

Ericksen, P. (2008a) 'Conceptualizing food systems for global environmental change research', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp.234-245.

Ericksen, P. (2008b) 'Global environmental change and food security', *Global Change News Letter*, 71 [online] http://www.gecafs.org/publications/Publications/Global_Environmental_Change_%26_Food_Security.pdf (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Ericksen, P. (2008c) 'What is the vulnerability of a food system to global environmental change', *Ecology and Society*, 13(2) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss2/art14/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Ericksen, P., Ingram, J. and Liverman, D.M. (2009) 'Food security and global environmental change: emerging challenges', *Environmental Science & Policy*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp.373-377.

Ericksen, P., Stewart, B., Dixon, J., Barling, D., Loring, P., Anderson, M. and Ingram, J. (2010) 'The value of a food system approach', in Ingram, J. et al (Eds.), *Food Security and Global Environmental Change*, Earthscan, London, pp.25-45.

Ericksen, P. (2014) 'Vulnerability of Food Security to Global Change', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 1, pp.677-680.

Escrich, E., Moral, R. and Solanas, M. (2011) 'Olive oil, an essential component of the Mediterranean diet, and breast cancer', *Public Health Nutrition*, Vol. 14, No. 12A, pp.2323-2332.

Esnouf, C., Russel, M. and Bricas, N. (2013) *Food System Sustainability: Insights from DuALIne*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.

ESPON. (2007) *Scenarios on the territorial future of Europe*, ESPON Project 3.2, European Union, Brussels, Belgium.

Etxeberria, I.A., Garayar, A. and Sánchez, J.A.C. (2014) 'Development of sustainability reports for farming operations in the Basque Country using the Delphi method', *Revista de Contabilidad*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp.44-54.

European Commission. (2014) *Impact Assessment On Measures Addressing Food Waste To Complete Swd (2014) 207 Regarding The Review Of Eu waste management target*, European Union, Brussels, Belgium.

European Technology Platform (2008) *European Technology Platform on Food for Life: Implementation action plan*. Confederation of the food and drink industries of the EU, Brussels, Belgium.

Ewers, R.M., Fa, J.E., Gardner, T.A., Gibbons, J., Grenyer, R., Metcalfe, R., Mourato, S., Muûls, M., Osborn, D., Reuman, D.C., Watson, C. and Milner-Gulland E.J. (2009) 'Priority research areas for ecosystem services in a changing world', *Journal of Applied Ecology*, Vol. 46, No. 6, pp.1139-1144.

Failing, L., Gregory, R. and Harstone, M. (2007) 'Integrating science and local knowledge in environmental risk management: a decision-focused approach', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 64, No. 1, pp.47-60.

Fanzo, J. (2014) 'Strengthening the engagement of food and health systems to improve nutrition security: Synthesis and overview of approaches to address malnutrition', *Global Food Security*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp.183-192.

Fanzo, J., Cogill, B. and Mattei, F. (2012) *Metrics of sustainable diets and food systems*, Technical Brief-Madrid Roundtable, Bioversity International, Rome, Italy.

FAO. (1983) *World Food Security: a Reappraisal of the Concepts and Approaches*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO. (2002) *Review and Development of indicators for genetic diversity, genetic erosion and genetic vulnerability: summary report of a joint FAO, IPGRI workshop*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO. (2004) *Food Insecurity and Vulnerability in Viet Nam: Profiles of Four Vulnerable Groups*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO. (2006) *Livestock's long shadow: Environmental issues and options*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO. (2008) *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2008: High food prices and food security threats and opportunities*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO. (2009) *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2009: Economic crises – impacts and lessons learned*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO. (2011a) *Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture: Contributing to food security and sustainability in a changing world*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO. (2011b) *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2011: How does international price volatility affect domestic economies and food security?*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO. (2013a) *The State of food insecurity in the world: The multiple dimensions of food security*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO. (2013b) *Sustainability Assessment and Food and Agriculture*, SAFA Systems Indicators, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO and Bioversity International. (2010) *Biodiversity in Sustainable Diets: Technical Workshop 31 May – 1 June 2010*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO and Biodiversity International. (2012) *Proceedings of the International Scientific Symposium: Biodiversity and Sustainable Diets United Against Hunger*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAO, IFAD and WFP (2014) *The State of food insecurity in the world: Strengthening the enabling environment for food security and nutrition*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

FAOSTAT. [online] <http://faostat3.fao.org/home/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Feenstra, G., Jaramillo, C., McGrath, S. and Grunnell, A.N. (2005) *Proposed Indicators for Sustainable Food Systems*, Ecotrust, Portland, USA.

Feintrenie, L. and Levang, P. (2009) ‘Sumatra’s rubber agroforests: advent, rise and fall of a sustainable cropping system’, *Small-scale Forestry*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp.323-335.

Fezzardi, D., Massa, F., Àvila-Zaragoza, P., Rad, F., Yücel-Gier, G., Deniz, H., Hadj Ali Salem, M., Hamka, H.A. and Ben Salem, S. (2013) *Indicators for sustainable aquaculture in Mediterranean and Black Sea countries. Guide for the use of indicators to monitor sustainable development of aquaculture*, Rome, FAO.

Finucane, M.M., Stevens, G.A., Cowan, M.J., Danaei, G., Lin, J.K., Paciorek, C.J., Singh, G.M., Gutierrez, H.R., Lu, Y., Bahalim, A.N., Farzadfar, F., Riley and L.M., Ezzati, M. (2011) ‘National, regional, and global trends in body-mass index since 1980: systematic analysis of health examination surveys and epidemiological studies with 960 country-years and 9·1 million participants’, *The Lancet*, Vol. 377, No. 9765, pp.557-567.

Fitzsimmons, J. and Fitzsimmons, M. (2006) *Service management*, McGraw-Hill Higher Education, Singapore, Indonesia.

Fletcher, C.S., Craig, M. and Hilbert, D.W. (2006) 'Operationalizing resilience in Australian and New Zealand agroecosystems'. Paper presented at the *50th Annual Meeting of the International Society for the Systems Sciences*, 09-14 July 2006, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California, USA.

Flichman, G., Louhichi, K. and Boisson, J. (2011) 'Modelling the Relationship Between Agriculture and the Environment Using Bio-Economic Models: Some Conceptual Issues', in Flichman, G. et al (Eds.) *Bio-Economic Models applied to Agricultural Systems*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, pp.3-14.

Flick, U. (2014) *An introduction to qualitative research*, Sage, London, England.

Foley, J.A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K.A., Cassidy, E.S., Gerber, J.S., Johnston, M., Mueller, N.D., O'Connell, C., Ray, D.K., West, P.C., Balzer, C., Bennett, E.M., Carpenter, S., Hill, J., Monfreda, C., Polasky, S., Rockström, J., Sheehan, J., Siebert, S., Tilman, D. and Zaks D.P.M. (2011) 'Solutions for a cultivated planet', *Nature*, Vol. 478, No. 7369, pp.337-342.

Folke, C. (2002) *Social-ecological resilience and behavioural responses*, Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics, Stockholm, Sweden.

Folke, C. (2006) 'Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analyses', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp.253-267.

Folke, C. (2010) 'How resilient are ecosystems to global environmental change?', *Sustainability Science*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp.151-154.

Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T. and Rockström, J. (2010). 'Resilience thinking: integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability', *Ecology and Society*, 15(4) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss4/art20/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Foran, T., Butler, J. R., Williams, L. J., Wanjura, W. J., Hall, A., Carter, L. and Carberry, P. S. (2014) 'Taking Complexity in Food Systems Seriously: An Interdisciplinary Analysis', *World Development*, Vol. 61, pp.85-101.

Foresight. The Future of Food and Farming. (2011) *Final Project Report*, The Government Office for Science, London, England.

Fowler, C. and Mooney, P. (1990) *The threatened gene: food, politics, and the loss of genetic diversity*, Lutterworth Press, Cambridge, England.

Frankenberger T. (1992) *Indicators and Data Collection Methods for Assessing Household Food Security*, UNICEF and IFAD, New York and Rome.

Fraser, E. D., Mabee, W. and Figge, F. (2005) 'A framework for assessing the vulnerability of food systems to future shocks', *Futures*, Vol. 37, No. 6, pp.465-479.

Freeland-Graves, J. H. and Nitzke, S. (2013) 'Position of the academy of nutrition and dietetics: total diet approach to healthy eating', *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, Vol. 113, No. 2, pp.307-317.

Frewer, L., Fischer, A., Wentholt, M., Marvin, H., Ooms, B., Coles, D. and Rowe, G. (2011) 'The use of Delphi methodology in agrifood policy development: some lessons learned', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 78, No. 9, pp.1514-1525.

Friel, S. and Lichacz, W. (2010) 'Unequal Food Systems, Unhealthy Diets', in Lawrence, G. et al (Eds.) *Food security, nutrition and sustainability*, Earthscan, London, England, pp.115-129.

Frison E., Smith I.F., Johns T., Cherfas J. and Eyzaguirre P.B. (2006), 'Agricultural biodiversity, nutrition, and health: Making a difference to hunger and nutrition in the developing world', *Food & Nutrition Bulletin*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp.167-179.

Frison, E., Cherfas, J. and Hodgkin, T. (2011) 'Agricultural biodiversity is essential for a sustainable improvement in food and nutrition security', *Sustainability*, 3(1) [online] <http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/3/1/238/pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Frongillo, E.A., Tofail, F., Hamadani, J.D., Warren, A.M. and Mehrin, S.F. (2013) 'Measures and indicators for assessing impact of interventions integrating nutrition, health, and early childhood development', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 1308, pp.68-88.

Funtowicz, S.O. and Ravetz, J.R. (1993) 'Science for the post-normal age', *Futures*, Vol. 25, No. 7, pp.739-755.

Füssel, H.M. and Klein, R.J. (2006) 'Climate change vulnerability assessments: an evolution of conceptual thinking', *Climatic change*, Vol. 75, No. 3, pp.301-329.

Füssel H.M. (2007) 'Vulnerability: A generally applicable conceptual framework for climate change research', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp.155-167.

Gallopin, G. (2003) *A systems approach to sustainability and sustainable development*, United Nations Publications, New York, USA.

Gallopin, G. (2006) 'Linkages between vulnerability, resilience, and adaptive capacity', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp.293-303.

Gallopin, G., Funtowicz, S., O'Connor, M. and Ravetz, J. (2001) 'Science for the Twenty-First Century: From Social Contract to the Scientific Core', *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. 53, No. 168, pp.219-229.

Garrett, J.L. and Ruel, M.T. (2003) 'Stunted child-overweight mother pairs: An emerging policy concern?', *IFPRI FCND Discussion paper*, 148 [online] <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/fcndp148.pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Garrett, J.L. and Ruel, M.T. (2005) 'Stunted child-overweight mother pairs: Prevalence and association with economic development and urbanization', *Food & Nutrition Bulletin*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp.209-221.

Gbetibouo, G.A., Ringler, C. and Hassan, R. (2010) 'Vulnerability of the South African farming sector to climate change and variability: An indicator approach', *Natural Resources Forum*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 175-187.

GECAFS. [online] <http://www.gecafs.org> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Gerber, A. (2014) 'Food Security as an Outcome of Food Systems'. Paper presented at the *32nd International Conference of the System Dynamics Society*. 20-24 July 2014, Delft, The Netherlands.

Gil J., Gracia A. and Perez y Perez L. (1995) 'Economic development and food consumption in Mediterranean countries', *Options Méditerranéennes*, Vol. 26, pp.25-33.

Giorgi, F. (2006) 'Climate change hot-spots', *Geophysical Research Letters*, Vol. 33, No. 8.

Girardin, P., Bockstaller, C. and Werf, H. (1999) 'Indicators: tools to evaluate the environmental impacts of farming systems', *Journal of sustainable agriculture*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp.5-21.

Global Footprint Network. (2012) *Mediterranean ecological footprint trends*, Global Footprint Network, Geneva, Switzerland.

Godfray, H.C.J., Beddington, J.R., Crute, I.R., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J. F., Pretty, J., Robinson, S., Thomas, S.M. and Toulmin, C. (2010) 'Food security: the challenge of feeding 9 billion people', *Science*, Vol. 327, No. 5967, pp.812-818.

Gorton, D., Bullen, C.R. and Mhurchu, C.N. (2010) 'Environmental influences on food security in high-income countries', *Nutrition reviews*, Vol. 68, No. 1, pp.1-29.

- Graefe, S., Dufour, D., van Zonneveld, M., Rodriguez, F. and Gonzalez, A. (2013) 'Peach palm (*Bactris gasipaes*) in tropical Latin America: implications for biodiversity conservation, natural resource management and human nutrition', *Biodiversity and Conservation*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp.269-300.
- Grafton, R.Q. (2010) 'Adaptation to climate change in marine capture fisheries', *Marine Policy*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp.606-615.
- de Haan, S., Burgos, G., Thiele, G., Liria, R., Meisner, C.A., Beebe S.E., Potts, M.J., Kadian, M., Hobbs, P.R., Gupta, R. and Twomlow, S. (2007) 'Nutritious subsistence food systems', *Advances in Agronomy*, Vol. 92, pp.1-74.
- Gras, R. (1989) *Le fait technique en agronomie*, Editions L'Harmattan, Paris, France.
- Green, R.A. (2014) 'The Delphi Technique in Educational Research', *SAGE Open*, 4(2) [online] <http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/4/2/2158244014529773.full.pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2014).
- Gregory, P.J., Ingram, J. and Brklacich, M. (2005) 'Climate change and food security', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 360, No. 1463, pp.2139-2148.
- Groot, J.C., Rossing, W.A., Jellema, A., Stobbelaar, D.J., Renting, H. and Van Ittersum, M.K. (2007) 'Exploring multi-scale trade-offs between nature conservation, agricultural profits and landscape quality—a methodology to support discussions on land-use perspectives', *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, Vol. 120, No. 1, pp.58-69.
- Gudmundsson, H. (2003) 'The policy use of environmental indicators—learning from evaluation research', *The Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp.1-12.
- Gunderson, L.H. and Holling, C.S. (2002) *Panarchy: understanding transformations in systems of humans and nature*, Island Press, Washington DC, USA.
- Gupta, U.G. and Clarke, R.E. (1996) 'Theory and applications of the Delphi technique: A bibliography (1975–1994)', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp.185-211.
- Gussow, J.D. and Clancy, K.L. (1986) 'Dietary guidelines for sustainability', *Journal of Nutrition Education*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp.1-5.
- Guyomard, H., Darcy-Vrillon, B., Esnouf, C., Marin, M., Momot, A., Russel, M. and Guillou, M. (2012) 'Eating patterns and food systems: critical knowledge requirements for policy design and implementation', *Agric Food Secur*, 1 [online]

<http://www.agricultureandfoodsecurity.com/content/pdf/2048-7010-1-13.pdf>
(Accessed 01 March 2015).

Haddad, L. (2013) 'How should nutrition be positioned in the post-2015 agenda?', *Food Policy*, Vol. 43, pp.341-352.

Halwart, M. (2006) 'Biodiversity and nutrition in rice-based aquatic ecosystems', *Journal of food composition and analysis*, Vol. 19, No. 6, pp.747-751.

Hammond, R.A. and Dubé, L. (2012) 'A systems science perspective and transdisciplinary models for food and nutrition security', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 109, No. 31, pp.12356-12363.

Hanafin, S. (2004) *Review of literature on the Delphi Technique*, National Children's Office, Dublin, Ireland.

Hanlon, P. and Carlisle, S. (2008) 'Do we face a third revolution in human history? If so, how will public health respond? ', *Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 30, No. 4, pp.355-361.

Hansen, J. (1996) 'Is agricultural sustainability a useful concept?', *Agricultural Systems*, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp.117-143.

Hasson, F., Keeney, S. and McKenna, H. (2000) 'Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp.1008-1015.

Hawkes, C., Blouin, C., Henson, S., Drager, N. and Dubé, L. (2009) *Trade, food, diet and health: perspectives and policy options*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, USA.

Hawkes, C., Jewell, J. and Allen, K. (2013) 'A food policy package for healthy diets and the prevention of obesity and diet-related non-communicable diseases: the NOURISHING framework', *Obesity Reviews*, Vol. 14, No. S2, pp.S159-S168.

Hebb, A. and Mortsch, L. (2007) *Floods: Mapping Vulnerability in the Upper Thames - Watershed under a Changing Climate*, CFCAS Project Assessment of Water Resources Risk and Vulnerability to Changing Climatic Conditions, Project Report XI, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

Hellegers, P., Zilberman, D., Steduto, P. and McCornick, P. (2008) 'Interactions between water, energy, food and environment: evolving perspectives and policy issues', *Water Policy*, Vol. 10, No. S1, pp.S1-S10

Herforth, A. (2010) *Promotion Of Traditional African Vegetables In Kenya And Tanzania: A Case Study Of An Intervention Representing Emerging Imperatives in Global Nutrition*. Cornell University, Ithaca, USA.

Herrin, M. and Gussow, J. D. (1989) 'Designing a sustainable regional diet', *Journal of Nutrition Education*, Vol. 21, No. 6, pp.270-275.

Heywood, V. (2013) 'Overview of agricultural biodiversity and its contribution to nutrition and health', in Fanzo et al (Eds.), *Diversifying Food and Diets: Using Agricultural Biodiversity to Improve Nutrition and Health*, Routledge, New York, USA, pp.35-67.

Hezri, A. and Dovers, S. (2006) 'Sustainability indicators, policy and governance: issues for ecological economics', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 60, pp.86–99.

Hinkel, J. (2011) '“Indicators of vulnerability and adaptive capacity”: Towards a clarification of the science–policy interface', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp.198-208.

HLPE. (2011) *Price volatility and food security: a report by the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

Hoekstra, A. (Ed.) (2003) *Virtual water trade: Proceedings of the International Expert Meeting on Virtual Water Trade*, IHE, Delft, The Netherlands.

Hoekstra, A. and Chapagain, A. (2008) *Globalization of water: Sharing the planet's freshwater resources Appendix XX: Water footprints of nations*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, England.

Hoekstra A. and Hung P.Q. (2002) *Virtual water trade: A quantification of virtual water flows between nations in relation to international crop trade*, UNESCO-IHE, Delft, The Netherlands.

Hoekstra, A. and Chapagain, A. (2011) *Globalization of water: Sharing the planet's freshwater resources*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, USA.

Holden, S., Shiferaw, B. and Pender, J. (2004) 'Non-farm income, household welfare, and sustainable land management in a less-favoured area in the Ethiopian highlands', *Food Policy*, Vol. 29, No. 4, 369-392.

Holling, C. (1973) 'Resilience and stability of ecological systems', *Annual review of ecology and systematics*, Vol. 4, pp.1-23.

Holling, C. (1993) 'Investing in research for sustainability', *Ecological applications*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp.552-555.

Holling, C. (1996) 'Cross-scale morphology, geometry, and dynamics of ecosystems', in Samson, F. and Knopf, F. (Eds.), *Ecosystem Management*, Springer, Verlag New York Berlin Heidelberg, pp.351-423.

Holling, C. (1998) 'Two cultures of ecology', *Conservation ecology*, 2(2) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol2/iss2/art4/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Holling, C. (2003) 'The backloop to sustainability', in Berkes, F. et al (Eds.) *Navigating socialecological systems, building resilience for complexity and change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.xv-xxii.

Holling, C. and Allen, C.R. (2002) 'Adaptive inference for distinguishing credible from incredible patterns in nature', *Ecosystems*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp.319-328.

Holzämper, A. and Seppelt, R. (2007) 'A generic tool for optimising land-use patterns and landscape structures', *Environmental Modelling & Software*, Vol. 22, No. 12, pp.1801-1804.

Hubbard, L. and Hubbard, C. (2013) 'Food security in the United Kingdom: External supply risks', *Food Policy*, Vol. 43, pp.142-147.

Huber, R., A. Rigling, P. Bebi, F. Simon Brand, S. Briner, A. Buttler, C. Elkin, F. Gillet, A. Grêt-Regamey, C. Hirschi, H. Lischke, R. Werner Scholz, R. Seidl, T. Spiegelberger, A. Walz, W. Zimmermann and Bugmann, H. (2013) 'Sustainable land use in mountain regions under global change: synthesis across scales and disciplines', *Ecology and Society*, 18(3) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol18/iss3/art36/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Hugé, J., Le Trinh, H., Hai, P.H., Kuilman, J. and Hens, L. (2010) 'Sustainability indicators for clean development mechanism projects in Vietnam', *Environment, development and sustainability*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp.561-571.

Hughes S., Yau A., Max L., Petrovic N., Davenport F., Marshall M., McClanahan, T.R., Allison, E.H. and Cinner, J.E. (2012) 'A framework to assess national level vulnerability from the perspective of food security: The case of coral reef fisheries', *Environmental Science & Policy*, Vol. 23, pp.95-108.

Hwang, G.H., Chen, J.M., Hwang, G.J. and Chu, H.C. (2006) 'A time scale-oriented approach for building medical expert systems', *Expert Systems with Applications*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp.299-308.

IAASTD. (2009) *Agriculture at a crossroads Synthesis report*, IAASTD, Washington DC, USA.

IFAD. (2009) *Food Price Volatility: How to help smallholder farmers manage risk and uncertainty*, Discussion Paper for Round Table 1 organized during the 32nd session of IFAD's Governing Council 18 February 2009, IFAD, Rome, Italy.

IFAD. (2014) *Food prices: smallholder farmers can be part of the solution. Key facts*, IFAD, Rome [online] <http://www.ifad.org/operations/food/farmer.htm> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Ingram, J. (2008) *Food system concepts for the ESF/COST Forward Look on European food systems in a changing world*, Paper presented at the Work document ESF-COST Forward Look Workshop, Brussels, Belgium.

Ingram, J., Ericksen, P. and Liverman, D. M. (Eds.) (2010) *Food security and global environmental change*, Routledge, London, England.

Ingram, J. and Izac, A.M. (2010) 'Undertaking research at the regional level', in Ingram, J. et al (Eds.), *Food security and global environmental change*, Earthscan, London, England, pp.221-240.

Ingram, J. and Kapadia, K. (2010) 'Stakeholders' Approaches to Regional Food Security Research', in Ingram, J. et al (Eds.), *Food security and global environmental change*, Earthscan, London, England, pp.212-220.

Ingram, J. (2011) 'A food systems approach to researching food security and its interactions with global environmental change', *Food Security*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp.417-431.

Ingram et al. (2013) 'Priority research questions for the UK food system', *Food Security*, Vol. 5, No. 5, pp.617-636.

Innes, J.E. (1998) 'Information in communicative planning', *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 64, No. 1, pp.52-63.

IUCN. (2013) *IUCN Red List version 2013*, IUCN: Gland, Switzerland

Ionescu, C., Klein, R.J., Hinkel, J., Kumar, K.K. and Klein, R. (2009) 'Towards a formal framework of vulnerability to climate change', *Environmental modeling & assessment*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp.1-16.

IPCC. (2001) *Climate change 2001: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability*, IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.

IPCC. (2012) *Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation: Special report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.

IPCC. (2013) 'Summary for Policymakers', in Stocker, T.F. et al (Eds.) *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, pp.3-29.

IPCC. (2014) *Summary for Policymakers. Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*, IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.

Jacques, P.J. and Jacques, J.R. (2012) 'Monocropping cultures into ruin: the loss of food varieties and cultural diversity', *Sustainability*, 4(11) [online] <http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/4/11/2970/pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Jairath, N. and Weinstein, J. (1993) 'The Delphi methodology (Part one): A useful administrative approach', *Canadian Journal of Nursing Administration*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp.29-42.

James, O. (2008) *The Selfish Capitalist*, Vermilion, London, England.

Janssen, S. and van Ittersum, M.K. (2007) 'Assessing farm innovations and responses to policies: a review of bio-economic farm models', *Agricultural Systems*, Vol. 94, No. 3, pp.622-636.

Johns, T. and Eyzaguirre, P.B. (2006) 'Linking biodiversity, diet and health in policy and practice', *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, Vol. 65, No. 2, pp.182-189.

Johnston, J.L., Fanzo, J.C. and Cogill, B. (2014) 'Understanding sustainable diets: a descriptive analysis of the determinants and processes that influence diets and their impact on health, food security, and environmental sustainability', *Advances in Nutrition: An International Review Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp.418-429.

Jolliffe, I.T. (1986) *Principal Component Analysis*, Springer, Verlag New York Berlin Heidelberg.

Kahane, R., Hodgkin, T., Jaenicke, H., Hoogendoorn, C., Hermann, M., Hughes, J. d. A., Padulosi, S. and Looney, N. (2013) 'Agrobiodiversity for food security, health and income', *Agronomy for sustainable development*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp.671-693.

Kalman, R.E., Englar, T. and Bucy, R.S. (1962) *Fundamental study of adaptive control systems*, DTIC Document, Baltimore, USA.

Kant, A.K., Leitzmann, M.F., Park, Y., Hollenbeck, A. and Schatzkin, A. (2009) 'Patterns of recommended dietary behaviors predict subsequent risk of mortality in a large cohort of men and women in the United States', *The Journal of Nutrition*, Vol. 139, No.7, pp.1374-1380.

- Kaplan, M.S., Hugueta, N., Newsom, J. T. and McFarland, B.H. (2004) 'The association between length of residence and obesity among Hispanic immigrants', *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, Vol. 27, No.4, pp.323-326.
- Kates R.W., Clark W.C., Corell R., Hall J.M., Jaeger C.C., Lowe I., McCarthy, J.J., Schellnhuber, H.J., Bolin, B., Dickson, N.M., Faucheux, S., Gallopin, G.C., Grübler, A., Huntley, B., Jäger, J., Jodha, N.S., Kasperson, R.E., Mabogunje, A., Matson, P., Mooney, H., Moore, B., O'Riordan, T., Svedin, U. (2001) 'Sustainability Science', *Science*, Vol. 292, No. 5517, pp.641-642.
- Kearney, J. (2010) 'Food consumption trends and drivers', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 365, No. 1554, pp.2793-2807.
- Keding, G. B., Schneider, K. and Jordan, I. (2013) 'Production and processing of foods as core aspects of nutrition-sensitive agriculture and sustainable diets', *Food Security*, Vol. 5, No. 6, pp.825-846.
- Keeney, R.L. and Raiffa, H. (1993) *Decisions with multiple objectives: preferences and value trade-offs*, Cambridge university press, Cambridge, England.
- Keeney, S., Hasson, F. and McKenna, H.P. (2001) 'A critical review of the Delphi technique as a research methodology for nursing', *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp.195-200.
- Keeney, S., Hasson, F. and McKenna, H. (2011) *A Classical Delphi Design Case Study, in The Delphi Technique in Nursing and Health Research*, Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, England.
- Keith, D.W. (1996) 'When is it appropriate to combine expert judgments?' *Climatic change*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp.139-143.
- Kelly, P.M. and Adger, N. (2000) 'Theory and practice in assessing vulnerability to climate change and facilitating adaptation', *Climatic change*, Vol. 47, No. 4, pp.325-352.
- Kelly, T., Yang, W., Chen, C., Reynolds, K. and He, J. (2008) '*International journal of obesity*', Vol. 32, No. 9, pp.1431-1437.
- Kennedy, G. and Burlingame, B. (2003) 'Analysis of food composition data on rice from a plant genetic resources perspective', *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 80, No. 4, pp.589-596.
- Khan, S. and Hanjra, M.A. (2009) 'Footprints of water and energy inputs in food production—Global perspectives', *Food Policy*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp.130-140.

Khoury, C.K., Bjorkman, A. D., Dempewolf, H., Ramirez-Villegas, J., Guarino, L., Jarvis, A., Rieseberg, L.H. and Struik, P. C. (2014) 'Increasing homogeneity in global food supplies and the implications for food security', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 111, No. 11, pp.4001-4006.

Klein, R.J. and Nicholls, R.J. (1999) 'Assessment of coastal vulnerability to climate change', *Ambio*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp.182-187.

Kragta, M.E. (2012) *Bioeconomic modelling: Integrating economic and environmental systems?* Paper presented at the International Congress on Environmental Modelling and Software Managing Resources of a Limited Planet, Sixth Biennial Meeting, Leipzig, Germany.

Kriegler, E., O'Neill, B. C., Hallegatte, S., Kram, T., Lempert, R. J., Moss, R. H. and Wilbanks, T. (2012) 'The need for and use of socio-economic scenarios for climate change analysis: a new approach based on shared socio-economic pathways', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp.807-822.

Krueger, T., Page, T., Hubacek, K., Smith, L. and Hiscock, K. (2012) 'The role of expert opinion in environmental modelling', *Environmental Modelling & Software*, Vol. 36, pp.4-18.

Kruseman, G. and Bade, J. (1998) 'Agrarian policies for sustainable land use: bio-economic modelling to assess the effectiveness of policy instruments', *Agricultural Systems*, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp.465-481.

Kuhnlein, H.V., Erasmus, B. and Spigelski, D. (2009) *Indigenous peoples' food systems: the many dimensions of culture, diversity and environment for nutrition and health*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

Kuhnlein, H.V., Receveur, O., Soueida, R. and Egeland, G.M. (2004) 'Arctic indigenous peoples experience the nutrition transition with changing dietary patterns and obesity', *The Journal of Nutrition*, Vol. 134, No. 6, pp.1447-1453.

Küstermann, B., Kainz, M. and Hülsbergen, K.J. (2008) 'Modeling carbon cycles and estimation of greenhouse gas emissions from organic and conventional farming systems', *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp.38-52.

Lai, V.S., Wong, B. K. and Cheung, W. (2002) 'Group decision making in a multiple criteria environment: A case using the AHP in software selection', *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol. 137, No. 1, pp.134-144.

Landeta, J. (2006) 'Current validity of the Delphi method in social sciences', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 73, No. 5, pp.467-482.

Landeta, J. and Barrutia, J. (2011) 'People consultation to construct the future: a Delphi application', *International Journal of Forecasting*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp.134-151.

Lang, T. (2012). 'Sustainable diets and biodiversity: the challenge for policy, evidence and behaviour change', in Burlingame, B. and Dernini, S. *Sustainable Diets and Biodiversity*, FAO & Bioversity International, Rome, Italy.

Lang, T., Dibb, S. and Reddy, S. (2011) *Looking Back, Looking Forward: Sustainability and UK food policy 2000-2011*, Sustainable Development Commission, London, England.

Leach, M. (Ed.) (2008) *Re-framing Resilience: a Symposium Report*, STEPS Working Paper 13, STEPS Centre, Brighton, England.

Lee, A., Mhurchu, C.N., Sacks, G., Swinburn, B., Snowdon, W., Vandevijvere, S., Hawkes, C., L'Abbé, M., Rayner, M., Sanders, D., Barquera, S., Friel, S., Kelly, B., Kumanyika, S., Lobstein, T., Ma, J., Macmullan, J., Mohan, S., Monteiro, C., Neal, B., Walker, C. and INFORMAS. (2013) 'Monitoring the price and affordability of foods and diets globally', *Obesity Reviews*, Vol. 14, No. S1, pp.S82-S95.

Lehtonen, M. (2004) 'The environmental–social interface of sustainable development: capabilities, social capital, institutions', *Ecological economics*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp.199-214.

Leichenko, R.M. and O'Brien, K.L. (2002) 'The dynamics of rural vulnerability to global change: the case of southern Africa', *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.1-18.

Ley, R.E., Turnbaugh, P.J., Klein, S. and Gordon, J.I. (2006) 'Microbial ecology: human gut microbes associated with obesity', *Nature*, Vol. 444, No. 7122, pp.1022-1023

Lindenthal, T., Markut, T., Hörtenhuber, S., Theurl, M. and Rudolph, G. (2010) *Greenhouse gas emissions of organic and conventional foodstuffs in Austria*, Paper presented at the Proceedings of the International Conference on LCA in the Agri-Food, Bari, Italy.

Linstone, H.A. and Turoff, M. (1975) *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*, Addison-Wesley Reading, USA.

Liu, J., Dietz, T., Carpenter, S. R., Alberti, M., Folke, C., Moran, E., Pell, A.N., Deadman, P., Kratz, T., Lubchenco, J., Ostrom, E., Ouyang, Z., Provencher, W., Redman, C.L., Schneider, S.H., Taylor, W.W. (2007) 'Complexity of coupled human and natural systems', *Science*, Vol. 317, No. 5844, pp.1513-1516.

Liverman, D. and Ingram, J. (2010) 'Why regions?', in Ingram, J. et al (Eds.) *Food security and global environmental change*, Earthscan, London, pp.203-211.

Liverman, D. and Kapadia, K. (2010) 'Food systems and the global environment: An overview', in Ingram, J. et al (Eds.) *Food security and global environmental change*, Earthscan, London, pp.3-24.

Lobell, D.B., Bänziger, M., Magorokosho, C. and Vivek, B. (2011) 'Nonlinear heat effects on African maize as evidenced by historical yield trials', *Nature Climate Change*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 42-45.

Locatelli, B., Kanninen, M., Brockhaus, M., Colfer, C.P., Murdiyarso, D. and Santoso, H. (2008) *Facing an uncertain future: How forests and people can adapt to climate change*, CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.

Lopez-Legarrea, P., Fuller, N., Zulet, M., Martinez, J. and Caterson, I. (2014) 'The influence of Mediterranean, carbohydrate and high protein diets on gut microbiota composition in the treatment of obesity and associated inflammatory state', *Asian Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp.360-368.

Loring, P., Gerlach, S. and Huntington, H. (2013) 'The new environmental security: linking food, water and energy for integrative and diagnostic social-ecological research', *Journal of Agricultural and Food Systems Community Development*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp.55-61.

Louhichi, K., Gomez y Paloma, S., Belhouchette, H., Allen, T., Fabre, J., Blanco Fonseca, M., Chenoune, R., Acs, S. and Flichman, G. (2013) 'Modelling Agri-Food Policy Impact at Farm-household Level in Developing Countries (FSSIM-Dev): Application to Sierra Leone, in Louhichi, K. & Gomez y Paloma, S. (Eds.), *JRC Scientific and Policy Reports*, European Commission, Institute for Prospective and Technological Studies, Joint Research Centre, Luxembourg.

Lozupone, C.A., Stombaugh, J.I., Gordon, J.I., Jansson, J.K. and Knight, R. (2012) 'Diversity, stability and resilience of the human gut microbiota', *Nature*, Vol. 489, No. 7415, pp.220-230.

Lucas, P. and Hilderink, H. (2005) *Vulnerability Concept and its Application to Food Security*, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands.

Ludwig, D., Walker, B. and Holling, C.S. (1997) 'Sustainability, stability, and resilience', *Conservation Ecology*, 1(1) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol1/iss1/art7/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

- Luers, A.L. (2005) 'The surface of vulnerability: an analytical framework for examining environmental change', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp.214-223.
- Luers, A.L., Lobell, D.B., Sklar, L.S., Addams, C.L. and Matson, P.A. (2003) 'A method for quantifying vulnerability, applied to the agricultural system of the Yaqui Valley, Mexico', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp.255-267.
- Lundqvist, J., de Fraiture, C. and Molden, D. (2008) *Saving water: from field to fork: curbing losses and wastage in the food chain*, SIWI Policy Brief, SIWI, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Lutaladio, N., Burlingame, B. and Crews, J. (2010) 'Horticulture, biodiversity and nutrition', *Journal of food composition and analysis*, Vol. 23, No. 6, pp.481-485.
- Lutter S. and Schnepf D. (2011) 'Water Management Indicators – State of the Art for the Mediterranean Region', *Options Méditerranéennes*, No. 98, pp.37-53.
- MacDiarmid, J.I., Kyle, J., Horgan, G.W., Loe, J., Fyfe, C., Johnstone, A. and McNeill, G. (2012) 'Sustainable diets for the future: can we contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by eating a healthy diet? ', *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, Vol. 96, No. 3, pp.632-639.
- Manarolla, J.A. (1989) *A methodology for ranking countries according to relative food insecurity*. Paper presented at the AID Economists Conference, 12-17 November 1989, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Marschke, M.J. and Berkes, F. (2006) 'Exploring strategies that build livelihood resilience: a case from Cambodia', *Ecology and Society*, 11(1) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss1/art42/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).
- Martins, A.A., Mata, T.M., Costa, C.A. and Sikdar, S.K. (2007) 'Framework for sustainability metrics', *Industrial & engineering chemistry research*, Vol. 46, No. 10, pp.2962-2973.
- Masset, G., Soler, L.G., Vieux, F. and Darmon, N. (2014) 'Identifying sustainable foods: the relationship between environmental impact, nutritional quality, and prices of foods representative of the French diet', *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, Vol. 114, No. 6, pp.862-869.
- Mastrandrea, M.D. and Schneider, S.H. (2004) 'Probabilistic integrated assessment of "dangerous" climate change', *Science*, Vol. 304, No. 5670, pp.571-575.
- Maxwell D.G. (1996) 'Measuring food insecurity: the frequency and severity of "coping strategies"', *Food Policy*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp.291-303.

Maxwell, S. and Slater, R. (2003) 'Food Policy Old and New', *Development Policy Review*, Vol. 21, Nos. 5-6, pp.531-553.

Maxwell, S. and Frankenberger, T. (Eds.) (1992) *Household Food Security: concepts, indicators, measurements*, IFAD and UNICEF, Rome (Italy) and New York (USA).

McCarthy, J.J., Canziani, O.F., Leary, N.A., Dokken, D.J. and White, K.S. (Eds.) (2001) *Climate Change 2001: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability, Published for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.

McClanahan, T., Cinner, J., Maina, J., Graham, N., Daw, T., Stead, S., Wamukota, A., Brown, K., Ateweberhan, M., Venus, V. and Polunin, N.V.C. (2008) 'Conservation action in a changing climate', *Conservation Letters*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp.53-59.

McGraw, K.L. and Seale, M.R. (1988) 'Knowledge elicitation with multiple experts: considerations and techniques', *Artificial Intelligence Review*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.31-44.

McKenna, H.P. (1994) 'The Delphi technique: a worthwhile research approach for nursing? ', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 19, No. 6, pp.1221-1225.

Mclaren, D.S. (1966) 'A fresh look at protein-calorie malnutrition', *The Lancet*, Vol. 288, No. 7461, pp.485-488.

Meade, B. (2012) *Global Food Markets*, USDA, Washington, DC, USA.

Meade, B., Regmi, A., Seale J.L.Jr. and Muhammad, A. (2014) *New International Evidence on Food Consumption Patterns*, USAID, Washington, DC, USA.

Mehnen, N., Mose, I. and Strijker, D. (2013) 'The Delphi Method as a Useful Tool to Study Governance and Protected Areas? ', *Landscape Research*, Vol. 38, No. 5, pp.607-624.

Mekonnen M.M. and Hoekstra A.Y. (2011) *National water footprint accounts: the green, blue and grey water footprint of production and consumption*, UNESCO-IHE, Delft, The Netherlands.

Mendez, M. and Popkin, B. (2004) 'Globalization, urbanization and nutritional change in the developing world', *FAO Food and Nutrition papers*, V. 83, pp.55-80.

Metzger, M., Rounsevell, M., Acosta-Michlik, L., Leemans, R. and Schröter, D. (2006) 'The vulnerability of ecosystem services to land use change', *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, Vol. 114, No. 1, pp.69-85.

Metzger, M. and Schröter, D. (2006) 'Towards a spatially explicit and quantitative vulnerability assessment of environmental change in Europe', *Regional Environmental Change*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp.201-216.

Middleton, N. and O'Keefe, P. (1997) *Disaster and development: the politics of humanitarian aid*, Pluto Press, London, England.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. (2005) *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment*, Island Press, Washington, DC, USA.

Walker, B., Birkmann, J., Van der Leeuw, S., Rockström, J., Hinkel, J., Downing, T., Folke, C. and Nelson, D. (2010) 'Resilience and vulnerability: complementary or conflicting concepts', *Ecology and Society*, 15(3) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss3/art11/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Misselhorn, A., Eakin, H., Devereux, S., Drimie, S., Msangi, S., Simelton, E. and Stafford Smith, M. (2010) 'Vulnerability to what', in Ingram, J. et al (Eds.) *Food security and global environmental change*, Earthscan, London, pp.87-114.

Misselhorn, A., Aggarwal, P., Ericksen, P., Gregory, P., Horn-Phathanothai, L., Ingram, J. and Wiebe, K. (2012) 'A vision for attaining food security', *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 7-17.

Mitchell, G., May, A. and McDonald, A. (1995) 'PICABUE: a methodological framework for the development of indicators of sustainable development', *The International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp.104- 123.

Molden, D. (1997) *Accounting for water use and productivity*, IWMI, Stockholm, Sweden.

Molony, T. and Smith, J. (2010) 'Biofuels, food security, and Africa', *African Affairs*, Vol. 109, No. 436, pp.489-498.

Monteiro, C.A., Conde, W.L., Lu, B. and Popkin, B.M. (2004) 'Obesity and inequities in health in the developing world', *International Journal of Obesity*, Vol. 28, No. 9, pp.1181-1186.

Morgan, D.L. (1997) *Focus groups as qualitative research*, Sage Research Methods, London, England.

Moss, R., Brenkert, A. and Malone, E. (2001) *Vulnerability to Climate Change: A Quantitative Approach*, US Department of Energy, Washington, DC, USA.

Mouillé, B., Charrondière, U.R. and Burlingame, B. (2010) *The Contribution of Plant Genetic Resources to Health and Dietary Diversity*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

Mouysset, L., Doyen, L., Jiguet, F., Allaire, G. and Leger, F. (2011) 'Bio-economic modeling for a sustainable management of biodiversity in agricultural lands', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 70, No. 4, pp.617-626.

Myers, N., Mittermeier, R.A., Mittermeier, C.G., Da Fonseca, G.A. and Kent, J. (2000) 'Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities', *Nature*, Vol. 403, No. 6772, pp.853-858.

Nadasdy, P. (2007) 'Adaptive co-management and the gospel of resilience', in Armitage, D. et al (Eds.) *Adaptive co-management: collaboration, learning and multi-level governance*, pp.208-227.

Natura 2000. [online] <http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/figures/natura-2000-sites-biogeographical-regions-4> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Negin J., Remans R., Karuti S. and Fanzo J. (2009) 'Integrating a broader notion of food security and gender empowerment into the African Green Revolution', *Food Security*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp.351-360.

Nestle, M. (2006) 'Food industry and health: mostly promises, little action', *The Lancet*, Vol. 368, No. 9535, pp.564-565.

Ng, M. et al. (2014) 'Global, regional, and national prevalence of overweight and obesity in children and adults during 1980–2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013', *The Lancet*, Vol. 384, No. 9945, pp.766-781.

Nielsen, S. J. and Popkin, B. (2004) 'Changes in beverage intake between 1977 and 2001', *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp.205-210.

Niemeijer, D. (2002) 'Developing indicators for environmental policy: data-driven and theory-driven approaches examined by example', *Environmental Science & Policy*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp.91-103.

North, D.C. (1991) 'Institutions', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 97-112.

Nowack, M., Endrikat, J. and Guenther, E. (2011) 'Review of Delphi-based scenario studies: quality and design considerations', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 78, No. 9, pp.1603-1615.

O'Brien, K., Sygna, L. and Haugen, J. E. (2004) 'Vulnerable or resilient? A multi-scale assessment of climate impacts and vulnerability in Norway', *Climatic change*, Vol. 64, Nos. 1-2, pp.193-225.

Obersteiner, M., Stafford Smith, M., Hiepe, C., Brklacich, M. and Rudder, W. (2010) 'Green food systems for 9 billion', in Ingram, J. et al (Eds.) *Food security and global environmental change*, Earthscan, London, England, pp.301-317.

OECD. (2013) *Water Security for Better Lives*, OECD Publishing, Paris, France.

OECD. (2008) *Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide*, OECD, Paris, France.

Okoli, C. and Pawlowski, S.D. (2004) 'The Delphi method as a research tool: an example, design considerations and applications', *Information & Management*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp.15-29.

Olesen, J.E. (2006) *Climate change as a driver for European agriculture*. SCAR-Foresight in the field of agricultural research in Europe, Expert paper, Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences, SCAR Standing Committee on Agriculture Research. http://ec.europa.eu/research/agriculture/scar/pdf/scar_foresight_climate_change_en.pdf (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Olesen, J.E. and Bindi, M. (2002) 'Consequences of climate change for European agricultural productivity, land use and policy', *European journal of agronomy*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp.239-262.

Oosterveer, P. and Sonnenfeld, D.A. (2012) *Food, globalization and sustainability*, Routledge, London, England.

Orsi, F., Geneletti, D. and Newton, A.C. (2011) 'Towards a common set of criteria and indicators to identify forest restoration priorities: An expert panel-based approach', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp.337-347.

Ostrom, E. (2007) 'A diagnostic approach for going beyond panaceas', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 104, No. 39, pp.15181-15187.

Ostrom, E. (2009) 'A General Framework for Analyzing Sustainability of Social-Ecological Systems', *Science*, Vol. 325, No. 5939, pp.419-422.

Oswald, A.J. and Powdthavee, N. (2007) 'Book Review Feature: Two Reviews of The Challenge of Affluence: Self - Control and Well - Being in the United States and Britain Since 1950', *The Economic Journal*, Vo. 117, No. 521, pp.F441-F454.

- Padilla, M. (2008) 'Dietary patterns and trends in consumption', in Hervieu, B. (Ed.) *Mediterra 2008: The future of agriculture and food in Mediterranean countries*, CIHEAM, Presse de SciencesPo, Paris, France, pp.149-170.
- Palm, C., Sanchez, P., Ahamed, S. and Awiti, A. (2007) 'Soils: a contemporary perspective', *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, Vol. 32, pp.99-129.
- Pangaribowo, E.H., Gerber, N. and Torero, M. (2013) 'Food and nutrition security indicators: a review', *ZEF Working Paper Series*, 108 [online] http://www.zef.de/uploads/tx_zefportal/Publications/wp108.pdf (Accessed 01 March 2015).
- PARME. (2011) *Quelles recherches et quels partenariats pour la Méditerranée?. Atelier de Réflexion Prospective. Rapport final*, Agropolis International, Montpellier, France.
- Parry, M.L., Canziani, O.F., Palutikof, J.P., van der Linden, P.J. and Hanson, C. (2007) *Climate Change 2007: Working Group II—Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*, IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Pascual, U., Narloch, U., Nordhagen, S. and Drucker, A. G. (2011) 'The economics of agrobiodiversity conservation for food security under climate change', *Economía Agraria y Recursos Naturales (Agricultural and Resource Economics)*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp.191-220.
- Pasinetti, L.L. (1980) *Essays on the theory of joint production*, Macmillan, London, England.
- Patel, A.C., Nunez, N.P., Perkins, S.N., Barrett, J.C. and Hursting, S.D. (2004) 'Effects of energy balance on cancer in genetically altered mice', *The Journal of Nutrition*, Vol. 134, No. 12, pp.3394S-3398S.
- Patnaik, U., Narayanan, K. and Parthasarathy, D. (2005) *Climate Change and Vulnerability: Evidence from Indian Coastal Districts*. Paper presented at LOICZ II Inaugural Open Science Conference, Coasts and Coastal People - Scenarios and Responses, Egmond aan Zee, 27-29 June 2005, The Netherlands
- Patt, A.G., Schröter, D., Anne, C. and Klein, R.J. (2008) 'An introduction to the diversity of approaches to vulnerability research and assessment: common features and lessons learned', in Patt, A.G. et al (Eds.) *Assessing Vulnerability to Global Environmental Change*, Earthscan, London, pp.1-22.
- Pelletier, D.L. and Frongillo, E.A. (2003) 'Changes in child survival are strongly associated with changes in malnutrition in developing countries', *The Journal of Nutrition*, Vol. 133, No. 1, pp.107-119.

Pelling, M. and Uitto, J.I. (2001) 'Small island developing states: natural disaster vulnerability and global change', *Global Environmental Change Part B: Environmental Hazards*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp.49-62.

Perry, D.A. (1994) *Forest Ecosystems*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, USA.

Petchey O.L. and Gaston K.J. (2002) 'Functional diversity (FD), species richness and community composition', *Ecology Letters*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp.402-411.

Petersen, S.O., Regina, K., Pöllinger, A., Rigler, E., Valli, L., Yamulki, S., Esalab, M., Fabbrie, C., Syväsalob, E. and Vinthera, F.P. (2006) Nitrous oxide emissions from organic and conventional crop rotations in five European countries', *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, Vol. 112, No. 2-3, pp.200-206.

Phillips, T.P. and Taylor, D.S. (1998) 'Household food security: an assessment method', *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp.257-275.

Pinard, C.A., Kim, S.A., Story, M. and Yaroch, A.L. (2013) 'The Food and Water System: Impacts on Obesity', *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, Vol. 41, No.S2, pp.S52-S60.

Pingali, P. (2007) 'Westernization of Asian diets and the transformation of food systems: implications for research and policy', *Food Policy*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp.281-298.

Pinstrup-Andersen, P. (2006) 'Agricultural research and policy to achieve nutrition goals', in de Janvry, A. and Kanbur, R. (Eds.) *Poverty, Inequality and Development*, Springer, New York, USA, pp.353-370.

Pinstrup-Andersen, P. (2009) 'Food security: definition and measurement', *Food Security*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.5-7.

Pinstrup-Andersen, P. (2013) 'Nutrition-sensitive food systems: from rhetoric to action', *The Lancet*, Vol. 382, No. 9890, pp.375-376.

PIPAME. (2012) *Enjeux et perspectives des industries agroalimentaires face à la volatilité du prix des matières premières*, Pôle interministériel de prospective et d'anticipation des mutations économiques, Paris, France.

Plan Bleu. (2002) *Final Report on the Systemic and Prospective Sustainability Analysis Project within CAMP Malta*, UNEP, Valbonne, France.

Plummer, R. (2010) 'Social–ecological resilience and environmental education: Synopsis, application, implications', *Environmental Education Research*, Vol. 16, Nos. 5-6, pp.493-509.

Plummer, R. and Armitage, D. (2007) 'Charting the new territory of adaptive co-management: a Delphi study', *Ecology & Society*, 12(2) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol12/iss2/art10/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Polsky, C. and Eakin, H. (2011) *Global Change Vulnerability*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, England.

Polsky, C., Neff, R. and Yarnal, B. (2007) 'Building comparable global change vulnerability assessments: The vulnerability scoping diagram', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 17, Nos. 3–4, pp.472-485.

Popkin, B. (2002) 'The shift in stages of the nutrition transition in the developing world differs from past experiences! ', *Public Health Nutrition*, Vol. 5, No.1A, pp.205-214.

Popkin, B. (2003) 'The Nutrition Transition in the Developing World', *Development Policy Review*, Vol. 21, Nos. 5-6, pp.581-597.

Popkin, B. and Gordon-Larsen, P. (2004) 'The nutrition transition: worldwide obesity dynamics and their determinants', *International Journal of Obesity*, Vol. 28, pp.S2-S9.

Popkin, B. (2005) 'Using research on the obesity pandemic as a guide to a unified vision of nutrition', *Public Health Nutrition*, Vol. 8, No. 6a, pp.724-729.

Popkin, B. (2011) 'Contemporary nutritional transition: determinants of diet and its impact on body composition', *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, Vol. 70, No. 1, pp.82-91.

Powell, B., Lckowitz, A., McMullin, S., Jamnadass, R., Miguel, C., Vasquez, P. and Sunderland, T. (2013) *The role of forests, trees and wild biodiversity for nutrition-sensitive food systems and landscapes*, FAO and WHO Publication, Geneva, Switzerland.

Powell, C. (2003) 'The Delphi technique: myths and realities', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp.376-382.

Powell, L.M. and Chaloupka, F.J. (2009) 'Food prices and obesity: evidence and policy implications for taxes and subsidies', *Milbank Quarterly*, Vol. 87, No. 1, pp.229-257.

- Prato, T. (2008) 'Conceptual framework for assessment and management of ecosystem impacts of climate change', *Ecological complexity*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp.329-338.
- Prentice, A.M. and Jebb, S.A. (2003) 'Fast foods, energy density and obesity: a possible mechanistic link', *Obesity Reviews*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp.187-194.
- Pretty, J. (2008) 'Agricultural sustainability: concepts, principles and evidence', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 363, No. 1491, pp. 447-465.
- Prosperi, P., Allen, T., Padilla, M., Peri, I. and Cogill, B. (2014) 'Sustainability and Food & Nutrition Security: A Vulnerability Assessment Framework for the Mediterranean Region', *SAGE Open*, 4(2) [online] <http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/4/2/2158244014539169.full.pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).
- Ramalingam, B., Jones, H., Reba, T. and Young, J. (2008) *Exploring the science of complexity: Ideas and implications for development and humanitarian efforts*, Overseas Development Institute, London, England.
- Rammel, C., McIntosh, B.S. and Jeffrey, P. (2007) '(Co)evolutionary approaches to sustainable development', *The International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp.1-3.
- Randall, E., Nichaman, M.Z. and Contant C.F.Jr. (1985) 'Diet diversity and nutrient intake', *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, Vol. 85, No. 7, pp.830-836.
- Rastoin, J.L. and Ghersi, G. (2010) *Le système alimentaire mondial: concepts et méthodes, analyses et dynamiques*, Editions Quae, Paris, France.
- Rastoin, J., Ayadi, N. and Montigaud, J. (2007) 'Vulnérabilité régionale à l'ouverture commerciale internationale: le cas des fruits et légumes dans l'Euro-Méditerranée', in Regnault, H. and Deblock, C. (Dirs.) *Nord-Sud, Reconnexion périphérique*, Outremont, CEIM, Editions Athena, Montreal, Canada, pp.275-301.
- Rastoin, J. and Cheriet, F. (2010) *Sécurité alimentaire en Méditerranée: Un enjeu géostratégique majeur*, IPEMED, Paris, France.
- Rees, M., Condit, R., Crawley, M., Pacala, S. and Tilman, D. (2001) 'Long-term studies of vegetation dynamics', *Science*, Vol. 293, No. 5530, pp.650-655.
- Regmi, A. and Gehlhar, M.J. (2005) *New directions in global food markets*, US Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, USA.

Regmi, A. and Meade, B. (2013) 'Demand side drivers of global food security', *Global Food Security*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp.166-171.

Reidsma, P. and Ewert, F. (2008) 'Regional farm diversity can reduce vulnerability of food production to climate change', *Ecology and Society*, 13(1) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss1/art38/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Remans, R. and Smukler, S. (2013) '7 Linking biodiversity and nutrition', in Fanzo, J. et al (Eds.) *Diversifying Food and Diets: Using Agricultural Biodiversity to Improve Nutrition and Health*, Routledge, New York, USA, pp.140-163.

Remans, R., Flynn, D.F.B., DeClerck, F., Diru, W., Fanzo, J., Gaynor, K., Lambrecht, I., Mudiope, J., Mutuo, P.K., Nkhoma, P., Siriri, D., Sullivan, C., Palm, C.A. (2011) 'Assessing Nutritional Diversity of Cropping Systems in African Villages' *PLoS ONE*, 6(6) [online] <http://www.plosone.org/article/fetchObject.action?uri=info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0021235&representation=PDF> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Renkow, M. (2011) Assessing the environmental impacts of CGIAR research: toward an analytical framework', in Independent Science and Partnership Council, *Measuring the Environmental Impacts of Agricultural Research: Theory and Applications to CGIAR Research*, Independent Science and Partnership Council Secretariat, Rome, Italy.

Resilience Alliance. (2010) '*Assessing resilience in social-ecological systems: Workbook for practitioners*, Version 2.0. <http://www.resalliance.org/workbook/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Ribot, J.C. (1995) 'The causal structure of vulnerability: its application to climate impact analysis', *GeoJournal*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp.119-122.

Rigby, D., Woodhouse, P., Young, T. and Burton, M. (2001). 'Constructing a farm level indicator of sustainable agricultural practice', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp.463-478.

Rikkonen, P. and Tapio, P. (2009) 'Future prospects of alternative agro-based bioenergy use in Finland—constructing scenarios with quantitative and qualitative Delphi data', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 76, No. 7, pp.978-990.

Robles, M., Torero, M. and Von Braun, J. (2009) *When speculation matters*, International Food Policy Research Institute Issue Brief 57, IFPRI, Washington, DC, USA.

Roche, M., Creed-Kanashiro, H., Tuesta, I. and Kuhnlein, H. (2008) 'Traditional food diversity predicts dietary quality for the Awajun in the Peruvian Amazon', *Public Health Nutrition*, Vol. 11, No. 5, pp.457-465.

Rockström, J. (2003) 'Resilience building and water demand management for drought mitigation', *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C*, Vol. 28, No. 20, pp.869-877.

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E.F., Lenton, T.M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H.J., Nykvist, B., de Wit, C.A., Hughes, T., van der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P.K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., Falkenmark, M., Karlberg, L., Corell, R.W., Fabry, V.J., Hansen, J., Walker, B., Liverman, D., Richardson, K., Crutzen, P., Foley, J.A. (2009) 'A safe operating space for humanity', *Nature*, Vol. 461, No. 7263, pp.472-475.

Roe, E. (1998) *Taking complexity seriously: Policy analysis, triangulation, and sustainable development*, Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Rosen, R.A. (2000) 'European development and environmental risk: Sustainable growth at what cost? ', *Environmental Claims Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp.99-111.

Rosenström, U. (2006) 'Exploring the policy use of sustainable development indicators: interviews with Finnish politicians', *The Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies*, Vol. 5, Nos. 1-2, pp.1-13.

Roson, R. and Sartori, M. (2010) 'Water scarcity and virtual water trade in the Mediterranean', *University Ca' Foscari of Venice, Department of Economics Research Paper Series*, No. 08-10.

Rowe, G., Wright, G. and McColl, A. (2005) 'Judgment change during Delphi-like procedures: The role of majority influence, expertise, and confidence', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 72, No. 4, pp.377-399.

Rowell, D. (2002) *State-space representation of LTI systems*. [online] <http://web.mit.edu/2.14/www/Handouts/StateSpace.pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Ruben, R. and van Ruijven, A. (2001) 'Technical coefficients for bio-economic farm household models: a meta-modelling approach with applications for Southern Mali', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp.427-441.

Ruel, M.T. (2003) 'Is dietary diversity an indicator of food security or dietary quality? A review of measurement issues and research needs', *Food and Nutrition Bulletin*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp.231-232.

Rutten, L.F., Yaroch, A.L. and Story, M. (2011) 'Food Systems and Food Security: A Conceptual Model for Identifying Food System Deficiencies', *Journal of Hunger & Environmental Nutrition*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp.239-246.

Rydin, Y. (2007) 'Re-examining the role of knowledge within planning theory', *Planning theory*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp.52-68.

Saaty, T.L. (1986) *Decision Making for Leaders: The Analytical Hierarchy Process for Decisions in A Complex World*, University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, USA.

Sackman, H. (1974) *Delphi critique; expert opinion, forecasting, and group process*, Lexington Books, Lexington, USA.

Sadoulet, E. and De Janvry, A. (1995) *Quantitative development policy analysis*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, USA.

Sage, C. (2013) 'The interconnected challenges for food security from a food regimes perspective: Energy, climate and malconsumption', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 29, pp.71-80.

Sajise, P.E. (2005) 'Biodiversity research for sustainable development: can it be achieved?' *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Development*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.1-14.

Saldarriaga, M., Nyanga, P.H. and Kopainsky, B. (2014) 'Dynamic decision making in coupled social-ecological systems'. Paper presented at the *32nd International Conference of the System Dynamics Society*. 20-24 July 2014, Delft, The Netherlands.

Salvati, L. (2014) 'Toward a 'Sustainable' land degradation? Vulnerability degree and component balance in a rapidly changing environment', *Environment, development and sustainability*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.239-254.

Sassi, F., Devaux, M., Cecchini, M. and Rusticelli, E. (2009) *The Obesity Epidemic: Analysis of past and Projected Future Trends in Selected OECD Countries*, OECD, Paris, France.

SCAR. (2008) *2nd Foresight Exercise: New challenges for Agricultural Research: Climate change, food security, rural development, agricultural knowledge systems*, Standing Committee on Agricultural Research, Foresight Expert Group, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.

SCAR. (2011) *3rd SCAR foresight exercise: Sustainable Food Consumption and Production in a Resource-Constrained World*, Standing Committee on Agricultural Research, Foresight Expert Group, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.

Schewenius, M., McPhearson, T. and Elmqvist, T. (2014) 'Opportunities for Increasing Resilience and Sustainability of Urban Social–Ecological Systems: Insights from the URBES and the Cities and Biodiversity Outlook Projects', *Ambio*, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp.434-444.

Schlüter, M., Hinkel, J., Bots, P.W. and Arlinghaus, R. (2014) 'Application of the SES Framework for Model-based Analysis of the Dynamics of Social-Ecological Systems', *Ecology and Society*, 19(1) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol19/iss1/art36/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Schönhart, M., Schauppenlehner, T., Schmid, E. and Muhar, A. (2011) 'Integration of bio-physical and economic models to analyze management intensity and landscape structure effects at farm and landscape level', *Agricultural Systems*, Vol. 104, No. 2, pp.122-134.

Schröter, D., Polsky, C. and Patt, A. (2005) 'Assessing vulnerabilities to the effects of global change: an eight step approach', *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp.573-595.

Schubert, L., Jennaway, M. and Johnson, H. (2010) 'Explaining Patterns of Convenience Food Consumption', in Lawrence, G. et al (Eds.) *Food security, nutrition and sustainability*, Earthscan, London, England, pp.130-144.

Scoones, I., Leach, M., Smith, A., Stagl, S., Stirling, A. and Thompson, J. (2007) *Dynamic Systems and the Challenge of Sustainability*, STEPS Working Paper 1, STEPS Centre, Brighton, England.

Sébastien, L. and Bauler, T. (2013) 'Use and influence of composite indicators for sustainable development at the EU-level', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 35, pp.3-12.

Sen A. (1981) *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England.

Shiferaw, B., Holden, S. and Aune, J. (2001) 'Population pressure and land degradation in the Ethiopian highlands: a bio-economic model with endogenous soil degradation', in Heerink, N. et al (Eds.) *Economic Policy and Sustainable Land Use*, Springer, Verlag Heidelberg New York, pp.73-92.

Singh, R.K., Murty, H.R., Gupta, S.K. and Dikshit, A.K. (2012) 'An overview of sustainability assessment methodologies', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp.281-299.

Smit, B. and Wandel, J. (2006) 'Adaptation, adaptive capacity and vulnerability', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp.282-292.

- Snyder-Halpern, R. (2001) 'Indicators of organizational readiness for clinical information technology/systems innovation: a Delphi study', *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, Vol. 63, No. 3, pp.179-204.
- Sobal, J., Kettel Khan, L. and Bisogni, C. (1998) 'A conceptual model of the food and nutrition system', *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 47, No. 7, pp.853-863.
- Sonwa D.J., Somorin O.A., Jum C., Bele M.Y. and Nkem J.N. (2012) 'Vulnerability, forest-related sectors and climate change adaptation: The case of Cameroon', *Forest Policy and Economics*, Vol. 23, pp.1-9.
- Sousa, P., Trigo, R., Aizpurua, P., Nieto, R., Gimeno, L. and Garcia-Herrera, R. (2011) 'Trends and extremes of drought indices throughout the 20th century in the Mediterranean', *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp.33-51.
- Speth, J.G. (1993) *Towards sustainable food security*, CGIAR, Washington, DC, USA.
- Staatz, J.M., D'Agostino, V.C. and Sundberg, S. (1990) 'Measuring food security in Africa: conceptual, empirical, and policy issues', *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 72, No. 5, pp.1311-1317.
- Stamp, P., Messmer, R. and Walter, A. (2012) 'Competitive underutilized crops will depend on the state funding of breeding programmes: An opinion on the example of Europe', *Plant Breeding*, Vol. 131, No. 4, 461-464.
- Stankovski, T. (2014) *Tackling the inverse problem for non-autonomous systems: application to the life sciences*, Springer International Publishing, Switzerland.
- Stave, K. and Kopainsky, B. (2014) 'Dynamic thinking about food system vulnerabilities in highly developed countries: Issues and initial analytic structure'. Paper presented at the *32nd International Conference of the System Dynamics Society*. 20-24 July 2014, Delft, The Netherlands.
- Steyaert, S. and Lisoir, H. (2005) *Participatory methods toolkit—A practitioner's manual*, King Baudouin Foundation and Flemish Institute for Science and Technology Assessment, Brussels, Belgium.
- Stiglitz, J.E., Sen, A. and Fitoussi, J.P. (2010) *Report by the commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress*. Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress, Paris, France
- Story, M., Hamm, M.W. and Wallinga, D. (2009) 'Food systems and public health: linkages to achieve healthier diets and healthier communities', *Journal of Hunger & Environmental Nutrition*, Vol. 4, Nos. 3-4, pp.219-224.

Strang, B. (2009) *Investing in the future: A united call to action on vitamin and mineral deficiencies: Global Report 2009*, Micronutrient Initiative, Ottawa, Canada.

Strunz, S. (2012) 'Is conceptual vagueness an asset? Arguments from philosophy of science applied to the concept of resilience', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 76, pp.112-118.

Swaminathan, M. (1983) 'Third world lecture 1983: Agricultural progress—key to third world prosperity', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp.553-566.

Swaminathan, M. (1987) 'The promise of agroforestry for ecological and nutritional security', in Stepler, H.A. and Nair, P.K.R. (Eds.) *Agroforestry: a decade of development*, ICRAF, Nairobi, Kenya, pp.25-42.

Swift, J. (1989) 'Why are Rural People Vulnerable to Famine? ' *Institute of Development Studies Bulletin*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp.8-15.

Swift, M.J., Izac, A.M.N. and Van Noordwijk, M. (2004) 'Biodiversity and ecosystem services in agricultural landscapes: Are we asking the right questions? ', *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, Vol. 104, No. 1, pp.113-134.

Swinburn, B., Egger, G. and Raza, F. (1999) 'Dissecting obesogenic environments: the development and application of a framework for identifying and prioritizing environmental interventions for obesity', *Preventive Medicine*, Vol. 29, No. 6, pp.563-570.

Swinburn, B.A., Caterson, I., Seidell, J.C. and James, W.P. (2004) 'Diet, nutrition and the prevention of excess weight gain and obesity', *Public Health Nutrition*, Vol. 7, No. 1a, pp.123-146.

Swingland, I.R. (2000) 'Biodiversity, definition of. ' in Levin, S.A. *Encyclopedia of biodiversity*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Vol. 1, pp.377-391.

Swor, T. and Canter, L. (2011) 'Promoting environmental sustainability via an expert elicitation process', *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, Vol. 31, No. 5, pp.506-514.

Tapio, P. (2003) 'Disaggregative policy Delphi: using cluster analysis as a tool for systematic scenario formation', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 70, No. 1, pp.83-101.

Tegart, W., Sheldon, G. and Griffiths, D. (1990) *Climate Change: The IPCC Scientific Assessment*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, Australia.

Termote, C., Cogill, B., Deptford, A., Muguro, S., Kimere, C., Grace, J., Mutangah, J., Mattei, F. and Fanzo, J. (2013) '*Role of wild, neglected and underutilized foods in reducing the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet in the eastern region of Baringo District, Kenya*'. Paper presented at the Grand Challenges Exploration: Agriculture and Nutrition Meeting, 27 February 2013, Seattle, USA.

Termote, C., Van Damme, P. and Dheda Djailo, B. (2010) 'Eating from the wild: Turumbu indigenous knowledge on noncultivated edible plants, Tshopo District, DR Congo', *Ecology of food and nutrition*, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp.173-207.

Thangaratinam, S. and Redman, C.W. (2005) 'The Delphi technique', *The obstetrician & gynaecologist*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp.120-125.

Thivierge, M.N., Parent, D., Bélanger, V., Angers, D.A., Allard, G., Pellerin, D., and Vanasse, A. (2014) 'Environmental sustainability indicators for cash-crop farms in Quebec, Canada: A participatory approach', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 45, pp.677-686.

Thompson, B. and Cohen, M.J. (2012) *The impact of climate change and bioenergy on nutrition*: Springer Publishing, Switzerland..

Thompson, J., Millstone, E., Scoones, I., Ely, A., Marshall, F., Shah, E. and Stagl, S. (2007) *Agri-food System Dynamics: pathways to sustainability in an era of uncertainty*, STEPS Working Paper 4, STEPS Centre, Brighton, England.

Thompson, J. and Scoones, I. (2009) 'Addressing the dynamics of agri-food systems: an emerging agenda for social science research', *Environmental Science & Policy*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 386-397.

Thornton, P.K., Jones, P.G., Owiyo, T., Kruska, R.L., Herrero, M., Orindi, V., Bhadwal, S., Kristjanson, P., Notenbaert, A., Bekele, N. and Omolo, A. (2008) 'Climate change and poverty in Africa: Mapping hotspots of vulnerability', *African Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.24-44.

Thrupp, L.A. (2000) 'Linking agricultural biodiversity and food security: the valuable role of agrobiodiversity for sustainable agriculture', *International Affairs*, Vol. 76, No. 2, pp.283-297.

Tilman, D., Cassman, K.G., Matson, P.A., Naylor, R. and Polasky, S. (2002) 'Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices', *Nature*, Vol 418, No. 6898, pp.671-677.

Tilman, D. and Clark, M. (2014) 'Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health', *Nature*, Vol. 515, No. 7528, pp.518-522.

Timmermann, P. (1981) *Vulnerability, resilience and the collapse of society*, Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

Tol, R.S. (2003) 'Is the uncertainty about climate change too large for expected cost-benefit analysis? ', *Climatic change*, Vol. 56, No. 3, pp.265-289.

Torheim, L., Ouattara, F., Diarra, M., Thiam, F., Barikmo, I., Hatløy, A. and Oshaug, A. (2004) 'Nutrient adequacy and dietary diversity in rural Mali: association and determinants', *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 58, No. 4, pp.594-604.

TRANSMANGO. [online] <http://www.transmango.eu> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Tsaur, S.H., Lin, Y.C. and Lin, J.H. (2006) 'Evaluating ecotourism sustainability from the integrated perspective of resource, community and tourism', *Tourism management*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp.640-653.

Tucker, K. (2001) 'Eat a variety of healthful foods: old advice with new support', *Nutrition Reviews*, Vol. 59, No. 5, pp.156-158.

Turner, B.L., Kasperson, R.E., Matson, P.A., McCarthy, J.J., Corell, R.W., Christensen, L., Eckley, N., Kasperson, J.X., Luers, A., Martello, M.L., Polsky, C., Pulsipher, A., Schiller, A. (2003) 'A framework for vulnerability analysis in sustainability science', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 100, No. 14, pp.8074-8079.

Turner, B.L. (2010) 'Vulnerability and resilience: coalescing or paralleling approaches for sustainability science?', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp.570-576.

Turnhout, E., Hisschemöller, M. and Eijsackers, H. (2007) 'Ecological indicators: between the two fires of science and policy', *Ecological indicators*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp.215-228.

Turoff, M. (1970). 'The design of a policy Delphi', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp.149-171.

UK Cabinet Office. (2008) *Food Matters: Towards a Strategy for the 21st Century*, UK Cabinet Office, London, England.

Ulanowicz, R.E. (1997) *Ecology, the ascendent perspective*, Columbia University Press, New York, USA.

UN-ECOSOC. (1996) *Impact of the economic embargo on the economic, social and cultural situation in Iraq*, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights-OHCHR, Geneva, Switzerland.

UNDP. (1994) *Vulnerability and Risk Assessment*, 2nd ed, Cambridge Architectural Research Limited, Cambridge, England.

UNEP. (2012) *Measuring Progress: Environmental Goals & Gaps*, United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya.

UNEP Plan Bleu. (2006) *Facing water stress and shortage in the Mediterranean*, Plan Bleu, Sophia Antipolis, France,

UNICEF. (2013) *Improving child nutrition: The achievable imperative for global progress*, UNICEF, New York, USA.

United Nations. (1975) *Report of the World Food Conference*, United Nations Brussels, Belgium.

United Nations. (1987) *Report of the World Commission on environment and development: "Our common future."*, United Nations, New York, USA.

United Nations. (1992) *Convention on Biological Diversity*, United Nations, New York, USA.

United Nations. (1996) *Rome Declaration on World Food Security*, FAO, Rome, Italy.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2007) *Indicators of sustainable development: Guidelines and methodologies*, United Nations Publications, New York, USA.

United Nations. (2014) *World Statistics Pocketbook 2014 edition*, United Nations, New York, USA.

United Nations Disaster Relief Organization. (1979) *Natural disasters and vulnerability analysis: Report of Expert Group Meeting*, United Nations Disaster Relief Organization. Geneva, Switzerland.

UNSCN. (2000) *Fourth Report on the World Nutrition Situation*, United Nations System Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN), Geneva, Switzerland.

UNSDSN. (2014) *Indicators and a monitoring framework for Sustainable Development Goals*. UNSDSN, New York, USA.

UNWATER. (2014) *The United Nations Water Development Report 2014: Water and Energy*, UNESCO, Paris, France.

van de Wouw, M., Kik, C., van Hintum, T., van Treuren, R. and Visser, B. (2010) 'Genetic erosion in crops: concept, research results and challenges', *Plant Genetic Resources*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp.1-15.

Van Der Sluijs, J. P., Craye, M., Funtowicz, S., Kloprogge, P., Ravetz, J. and Risbey, J. (2005) 'Combining quantitative and qualitative measures of uncertainty in model-based environmental assessment: the NUSAP system', *Risk Analysis*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp.481-492.

van Ittersum, M. and Rijk, H. (2009) 'Current systems and future scenarios for food production activities', in Rabbinge, R. and A. Linnemann (Eds.), *European Food Systems in a Changing World*, European ScienceFoundation/COST Forward Look, Wageningen, The Netherlands, pp.34-64.

Van Oel, P., Mekonnen, M. and Hoekstra, A. (2009) 'The external water footprint of the Netherlands: Geographically-explicit quantification and impact assessment', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 69, No. 1, pp.82-92.

Van Zolingen, S.J. and Klaassen, C.A. (2003) 'Selection processes in a Delphi study about key qualifications in Senior Secondary Vocational Education', *Technological forecasting and social change*, Vol. 70, No. 4, pp.317-340.

Vanham, D., Hoekstra, A. and Bidoglio, G. (2013) 'Potential water saving through changes in European diets', *Environment international*, Vol. 61, pp.45-56.

Vanolo, A. (2007) 'Innovation and Polycentrism in the Mediterranean Latin Arc', in Cattani, N., (Ed.) *Cities and Networks in Europe-a Critical Approach of Polycentrism*, John Libbey Eurotext, Esher, England, pp.39-49.

Vermeulen, S.J., Challinor, A.J., Thornton, P.K., Campbell, B.M., Eriyagama, N., Vervoort, J. M., Kinyangi, J., Jarvis, A., Läderach, P., Ramirez-Villegas, J., Ramirez-Villegas, J., Nicklin, K.J., Hawkins, E., Smith, D.R. (2013) 'Addressing uncertainty in adaptation planning for agriculture', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 110, No. 21, pp.8357-8362.

Vervoort, J., Hoogstra, M., Kok, K., van Lammeren, R., Bregt, A. and Janssen, R. (2014) 'Visualizing stakeholder perspectives for reflection and dialogue on scale dynamics in social-ecological systems', *Human Ecology Review*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp.157-181.

Vervoort, J.M., Thornton, P.K., Kristjanson, P., Förch, W., Ericksen, P., Kok, K., Ingram, J., Herrero, M., Palazzo, A., Helfgott, A., Wilkinson, A., Havlik, P., Mason-D'Croz, D. and Jost, C. (2014) 'Challenges to scenario-guided adaptive action on food security under climate change', *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 28, pp.383-394.

- Vieux, F., Darmon, N., Touazi, D. and Soler, L. (2012) 'Greenhouse gas emissions of self-selected individual diets in France: Changing the diet structure or consuming less?', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 75, pp.91-101.
- Vieux, F., Soler, L.-G., Touazi, D. and Darmon, N. (2013) 'High nutritional quality is not associated with low greenhouse gas emissions in self-selected diets of French adults', *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, Vol. 97, No. 3, pp.569-583.
- Vinceti, B., Termote, C., Ickowitz, A., Powell, B., Kehlenbeck, K. and Hunter, D. (2013) 'The contribution of forests and trees to sustainable diets', *Sustainability*, 5(11), pp.4797-4824.
- Vinnari, M. and Tapio, P. (2009) 'Future images of meat consumption in 2030', *Futures*, Vol. 41, No. 5, pp.269-278.
- Voiron-Canicchio, C. (1994) 'À la recherche d'un arc méditerranéen', *Méditerranée*, Vol. 79, Nos. 1-2, pp.15-23.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968) *General Systems Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications*, George Braziller, New York, USA.
- Von Braun, J. and Díaz-Bonilla, E. (Eds.) (2008) *Globalization of food and agriculture and the poor*, Oxford University Press, New Dehli, India.
- Vrana, I., Vaníček, J., Kovář, P., Brožek, J. and Aly, S. (2012) 'A group agreement-based approach for decision making in environmental issues', *Environmental Modelling & Software*, Vol. 36, pp.99-110.
- Waas, T., Hugé, J., Verbruggen, A. and Wright, T. (2011) 'Sustainable development: A bird's eye view', *Sustainability*, 3(10) [online] <http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/3/10/1637/pdf> (Accessed 01 March 2015).
- Wahlqvist, M. L. and Lee, M.-S. (2007) 'Regional food culture and development', *Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 16, pp.S2-S7.
- Walker, B., Carpenter, S., Anderies, J., Abel, N., Cumming, G., Janssen, M., Lebel, L., Norberg, J., Peterson, G.D. and Pritchard, R. (2002) 'Resilience management in social-ecological systems: a working hypothesis for a participatory approach', *Conservation ecology*, 6(1) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol6/iss1/art14/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).
- Walker, B., Gunderson, L., Kinzig, A., Folke, C., Carpenter, S. and Schultz, L. (2006) 'A handful of heuristics and some propositions for understanding resilience in social-ecological systems', *Ecology and Society*, 11(1) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss1/art13/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Walker, B., Holling, C.S., Carpenter, S.R. and Kinzig, A. (2004) 'Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social-ecological systems', *Ecology and Society*, 9(2) [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss2/art5/> (Accessed 01 March 2015).

Wang, S.T. and Ebert, A.W. (2012) 'Breeding of Leafy Amaranth for Adaptation to Climate Change', in Holmer, R. et al (Eds.) *High Value Vegetables in Southeast Asia: Production, Supply and Demand*, Proceedings of the SEAVEG 2012 Regional Symposium, The World Vegetable Center, Tainan, Taiwan, pp. 36–43.

Watson, D., Lorenz, U., Stenbaek Hansen, M., Szlezak, J., Zoboli, R., Kuhndt, M., Wilson, C., Mont, O. and Wittmer, D. (2012) *Towards a Set of Indicators on Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) for EEA reporting*, ETC/SCP working paper 1/2010, European Topic Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ETC/SCP), Copenhagen, Denmark.

Watts, M.J. and Bohle, H.G. (1993) 'Hunger, famine and the space of vulnerability', *GeoJournal*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp.117-125.

Waughray, D. (2011) *Water security: the water-food-energy-climate nexus*, Island Press, Washington DC, USA.

Webb, P. (2010) 'Medium-to long-run implications of high food prices for global nutrition', *The Journal of Nutrition*, Vol. 140, No. 1, pp.143S-147S.

Webster, M. (2002) 'The curious role of "learning" in climate policy: should we wait for more data?', *The Energy Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp.97-119.

Webster, M., Forest, C., Reilly, J., Babiker, M., Kicklighter, D., Mayer, M., Prinn, R., Sarofim, M., Sokolov, A., Stone, P. and Wang, C. (2003) 'Uncertainty analysis of climate change and policy response', *Climatic change*, Vol. 61, No. 3, pp.295-320.

Welch R.M. and Graham R.D. (1999) 'A new paradigm for world agriculture: meeting human needs: Productive, sustainable, nutritious', *Field Crops Research*, Vol. 60, No 1-2, pp.1-10.

Wentholt, M., Rowe, G., König, A., Marvin, H. and Frewer, L. (2009) 'The views of key stakeholders on an evolving food risk governance framework: results from a Delphi study', *Food Policy*, Vol. 34, No. 6, pp.539-548.

WHO. (2003) *Diet, nutrition and the prevention of chronic diseases*, Report of a joint WHO/FAO expert consultation, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

WHO. (2008) *WHO European Action Plan for Food and Nutrition Policy 2007-2012*, World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen, Denmark.

WHO Fact Sheets. (2013 and 2014) [online] <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs311/en/> (Accessed -1 March 2015).

Wiener, N. (1948) *Cybernetics*, Hermann, Paris, France.

Wilby, R.L., Dawson, C.W. and Barrow, E.M. (2002) 'SDSM—a decision support tool for the assessment of regional climate change impacts', *Environmental Modelling & Software*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp.145-157.

Wilkins, J.L. (2005) 'Eating right here: Moving from consumer to food citizen', *Agriculture and Human Values*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp.269-273.

Winson, A. (2004) 'Bringing political economy into the debate on the obesity epidemic', *Agriculture and Human Values*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp.299-312.

Wolfe, W.S. and Frongillo, E.A. (2001) 'Building household food-security measurement tools from the ground up', *Food & Nutrition Bulletin*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp.5-12.

Wood, S., Ericksen, P., Stewart, B., Thornton, P. and Anderson, M. (2010) 'Lessons learned from international assessments', in Ingram, J. et al (Eds.), *Food security and global environmental change*, Earthscan, London, pp.46-62.

The World Bank. (1986) *A World Bank policy study. Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security in Developing Countries*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Washington, DC, USA.

Wriedt, G., Van der Velde, M., Aloe, A. and Bouraoui, F. (2008) *Water Requirements for Irrigation in the European Union. A model based assessment of irrigation water requirements and regional water demands in Europe*, JRC Scientific and Technical Reports, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Wright, A. and Sharon, T. (2006) 'Giving "teeth" to an environmental policy: a Delphi study at Dalhousie University', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 14, No. 9, pp.761-768.

Yang, H. and Zehnder, A.J. (2008) *Globalization of water resources through virtual water trade*, Swiss Federal Institute for Aquatic Science and Technology, Dübendorf, Switzerland.

Yatsunencko, T., Rey, F. E., Manary, M. J., Trehan, I., Dominguez-Bello, M. G., Contreras, M., Magris, M., Hidalgo, G., Baldassano, R.N., Anokhin, A.P., Heath, A.C., Warner, B., Reeder, J., Kuczynski, J., Caporaso, J.G., Lozupone, C.A., Lauber, C., Clemente, J.C., Knights, D., Knight, R. and Gordon, J.I. (2012) 'Human gut

microbiome viewed across age and geography’, *Nature*, Vol. 486, No. 7402, pp.222-227.

Yu, Q., Wu, W., Yang, P., Li, Z., Xiong, W. and Tang, H. (2012) ‘Proposing an interdisciplinary and cross-scale framework for global change and food security researches’, *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, Vol. 156, pp.57-71.

Zeckhauser, R. (1996) ‘The economics of catastrophes’, *Journal of risk and uncertainty*, Vol. 12, Nos. 2-3, pp.113-140.

Ziervogel, G. and Ericksen, P. (2010) ‘Adapting to climate change to sustain food security’, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp.525-540.

ANNEX 1:

Letter of invitation in the Delphi study

19 February 2014

Invitation to participate in an expert consultation

Dear colleagues,

[Bioversity International](#) & [CIHEAM-IAMM](#) have the pleasure to invite you to participate in the expert consultation survey *Metrics of Sustainable Diets and Food Systems 2014*.

There is a growing interest in sustainable diets and food systems. It is marking metrics as an area for research. We believe that your input into the consultative proves for the development of improved metrics will substantially accelerate this much needed work.

The goal of the consultative process is to explore the different approaches to assess the sustainability of our diets, and to build a multidisciplinary task force of experts working on defining shared standards and methods.

We have identified you and your institution as leader in this research. We would like to invite you, through a brief iterative online survey, to select and discuss a first set of indicators. This collaborative process will be further continued at a workshop to be held in Montpellier (France) in the end of 2014, where participants will have the opportunity to share their views and identify commonalities and gaps.

A final report highlighting the recommendations of the panel and acknowledging the contribution of all participants will be published for larger dissemination by Bioversity International and CIHEAM-IAMM.

Our colleagues in charge of this project, Thomas Allen and Paolo Prosperi, will contact you and provide you with more information in the forthcoming days.


We look forward to welcoming you and hope that this will be the beginning of a fruitful joint collaboration on the timely and important topic of Metrics for Sustainable Diets and Food Systems.

Yours sincerely,

Bruce Cogill
(Bioversity International)



Martine Padilla
(CIHEAM-IAMM)



For more information:

Thomas Allen: t.allen@cgiar.org
Paolo Prosperi: prosperi@iamm.fr

ANNEX 2:

Technical Brief:


"Metrics of Sustainable Diets and Food Systems"

Identifying appropriate Metrics of Sustainable Diets and Food Systems

A Delphi expert consultation

- Objectives**
1. **Exploring the different approaches** to assess the sustainability of Diets and Food Systems
 2. **Establishing a multidisciplinary taskforce of experts**
 3. **Identifying a shortlist of indicators** for Sustainable Diets and Food Systems

Initial focus on Spain, France and Italy



3 Mediterranean countries facing similar food and nutrition security issues and exposed to common global and regional drivers of change

Reconsidering Nutrition

Overview The stark observation of the coexistence of undernutrition, nutrient deficiencies, overweight and obesity – the triple burden of malnutrition – is inviting us to **reconsider health and nutrition as the primary goal of food systems**. Agriculture and the food industry have made remarkable advances in the past decades, but have not entirely met health and nutritional needs. Moreover, they have generated unintended consequences including environmental losses. Simultaneously, several regions are experiencing unprecedented weather events caused by climate change and habitat depletion, in turn further destabilizing global food and nutrition security. This confluence of food crises with increasing environmental degradation suggests an urgent need for novel analyses and new paradigms to describe and understand the causes and facilitate adaptation and mitigation.

Participants at the 2010 international conference organized by the FAO and Bioversity International agreed on a common definition of Sustainable Diets that emphasizes the food and nutrition security purpose of food systems, and the need to maintain or enhance this outcome over time - across generations - by preserving essential human and natural assets and the flows of services they provide. The concept of Sustainable Diets promotes **economically, socially and environmentally sustainable food systems that concurrently ensure food and nutrition security**.

What is counted is what counts: Identifying Metrics

Rationale Modern societies depend on complex agro-ecological and trading systems to provide food. The move to sustainable diets calls for changes in the agricultural and food systems. **Policy-makers and other stakeholders need evidence-based information and assessment tools** to lead public policy interventions.

Metrics are an organized information system combined to provide a perspective. It targets three principal objectives:

- **Inform** civil society, industry, public officials and all stakeholders
- **Measure progress** toward defined goals
- **Aid decision making** processes

A sound theoretical framework is the starting point in constructing metrics.

Suggesting a framework

Framework

Sustainability – or Sustainable Development – is a necessarily complex concept that can have different understandings. In this exercise, we assume that a sustainability assessment aims at capturing the **ability of a system to maintain and enhance its essential functions over time**. Sustainability addresses threats to preserving life support systems, including their capacity to withstand and adjust. It is then key to assess stocks of and changes in human and natural assets. Derived from Sustainability sciences, the vulnerability approach, complemented by inputs from the resilience literature, is proposed to analyze the sustainability of critical food and nutrition security outcomes.

Vulnerability - as the degree to which a system is likely to experience harm due to exposure to a perturbation or stress - is a function of:


- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change;
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected, either adversely or beneficially, by a change;
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a potentially hazardous event in a timely and efficient manner, through **ensuring the preservation, restoration, or improvement of its essential basic structures and functions** (IPCC, 2012).

Vulnerability/Resilience of what to what?

Main Facts

- Increasing consumption of nutrient-poor energy-dense foods and beverages
- Widespread **obesity** and overweight: France 46%, Italy 49%, Spain 58% among adults (WHO, 2013)
- Rising food cost especially in nutrient-rich and diverse foods, and increasing poverty
- **Water demand doubled** in 50 years in Mediterranean countries (UNEP, 2006)
- **Declining biodiversity in the Mediterranean** with 19% of the species threatened (IUCN, 2008)
- An ongoing **dietary transition** coupled with changing life and consumption patterns

Several **global and regional drivers** of change affect the structure and processes of the food systems, putting at risk context-specific **food and nutrition security outcomes**. Based on an extensive literature review, 4 critical food and nutrition security issues and 4 drivers of change have been identified:



(Adapted from Prosperi, Allen et al., 2014)

An expert consultation process

Delphi survey

The suggested framework and the initial short-list of indicators were developed in discussions with selected expert focus groups. We are now submitting them to a large panel of experts for further discussion. **A revised framework and a restricted set of indicators are expected from this consultation process.**

Following the protocol of the Delphi Survey, we ask participants to:

- Discuss and complement the framework and the underlying assumptions
- Test the framework by selecting *proxy* indicators

A Delphi Survey is a group interaction process directed in **iterative rounds of opinion collection and feedback**. After a first open-ended round, panelists will be presented with the opportunity to justify or amend their first choices. Succeeding rounds are designed to bring the group to focus or consensus.

This initiative is funded by:

More information:

<http://www.bioversityinternational.org/research-portfolio/diet-diversity/sustainable-diets/>
<http://www.iamm.fr/recherche/projets/Indicateurs-de-la-securite-alimentaire-durable-en-Mediterranee>

ANNEX 3:
Indicator list

Question	Indicator	Unit	Definition	Sources	
NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY / WATER DEPLETION					
1	E	TARWR - Total actual renewable water resources	<i>m3/cap</i>	Total resources that are offered by the average annual natural inflow and runoff that feed each hydrosystem (catchment area or aquifer).	FAO
1	E	Agricultural irrigated land	%	Agricultural areas purposely provided with water, including land irrigated by controlled flooding (% of total agricultural land).	The World Bank
1	E	Water Footprint of nutrient-dense foods	<i>m3/kg</i>	Volume of freshwater appropriated to produce a product, taking into account the volumes of water consumed and polluted at the different steps of the supply chain. This indicator refers to a specific application of the Water Footprint to nutrient-dense food items. The selection of the relevant nutrient-dense foods is left open for now. The Nutrient density score (SAIN) is suggested to identify them (Darmon and Darmon, 2008).	Authors' proposal (adapted from Water Footprint Network)
1	E	Energy share of water-demanding nutrient-dense foods	%	Share of nutrient-dense foods that are particularly water-demanding in total energy. The Nutrient density score (SAIN) and the Water Footprint are suggested to identify the nutrient-dense and water demanding foods respectively (Darmon and Darmon, 2008; Water Footprint Network).	Authors' proposal (adapted from FAO)
1	E	% of inland fish production	%	Ratio of inland fish catch over total fish production (aquaculture). It shows that fisheries (on-stream water user) is becoming water consumptive with increased inland aquaculture.	FAO
1	E	Fertilizer consumption	<i>kg/ha</i>	Quantity of plant nutrients used per hectare of arable land. Fertilizer products cover nitrogenous, potash, and phosphate fertilizers (including ground rock phosphate).	The World Bank
1	S	Intensity of use of actual water resources	%	Percentage of TARWR (Total actual renewable water resources) that is used (sum of total withdrawals/abstraction).	FAO
1	S	Change in aquifers quality status	%	Change in aquifers quality status (quality/salinity). Identified groundwater resources unfit for drinking water and other uses due to salinity (> 5g/l total dissolved solids) compared to total groundwater resources.	IGRAC
1	S	Food-borne disease incidence	‰	Cases of illness due to food-borne pathogens such as salmonella, listeria, e-coli and campylobacter.	Defra (UK)
1	S	Nutrient density score of water-demanding foods	<i>unit/100 kcal</i>	The Nutrient density score (SAIN-Score d'adéquation aux recommandations nutritionnelles in French) is a nutrient density that evaluate the capacity of a food product or food group - to cover the nutritional needs (Darmon and Darmon, 2008). It is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the percentage adequacy (to DVs) for positive nutrients over total energy intakes. The selection of the relevant nutrients and of the water-demanding foods is left open for now. The Water Footprint is suggested to identify the water-demanding foods (Water Footprint Network).	Authors' proposal (adapted from Darmon and Darmon, 2008)
1	S	Nutritional water productivity index	<i>unit/m3</i>	Water requirement to produce specific nutrient. It is an index for a given food which includes nutrient-based output per unit water use.	Renault and Wallender, 2000
1	R	Nb of international/national water agreements	<i>unit</i>	Number of international, regional and national water conventions or agreements.	Authors' proposal (adapted from UN-Water)
1	R	Purification rate of collected wastewater	%	Purification rate of collected wastewater.	UNEP/MAP
1	R	Irrigation water efficiency index	%	Product of assessed efficiency of irrigation water transport and distribution and theoretical plot irrigation efficiency.	UNEP/MAP/Blue Plan
1	R	Freshwater species population trends index	%	A component of the Living Planet index, the Freshwater species population trends index tracks changes in freshwater species found in temperate and tropical freshwater ecosystems. Trends in freshwater species populations reflect the health and quality of freshwater ecosystems and biomes on various scales.	Biodiversity Indicator Partnership
1	R	GEF benefits index for biodiversity	<i>score [0-100]</i>	Composite index of relative biodiversity potential for each country based on the species represented in each country, their threat status, and the diversity of habitat types in each country.	The World Bank
NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY / BIODIVERSITY LOSS					
2	E	Surface variability	<i>nb crops/ha</i>	Surface variability refers to the area covered by agricultural crops in a given agro-ecosystem.	Merrick, 1990
2	E	% of total acreage of top 5 varieties	%	Share of major varieties in total surface cultivated.	FAO, 2002
2	E	SOM - Soil Organic Matter	%	Organic fraction of the soil exclusive of undecayed plant and animal residues (SSSA, 1987).	SSSA, 1987; Visser and Parkinson, 1992
2	E	WQIB - Water Quality Index for Biodiversity	<i>score [0-100]</i>	Composite index that compares water quality (phosphorus, nitrogen, conductivity, pH, dissolved oxygen, temperature) to benchmarks derived for the protection of aquatic life.	UNEP; Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
2	E	Spring index (Climate Change pressure)	<i>day number</i>	Context indicator that shows the impact of temperature change on the timing of biological events such as flowering or migration in the spring.	Defra (UK)
2	E	Agriculture Greenhouse Gas emissions	<i>kt (CO2 eq) /year</i>	Aggregated annual emissions from agriculture of methane (CH4) and nitrous oxide (N2O). Emissions are expressed as CO2 equivalents.	Eurostat
2	S	ISPC - Index of Surface Percentage of Crops	%	Ratio between the number of crops that represent 50% of the cultivated area and the number of crops commercially cultivated.	Renkow , 2010

2	S	Genetic variability	unit	Genetic variability or diversity refers to variation in the genetic composition within or among species.	Wani et al., 2005
2	S	Dietary energy supply derived from the top 5 varieties	%	Percentage of the dietary energy supply derived from the 5 most representing (in terms of kcal) varieties, over total dietary energy supply.	Authors' proposal (adapted from FAO)
2	S	Nutritional Functional diversity	score [0-100]	Measures the capacity of a given farm/system/ecosystem to provide the diversity of nutritional elements required. The nutritional FD metric is based on plant species composition on a farm/system/ecosystem and the nutritional composition of these plants. It is correlated to species richness.	Remans et al., 2011
2	S	Intraspecific variation in nutrient content	unit	Coefficients of variation for nutrient content between varieties for a selection of highly consumed food crops. One nutrient (Vit. A, Zn, I, Fe) and one crop need to be selected or a composite indicator developed.	Authors' proposal (adapted from Longvah et al., 2012)
2	S	Nb of rare varieties/breeds used	unit	Number of rare plant varieties and animal breeds that are used.	European Environment Agency
2	R	Biodiversity-focused ODA	USD million	Extent to which donors address the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in their aid programme. The Official Development Assistance (ODA) indicator, collected by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC/OECD), can be used to follow biodiversity aid flows through the use of the 'Rio markers' for 'biodiversity'. For an activity to be labelled with this 'Rio marker' it must promote one of the three objectives of the CBD: the conservation of biodiversity, sustainable use of its components, or fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of the utilisation of genetic resources.	Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
2	R	Existence of national dietary guidelines	0 or 1	Binary indicator that measures whether the government has published guidelines for a balanced and nutritious diet.	Economist Intelligence Unit, 2013
2	R	Research and development in biofortification	%	Public and private expenses for research and development in biofortification in % of GDP.	Authors' proposal (adapted from Meenakshi, 2009)
2	R	Indicator on Food Composition (INFOODS)	unit	Count of the number of foods with a sufficiently detailed description to identify genus, species, subspecies and variety/cultivar/breed, and with at least one value for a nutrient or other bioactive component.	FAO
2	R	CAF - Crop agrobiodiversity factor	score [0-1]	The CAF indicates the relationship between the number of major crops in a given area and the number of crops that are ecologically adapted to the prevailing management system.	Icrisat; Renkow, 2010
2	R	Waste output assessment	score	Self-assessment tool that measures if waste prevention policy efforts have been made. It balances between the diversity of instruments applied locally, adapted to the needs of each context, and the need to reach common EU prevention policy goals.	Bio Intelligence Service/European
2	R	% of total acreage of organic farming	%	Area under organic farming.	European Environment Agency
2	R	Nb of rare varieties/breeds in genebanks	unit	Number of characteristic (low production) varieties and breeding males stored in genebank(s).	Eaton et al., 2006
2	R	ICI - Food Import Capacity Indicator	%	Ratio of the food import value to the total export value (excluding services).	FAO
NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY / PRICE VOLATILITY					
3	E	Nutritional inequality concentration index	score [-1 : +1]	Developed by analogy with the Lorenz curve and the Gini coefficient, the Concentration Curve and the related Concentration Index (CI) have been widely used in Health Economics to measure socioeconomic inequality of health. The concentration curve represents the cumulative percentage of the population against the cumulative amount of health. The Concentration Index is then defined as twice the area between the concentration curve and the diagonals. Similarly, the "Nutritional Inequality" Concentration Index (Allen, 2010) measures the socioeconomic inequality of nutrition adequacy scores by taking into account, for selected measures of nutritional adequacy (MAR, MER, MAR/DE), every individual's level of and every individual's rank in the socioeconomic domain. The resulting concentration index measures income distribution related nutritional adequacy performance.	Allen, 2010
3	E	Healthy Food Basket index	index	Following the Illawarra Healthy Food Basket index (Williams et al., 2009), the index would monitor the affordability of a nutritionally adequate diet. It consists of a basket of food items selected to meet the nutritional requirements at the lowest cost, and repeat the costing of the basket over time to assess trends in affordability.	Authors' proposal (adapted from Williams et al., 2009)
3	E	% of nutrient intakes (Vit. A, Zn, I, Fe) from 10 most volatile foods	%	Percentage of total nutrient intakes derived from the 10 most volatile food commodities. One nutrient (Vit. A, Zn, I, Fe) needs to be selected or a composite indicator developed.	Authors' proposal
3	E	Ratio seasonal/non-seasonal fruits & vegetables	%	Ratio between seasonal and non-seasonal fruits and vegetables in the diet.	Heller and Keoleian, 2000
3	E	Time available for food preparation	hours/day	Average time available for food preparation in a day.	Larson et al., 2006; Zezza et al., 2010
3	S	Price index for 10 most nutrient-dense foods	index	Measure of the monthly change in prices of a basket of nutrient-dense food commodities. The Nutrient density score (SAIN) is suggested to identify the 10 most nutrient-dense foods (Darmon and Darmon, 2008).	Authors' proposal (adapted from FAO)
3	S	Price elasticity of 10 most nutrient-dense foods	unit	The price elasticity of demand measures the sensitivity of the quantity demanded to changes in the price. As many price elasticities can be computed as item considered in the demand system. In the case at end, only the price elasticity for a food group comprising the 10 food items with the highest nutrient density score (SAIN) would be considered.	Authors' proposal
3	S	Price elasticities of nutrients (Vit. A, Zn, I, Fe)	unit	The price elasticities of nutrient measures the effects on specified nutrients of changes in food prices. It combines the price elasticities of demand with nutrient shares of each food item/group in the consumer basket. As many price elasticities of nutrient can be computed as nutrient and food item considered in the demand system. In the case at end, only the price elasticity for a food group comprising the 10 food items with the highest Nutrient density score (SAIN) would be considered. One nutrient (Vit. A, Zn, I, Fe) needs to be selected or a composite indicator developed.	Huang, 1996

3	S	Price elasticities of nutritional adequacy of diet	unit	The price elasticities of the Mean Adequacy Ratio (MAR) measures the effects on the overall nutritional adequacy of diets to changes in food prices. It combines the price elasticities of demand with nutrient adequacy ratios (NARs) for each food item/group in the consumer basket. As many price elasticities of MAR can be computed as item considered in the demand system. In the case at end, only the price elasticity for a food group comprising the 10 food items with the highest Nutrient density score (SAIN) would be considered.	Allen, 2010
3	R	HDDS - Household Dietary Diversity Score	score	Measure of the number of unique foods or food groups consumed by household members over a given period. At household level, it is meant to proxy the average economic ability of a household to access a variety of foods.	FANTA/FAO
3	R	Research and development in biofortification	%	Public and private expenses for research and development in biofortification in % of GDP.	Authors' proposal (adapted from Meenakshi, 2009)
3	R	Nb of farmers markets	unit	Number of farmers markets.	Feenstra, 2005
3	R	Community garden access	%	Proportion of households that are within 1/4 mile of a community garden.	Sustainable Communities Index
3	R	Food Miles	km	Distance food travels from the location where it is grown to the location where it is consumed.	Paxton, 1994; Lang et al., 2001

NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY / CHANGE IN FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS					
4	E	Food Purchasing Power Index	index	Compares the evolution of the total cost of the food basket to the lowest monthly salary.	FAO; UN-ECOSOC, 1996
4	E	Nutritional inequality concentration index	score [-1 : +1]	Developed by analogy with the Lorenz curve and the Gini coefficient, the Concentration Curve and the related Concentration Index (CI) have been widely used in Health Economics to measure socioeconomic inequality of health. The concentration curve represents the cumulative percentage of the population against the cumulative amount of health. The Concentration Index is then defined as twice the area between the concentration curve and the diagonals. Similarly, the "Nutritional Inequality" Concentration Index (Allen, 2010) measures the socioeconomic inequality of nutrition adequacy scores by taking into account, for selected measures of nutritional adequacy (MAR, MER, MAR/DE), every individual's level of and every individual's rank in the socioeconomic domain. The resulting concentration index measures income distribution related nutritional adequacy performance.	Allen, 2010
4	E	Time available for food preparation	hours/day	Average time available for food preparation in a day.	Larson et al., 2006; Zezza et al., 2010
4	E	Caloric share of ready-to-consume products	%	Share of ready-to-consume products in total energy. Purchased food items are divided according to the extent and purpose of their industrial processing (minimally processed, ready-to-consume, processed and ultra-processed food and drink products). The quantity of each group was converted into energy.	Moubarac et al., 2013
4	E	Nutrient density score of fast and street foods	unit/100 kcal	The Nutrient density score (SAIN-Score d'adéquation aux recommandations nutritionnelles in French) is a nutrient density that evaluate the capacity of a food product or food group - to cover the nutritional needs (Darmon and Darmon, 2008). It is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the percentage adequacy (to DVs) for positive nutrients over total energy intakes. The selection of the relevant nutrients and of fast and street food products is left open for now.	Authors' proposal (adapted from Darmon and Darmon, 2008; Gewa et al., 2007)

4	S	HDDS - Household Dietary Diversity Score	score	Measure of the number of unique foods or food groups consumed by household members over a given period. At household level, it is meant to proxy the average economic ability of a household to access a variety of foods.	FANTA/FAO
4	S	IDDS - Individual Dietary Diversity Score	score	Measure of the number of unique foods or food groups consumed by an individual over a given period. At individual level, it is meant to provide a proxy of individual nutrient adequacy.	FANTA/FAO
4	S	MAR - Mean adequacy ratio	%	Average percentage adequacy to recommended intakes for a selection of nutrients. It is calculated as the sum of the ratios of intakes to recommended intakes (NARS - each truncated at one) for all evaluated nutrients, divided by the number of nutrients evaluated and expressed as a percentage.	Madden et al., 1976
4	S	Micronutrient deficiency index	score	The micronutrient deficiency index measures the extent of micronutrient deficiency in a country. Three separate indices are developed for 3 specific micronutrient deficiencies: Vit. A, Zinc and Iron. For each micronutrient index, two variables are used.	IFPRI/Harvestplus, 2013
4	S	Retail Food Environment Index	score	Ratio describing the relative abundance of different types of retail food outlets in a given area. The RFEI is constructed by dividing the total number of fast-food restaurants and convenience stores by the total number of supermarkets and produce vendors (produce stores and farmers markets) in a given area. This methodology was developed by the California Center for Public Health Advocacy (2009).	USDA (USA)
4	S	Nb of food deserts	unit	Number of food deserts in a given geographical area. Food deserts are defined as urban neighborhoods and rural towns without ready access to fresh, healthy, and affordable food. In the USA, USDA, Treasury and HHS have defined a food desert as a census tract with a substantial share of residents who live in low-income areas that have low levels of access to a grocery store or healthy, affordable food retail outlet.	USDA (USA)

4	R	% of Internet users	%	Internet users (per 100 people). Internet users are people with access to the worldwide network.	The World Bank
4	R	ICI - Food Import Capacity Indicator	%	Ratio of the food import value to the total export value (excluding services).	FAO
4	R	% of public expenditure on food subsidies	%	Level of public expenditure on food subsidies.	FAO
4	R	Nb of farm-to-school programs	unit	Number of schools implementing farm-to-school programs. A school is considered as implementing a farm-to-school program when it is carrying out any combination of the following activities: 1. Buying products from local producers 2. Gardening and waste management programs 3. Nutrition, health and environment education 4. Learning opportunities such as farm/market tours or chef/farmer visits to the classroom.	Feenstra et al., 2005
4	R	Existence of national dietary guidelines	0 or 1	Binary indicator that measures whether the government has published guidelines for a balanced and nutritious diet.	Economist Intelligence Unit, 2013

4	R	Nb of foods bearing authorized nutrition claims	unit	Number of food products bearing a permitted nutrition claim. The EU Regulation on Nutrition and Health Claims [Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006] includes, in its annex, a list of the authorized nutrition claims. Since January 19, 2010, these have been the only permitted nutrition claims in the EU market.	Authors' proposal (adapted from Williams et al., 2003)
---	---	---	------	---	--

AFFORDABILITY OF FOOD / WATER DEPLETION					
6	E	Agricultural water withdrawal	km ³ /year	Annual quantity of self-supplied water withdrawn for irrigation, livestock and aquaculture purposes. Water for the dairy and meat industries and industrial processing of harvested agricultural products is not included.	FAO
6	E	Agricultural irrigated land	%	Agricultural areas purposely provided with water, including land irrigated by controlled flooding (% of total agricultural land).	The World Bank
6	E	Water productivity in agriculture	USD/cap/m ³	The value of agricultural production divided by the volume of water abstracted for agriculture (does not take into account the use of rainfall).	FAO
6	E	Share of agricultural production in arid/semi-arid area	%	Share of agricultural production from geographical areas defined as arid or semi-arid by IdM aridity index (De Martonne aridity index).	UNEP
6	E	Water Footprint (for an average diet)	m ³ /year	Total volume of freshwater that is used to produce the goods consumed in a specific diet. It is the sum of direct and indirect water use of domestic and foreign water resources through domestic consumption.	Water Footprint Network; Vanham et al., 2013

6	S	Importance of national expenditure for water supply and sanitation	USD/cap	Total public expenditures for water supply and sanitation as a percentage of total budget.	FAO
6	S	Price index for 10 most water-demanding foods	index	Measure of the monthly change in prices of a basket of water-demanding food commodities. The Water Footprint is suggested to identify the 10 most water-demanding foods.	Authors' proposal (adapted from FAO)
6	S	Price elasticity of demand for 10 most water-demanding foods	unit	The price elasticity of demand measures the sensitivity of the quantity demanded to changes in the price. As many price elasticities can be computed as item considered in the demand system. In the case at end, only the price elasticity for a food group comprising the 10 most water-demanding food items would be considered. It allows estimating the possible impact on overall diet cost of increase water scarcity.	Authors' proposal
6	S	Price elasticity of supply for 10 most water-demanding foods	unit	The price elasticity of supply measures the sensitivity of the quantity supplied to changes in the price. As many price elasticities can be computed as item considered in the demand system. In the case at end, only the price elasticity for a food group comprising the 10 most water-demanding food items would be considered. It allows estimating the possible impact on supply of possible increase in water scarcity.	Authors' proposal
6	S	Ratio external Water Footprint over total Water Footprint to produce food	%	Ratio between the volume of freshwater used outside the country to produce food that is consumed by the inhabitants of a nation, and the total volume of freshwater used inside and outside the country to produce food consumed in the nation.	Authors' proposal (adapted from Water Footprint Network)

6	R	Research and development of drought resistant crops	%	Public and private expenses for research and development of drought resistant crops in % of GDP.	Authors' proposal (adapted from UNEP/Blue Plan)
6	R	% of farmers who grow drought resistant crops	%	Percentage of farmers who grow drought resistant crops.	FAO, 2003
6	R	Waste water treatment connection rates	%	Percentage of national population connected to public waste water treatment plants. The extent of secondary (biological), or tertiary (chemical) treatment provides an indication of efforts to reduce pollution loads from cities.	OECD
6	R	Irrigation Water Efficiency Index	%	Product of assessed efficiency of irrigation water transport and distribution and theoretical plot irrigation efficiency.	UNEP/MAP/Blue Plan
6	R	Cross price elasticity of demand between high/low water-demanding foods	unit	Degree of substitution between low and high water-demanding foods.	Authors' proposal
6	R	% of food importations from water-rich countries	%	Percentage of food importations from water-rich countries over total food consumption. Water-rich countries have more than 1700 m ³ /inhabitant/year. Water-scarce country is below 1000 m ³ /inhab/year.	Authors' proposal adapted (from Water Footprint Network and UN-Water)

AFFORDABILITY OF FOOD / PRICE VOLATILITY					
7	E	IDR - Import dependency ratio	%	Ratio of domestic food supply that has been imported, calculated as: IDR = imports*100/(production + imports - exports).	FAO
7	E	% of food household expenditure	%	Monetary value of acquired food, purchased and non purchased (including non-alcoholic and alcoholic beverages as well as food expenses on away from home consumption in bars, restaurants, foodcourts, work canteens, street vendors, etc.) over total household consumption expenditure (monetary value of acquired goods for consumption, food and non-food items, consumed by members of household).	FAO
7	E	Food Purchasing Power Index	index	Compares the evolution of the total cost of the food basket to the lowest monthly salary.	FAO; UN-ECOSOC, 1996
7	E	Food and drink manufacturing waste	%	[under development] Percentage of waste produced by the food and drink manufacturing industry disposed of or recovered at regional level.	Defra (UK)
7	E	Ratio seasonal/non-seasonal fruits & vegetables	%	Ratio between seasonal and non-seasonal fruits and vegetables in the diet.	Heller and Keoleian, 2000

7	S	Index of food price transmission	<i>index</i>	[under development] Degree of price transmission between international commodity futures prices and the monthly food price index of the FAO (work in progress within the FoodSecure team).	Pangaribowo et al., 2013
7	S	Sensitivity to price volatility	<i>score</i>	The score brings together the essential determinants of sensitivity to price volatility: price formation mechanisms, market power and price volatility upstream and downstream of the food industry, as well as the ability to pass on price variations downstream.	Deloitte/PIPAME (France), 2012
7	S	PIN - Agriculture Producer Price Index	<i>index</i>	Measures annual changes in the selling prices received by farmers (prices at the farm-gate or at the first point of sale) for all primary crops and livestock products that are produced in a given country.	FAO
7	S	Healthy Food Basket index	<i>index</i>	Following the Illawarra Healthy Food Basket index (Williams et al., 2009), the index would monitor the affordability of a nutritionally adequate diet. It consists of a basket of food items selected to meet the nutritional requirements at the lowest cost, and repeat the costing of the basket over time to assess trends in affordability.	Authors' proposal (adapted from Williams et al., 2009)
7	S	Nb of people reached with food assistance	<i>unit</i>	Number of people who are reached with food assistance.	Authors' proposal (adapted from DFID (UK))
7	R	Average MFN applied tariff (Agricultural goods)	%	Trade weighted average of the MFN (Most Favoured Nation) applied tariff rates available on agricultural products.	The World Bank
7	R	% of diets locally produced	%	Share of diets that is locally produced (Authors' note: either in kcal or expenditure; a spatial criteria characterizing what is a local production needs to be defined).	CIHEAM/FAO, 2012
7	R	Nb of farmers markets	<i>unit</i>	Number of farmers markets.	Feenstra, 2005
7	R	Food Miles	<i>km</i>	Distance food travels from the location where it is grown to the location where it is consumed.	Paxton, 1994; Lang et al., 2001
7	R	Presence of food safety net programs	<i>score [0-4]</i>	A measure of public initiatives to protect the poor from food-related shocks. This indicator considers food safety net programmes, including in-kind food transfers, conditional cash transfers (i.e. food vouchers), and the existence of school feeding programmes by the government, NGOs or the multilateral sector.	Economist Intelligence Unit, 2013
DIETARY ENERGY BALANCE / CHANGE IN FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS					
9	E	At-risk-of-poverty rate	%	Share of people with an equivalised disposable income (after social transfer) below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold, which is set at 60 % of the national median equivalised disposable income after social transfers.	Eurostat
9	E	Caloric share of ready-to-consume products	%	Share of ready-to-consume products in total energy. Purchased food items were divided according to the extent and purpose of their industrial processing (minimally processed, ready-to-consume, processed and ultra-processed food and drink products). The quantity of each group is converted into energy.	Moubarac et al., 2013
9	E	Energy density of fast and street foods	<i>kcal/100g</i>	Average amount of kcal per 100 g for a selection of fast and street food products.	Authors' proposal (adapted from Gewa et al., 2007; Buscemi et al., 2011)
9	E	Milk fat/protein ratio in infant formula	%	Ratio of percent milk fat over milk protein in infant formula. An early adiposity rebound (AR) - a low BMI followed by increased BMI level after the rebound - is associated with an increased risk of overweight and associated metabolic diseases. Early AR suggests that an energy deficit had occurred at an early stage of growth, and can be attributable to the high-protein, low-fat diet fed to infants at a time of high energy needs (Rolland-Cachera et al., 2006; Koletzko et al., 2009).	Authors' proposal (adapted from Rolland-Cachera et al., 2006; Koletzko et al., 2009)
9	E	% of high school students watching TV ≥3 hours/day	%	Percentage of high school students who watched television ≥3 hours per day.	HHS (USA)
9	E	Nb of food TV advertisements to children	<i>unit</i>	Number of food and beverage advertising in programs with a significantly high child (14 years and under) audience.	ANPH (Australia)
9	S	DES - Dietary Energy Supply	<i>kcal/capita/day</i>	Estimate of the per capita amount of energy (kcal) in food available for human consumption, during the reference period (3-year average period). Per capita supplies represent only the average supply available for each individual in the population as a whole and do not indicate what is actually consumed by individuals.	FAO
9	S	Prevalence of overweight and obesity	%	Percentage of population with a body mass index (BMI) of 25 kg/m ² or higher.	WHO
9	S	Diet-related death rate	<i>[per 100,000]</i>	Age-standardised death rate calculated for selected diet-related mortality causes, including cardiovascular diseases (such as coronary/ischaemic heart diseases and stroke/cerebrovascular diseases), diabetes mellitus and malignant neoplasms such as malignant neoplasms (of the colon, stomach and breast).	WHO; Rodrigues et al., 2007
9	S	Average portion sizes for key foods	<i>g or kcal</i>	Amount of food consumed at a given eating occasion (EO) for a selection of key foods. Food models can be used to assist respondents in identifying portion sizes (cf.: USDA/NHANES surveys).	Piernas and Popkin, 2011
9	S	% of adults practicing physical activity	%	Percentage of adults reaching the minimum WHO recommendation on physical activity for health (150 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic physical activity throughout the week, or at least 75 minutes of vigorous-intensity aerobic physical activity throughout the week, or an equivalent combination of moderate- and vigorous-intensity activity).	European Commission, 2013
9	S	DALYs due to overweight and obesity	<i>years</i>	Disability Adjusted Life Years due to overweight and obesity: sum of years of potential life lost due to premature mortality and the years of productive life lost due to disability attributed to high BMI (overweight and obesity) and related risk factors, such as diabetes and high blood pressure.	WHO
9	R	Literacy rate of adults	%	Percentage of adults (years 15+) who can, with understanding, read and write a short, simple statement on their everyday life. Generally, 'literacy' also encompasses 'numeracy', the ability to make simple arithmetic calculations. This indicator is calculated by dividing the number of literates aged 15 years and over by the corresponding age group population.	The World Bank

9	R	Nb of foods bearing authorized nutrition claims	unit	Number of food products bearing a permitted nutrition claim. The EU Regulation on Nutrition and Health Claims [Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006] includes, in its annex, a list of the authorized nutrition claims. Since January 19, 2010, these have been the only permitted nutrition claims in the EU market.	Authors' proposal (adapted from Williams et al., 2003)
9	R	Compliance with food and beverage TV advertising standards	%	Percentage of advertisements aimed at children compliant with self-regulatory TV advertising standards to protect children from exposure to unhealthy food advertising. Classification into 3 categories: "compliance", "non-compliance" and "uncertain compliance".	Romero-Fernandez et al., 2009
9	R	Funding allocated specifically to physical activity	EUR million	Yearly funding (in Euros) allocated specifically to health-enhancing physical activity (HEPA) promotion. Financial resources allocated specifically to HEPA promotion is a strong indicator of the importance a country attaches to this topic within its policy agenda.	European Commission, 2013
9	R	Funding allocated specifically to nutrition education	EUR million	Yearly funding (in Euros) allocated specifically to nutrition education programs. Nutrition education spending was found to have the intended effect on BMI, obese and overweight in aggregate on US data (Geary, 2013).	Authors' proposal (adapted from Geary, 2013)
9	R	Existence of a policy plan for overweight/obesity	0 or 1	Indicates whether or not the country has an operational policy, strategy or action plan for unhealthy diet and/or overweight/obesity.	WHO

SATISFACTION OF CULTURAL FOOD PREFERENCES / BIODIVERSITY LOSS					
11	E	IDR - Import dependency ratio	%	Ratio of domestic food supply that has been imported, calculated as: $IDR = \text{imports} * 100 / (\text{production} + \text{imports} - \text{exports})$.	FAO
11	E	Time available for food preparation	hours/day	Average time available for food preparation in a day.	Larson et al., 2006; Zezza et al., 2010
11	E	Carbon Footprint of imported foods	kg (CO2 eq)/kg	Total amount of GHG emissions that are directly and indirectly caused by an activity or are accumulated over the life stages of a product. This indicator refers to a specific application of the Carbon Footprint to imported food commodities.	Defra (UK), 2005; WRAP/WWF (UK), 2011
11	E	HTL - Human Trophic Level	score [1-5]	Average of the trophic levels of the food items in the human diet, weighted by quantity consumed. Trophic levels describe the position of species in a food web from primary producers to apex predators. HTL depicts energy pathways from plant-based diets toward diets higher in meat and dairy consumption.	Bonhommeau et al., 2013
11	E	Caloric share of ready-to-consume products	%	Share of ready-to-consume products in total energy. Purchased food items were divided according to the extent and purpose of their industrial processing (minimally processed, ready-to-consume, processed and ultra-processed food and drink products). The quantity of each group is converted into energy.	Moubarac et al., 2013
11	S	Ratio seasonal/non-seasonal fruits & vegetables	%	Ratio between seasonal and non-seasonal fruits and vegetables in the diet.	Heller and Keoleian, 2000
11	S	MAI-Mediterranean Adequacy Index	score	Ratio obtained by dividing the energy provided by typical Mediterranean food items by the energy provided by non-traditional Mediterranean foods.	Alberti-Fidanza et al., 1999; Bach-Faig et al., 2010
11	S	% of eco-friendly & organic food consumption	%	Share of organic and eco-friendly food in the diet (Authors' note: either in kcal or expenditure).	CIHEAM/FAO, 2012
11	S	% of diets locally produced	%	Share of diets that is locally produced (Authors' note: either in kcal or expenditure; a spatial criteria characterizing what is a local production needs to be defined).	CIHEAM/FAO, 2012
11	S	Consumer interest in ethical imports	%	Imported fair-trade products relative to total expenditure for a selection of products (coffee, tea, bananas and chocolate/cocoa) to demonstrate the level of commitment that consumers give to ethically sourced products.	Defra (UK)
11	R	Nb of consumer organizations	unit	Number of consumer organizations that are active and present at a national level.	CIHEAM/FAO, 2012
11	R	Nb of CDO, PDO, PGI	unit	Number of products with geographical indication or designation of origin.	CIHEAM/FAO, 2012
11	R	Eco-Label awards	unit	Number of eco-label products. Eco-label is a voluntary certification scheme that is awarded to products and services with reduced environmental impacts.	Eurostat
11	R	Nb of farm-to-school programs	unit	Number of schools implementing farm-to-school programs. A school is considered as implementing a farm-to-school program when it is carrying out any combination of the following activities: 1. Buying products from local producers 2. Gardening and waste management programs 3. Nutrition, health and environment education 4. Learning opportunities such as farm/market tours or chef/farmer visits to the classroom.	Feenstra et al., 2005
11	R	% of Internet users	%	Internet users (per 100 people) are people with access to the worldwide network.	The World Bank
11	R	ICI - Food Import Capacity Indicator	%	Ratio of the food import value to the total export value (excluding services).	FAO
11	R	Food industry [innovation] benchmark	score	Innovative performances of the food industry are based on 5 innovation input variables and 7 output innovation variables. Countries are scored based on their relative position as best, middle group and worst.	Van Galen et al., 2013
11	R	Biodiversity-focused ODA	USD million	Extent to which donors address the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in their aid programme. The Official Development Assistance (ODA) indicator, collected by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC/OECD), can be used to follow biodiversity aid flows through the use of the 'Rio markers' for 'biodiversity'. For an activity to be labelled with this 'Rio marker' it must promote one of the 3 objectives of the CBD: the conservation of biodiversity, sustainable use of its components, or fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of the utilisation of genetic resources.	Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
11	R	Integration of biodiversity considerations in business activity	unit	[under development] Two measures are proposed: a) Measuring the number of businesses with an Environmental or Sustainable Management System (EMS), and b) Measuring how widely the environment is considered in the supply chain of businesses and whether there is a formal process carried out to consider the environment.	Defra (UK)

ANNEX 4:

Online Delphi Survey

MSDFS ROUND 1

Thank you for connecting to the "Metrics of Sustainable Diets & Food Systems" online survey.

The goal of this expert consultation is to select indicators and explore the different approaches to assess the sustainability of diets and food systems.

It is anonymous and secure. It should take about 30 to 45 minutes to complete.

We encourage reading the 2-page concept note first and referring to the companion document for the details of the indicators if necessary.

Thank you for your time.

***Username (your email address):**

***Password:**

MSDFS ROUND 1

NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

WATER DEPLETION

***1. As regards nutritional quality (of supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with water depletion?**

	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
[select from the menu]	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

If unsatisfied by the selection, please suggest other indicators:

EXPOSURE:	<input type="text"/>
SENSITIVITY:	<input type="text"/>
RESILIENCE:	<input type="text"/>

BIODIVERSITY LOSS

***2. As regards nutritional quality (of supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with biodiversity loss?**

	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
[select from the menu]	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

MSDFS ROUND 1

If unsatisfied by the selection, please suggest other indicators:

EXPOSURE:

SENSITIVITY:

RESILIENCE:

FOOD PRICE VOLATILITY

***3. As regards nutritional quality (of supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with food price volatility?**

	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
[select from the menu]	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

If unsatisfied by the selection, please suggest other indicators:

EXPOSURE:

SENSITIVITY:

RESILIENCE:

CHANGE IN FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS

***4. As regards nutritional quality (of supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with changing food consumption patterns?**

	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
[select from the menu]	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

If unsatisfied by the selection, please suggest other indicators:

EXPOSURE:

SENSITIVITY:

RESILIENCE:

MSDFS ROUND 1

5. Add a maximum of 3 other drivers of change likely to affect the NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY that you think are absolutely necessary.

MSDFS ROUND 1

AFFORDABILITY OF FOOD

Affordability of food refers to the relative cost of feeding oneself.

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

WATER DEPLETION

***6. As regards affordability of food, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with water depletion?**

	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
[select from the menu]	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

If unsatisfied by the selection, please suggest other indicators:

EXPOSURE:	<input type="text"/>
SENSITIVITY:	<input type="text"/>
RESILIENCE:	<input type="text"/>

FOOD PRICE VOLATILITY

***7. As regards affordability of food, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with food price volatility?**

	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
[select from the menu]	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

MSDFS ROUND 1

If unsatisfied by the selection, please suggest other indicators:

EXPOSURE:

SENSITIVITY:

RESILIENCE:

8. Add a maximum of 3 other drivers of change likely to affect the AFFORDABILITY OF FOOD that you think are absolutely necessary.

MSDFS ROUND 1

DIETARY ENERGY BALANCE

Dietary energy balance refers to the balance between energy intake and energy expenditure.

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

CHANGE IN FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS

***9. As regards dietary energy balance, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with changing food consumption patterns?**

	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
[select from the menu]	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

If unsatisfied by the selection, please suggest other indicators:

EXPOSURE:	<input type="text"/>
SENSITIVITY:	<input type="text"/>
RESILIENCE:	<input type="text"/>

10. Add a maximum of 3 other drivers of change likely to affect the DIETARY ENERGY BALANCE that you think are absolutely necessary.

MSDFS ROUND 1

SATISFACTION OF CULTURAL FOOD PREFERENCES

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

BIODIVERSITY LOSS

*** 11. As regards cultural food preferences, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with biodiversity loss?**

	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
[select from the menu]	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

If unsatisfied by the selection, please suggest other indicators:

EXPOSURE:	<input type="text"/>
SENSITIVITY:	<input type="text"/>
RESILIENCE:	<input type="text"/>

12. Add a maximum of 3 other drivers of change likely to affect the SATISFACTION OF CULTURAL FOOD PREFERENCES that you think are absolutely necessary.


MSDFS ROUND 1

OPEN QUESTIONS


Sustainability is a complex concept that can have different understandings. Your feedback would be particularly critical to explore the different approaches to sustainability assessment.

PLEASE COMMENT THESE THREE STATEMENTS:

13. In order for sustainability to be a useful criterion for guiding changes, its characterization should be system-oriented, predictive and diagnostic.


A large, empty text input field with a light gray background and a thin black border. It has a vertical scrollbar on the right side, indicating it is a scrollable area for text entry.

14. Assessment of current performances or well-being should be distinguished from assessment of sustainability, i.e. whether these can be sustained over time.

A large, empty text input field with a light gray background and a thin black border. It has a vertical scrollbar on the right side, indicating it is a scrollable area for text entry.

MSDFS ROUND 1

15. Metrics of food sustainability should measure stocks of, and changes in, essential human and natural assets key to food system functioning.



MSDFS ROUND 2

Thank you for connecting to the second round of the "Metrics of Sustainable Diets & Food Systems" online survey.

We invite you now to confirm or amend your first choices, considering the overall results from the panel, and further comment the framework and indicators.

You will find the general results of the first round in the questionnaire. Please refer to the "your name_INDI.pdf" file (attached to the last email you received) for individual feedback. We encourage referring to this document to check your previous choices and to the companion document for the details of the indicators.

NOTE: The desired scale of analysis in this study is national or subnational.

Thank you for your time.

***Username (your email address):**

***Password:**

MSDFS ROUND 2

NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

WATER DEPLETION

*** 1. As regards nutritional quality (of food supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with water depletion?**

[select from the menu]

EXPOSURE


SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the first round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your first choices. Individual feedback - with first round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

MSDFS ROUND 2

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



MSDFS ROUND 2

RESILIENCE



***Is assessing the impact of water depletion on the nutritional quality of food supply important? Please rank the level of importance to you.**

[select one option]

Not at all important Not that important Important Very important

If you wish, you can explain your choice [as regards the level of importance you attributed to the interaction] in the comment box below:

BIODIVERSITY LOSS

MSDFS ROUND 2

***2. As regards nutritional quality (of food supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with biodiversity loss?**

[select from the menu]


EXPOSURE

SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the first round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your first choices. Individual feedback - with first round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

EXPOSURE




MSDFS ROUND 2

SENSITIVITY



RESILIENCE



MSDFS ROUND 2

*** Is assessing the impact of biodiversity loss on the nutritional quality of food supply important? Please rank the level of importance to you.**

[select one option]

Not at all important	Not that important	Important	Very important
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you can explain your choice [as regards the level of importance you attributed to the interaction] in the comment box below:

FOOD PRICE VOLATILITY

*** 3. As regards nutritional quality (of food supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with food price volatility?**


[select from the menu]

EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>


Please find below the results from the first round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your first choices. Individual feedback - with first round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

MSDFS ROUND 2

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



MSDFS ROUND 2

RESILIENCE



***Is assessing the impact of food price volatility on the nutritional quality of food supply important? Please rank the level of importance to you.**

[select one option]

Not at all important Not that important Important Very important

If you wish, you can explain your choice [as regards the level of importance you attributed to the interaction] in the comment box below:

CHANGING FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS

MSDFS ROUND 2

***4. As regards nutritional quality (of food supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with changing food consumption patterns?**

[select from the menu]


EXPOSURE

SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the first round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your first choices. Individual feedback - with first round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

EXPOSURE




MSDFS ROUND 2

SENSITIVITY



RESILIENCE



MSDFS ROUND 2

***Is assessing the impact of changing food consumption patterns on the nutritional quality of food supply important? Please rank the level of importance to you.**

	Not at all important	Not that important	Important	Very important
[select one option]	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you can explain your choice [as regards the level of importance you attributed to the interaction] in the comment box below:

5. Several participants have proposed two other drivers of change likely to impact the NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY. Please rank each driver according to importance.

	Not at all important	Not that important	Important	Very important	Don't know
Technological innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Soil degradation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

MSDFS ROUND 2

AFFORDABILITY OF FOOD

Affordability of food refers to the relative cost of feeding oneself.

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

WATER DEPLETION

***6. As regards affordability of food, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with water depletion?**

[select from the menu]

EXPOSURE


SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the first round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your first choices. Individual feedback - with first round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

MSDFS ROUND 2

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



MSDFS ROUND 2

RESILIENCE



***Is assessing the impact of water depletion on the affordability of food important? Please rank the level of importance to you.**

[select one option]

Not at all important Not that important Important Very important

If you wish, you can explain your choice [as regards the level of importance you attributed to the interaction] in the comment box below:

FOOD PRICE VOLATILITY

MSDFS ROUND 2

***7. As regards affordability of food, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with food price volatility?**

[select from the menu]


EXPOSURE

SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the first round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your first choices. Individual feedback - with first round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

EXPOSURE




MSDFS ROUND 2

SENSITIVITY



RESILIENCE



MSDFS ROUND 2

*** Is assessing the impact of food price volatility on the affordability of food important? Please rank the level of importance to you.**

	Not at all important	Not that important	Important	Very important
[select one option]	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you can explain your choice [as regards the level of importance you attributed to the interaction] in the comment box below:

8. Several participants have proposed two other drivers of change likely to impact the AFFORDABILITY OF FOOD. Please rank each driver according to importance.

	Not at all important	Not that important	Important	Very important	Don't know
Policy actions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Changing agrifood industry and market patterns	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

MSDFS ROUND 2

DIETARY ENERGY BALANCE

Dietary energy balance refers to the balance between energy intake and energy expenditure.

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

CHANGING FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS

***9. As regards dietary energy balance, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with changing food consumption patterns?**

[select from the menu]

EXPOSURE


SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the first round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your first choices. Individual feedback - with first round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

MSDFS ROUND 2

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



MSDFS ROUND 2

RESILIENCE



***Is assessing the impact of changing food consumption patterns on the dietary energy balance important? Please rank the level of importance to you.**

[select one option]

Not at all important Not that important Important Very important

If you wish, you can explain your choice [as regards the level of importance you attributed to the interaction] in the comment box below:

MSDFS ROUND 2

10. Several participants have proposed two other drivers of change likely to impact the DIETARY ENERGY BALANCE. Please rank each driver according to importance.

	Not at all important	Not that important	Important	Very important	Don't know
Policy actions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
World population dynamics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

MSDFS ROUND 2

SATISFACTION OF CULTURAL FOOD PREFERENCES

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

BIODIVERSITY LOSS

***11. As regards cultural food preferences, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with biodiversity loss?**

[select from the menu]

EXPOSURE


SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the first round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your first choices. Individual feedback - with first round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

MSDFS ROUND 2

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



MSDFS ROUND 2

RESILIENCE



***Is assessing the impact of biodiversity loss on the satisfaction of cultural food preferences important? Please rank the level of importance to you.**

[select one option]

Not at all important Not that important Important Very important

If you wish, you can explain your choice [as regards the level of importance you attributed to the interaction] in the comment box below:

MSDFS ROUND 2


12. Several participants have proposed two other drivers of change likely to impact the SATISFACTION OF CULTURAL FOOD PREFERENCES. Please rank each driver according to importance.

	Not at all important	Not that important	Important	Very important	Don't know
Policy actions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Changing agrifood industry and market patterns	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

MSDFS ROUND 2

OPEN QUESTIONS


NB: Several global and regional drivers of change affect the structure and processes of the food systems, putting at risk context-specific food and nutrition security issues.



MSDFS ROUND 2


13. Four Food & Nutrition Security issues, specific to the geographical context considered (Spain, France and Italy), have been identified.

Please add other Food & Nutrition Security issues that you think are important.



14. Sustainability poses the challenge of determining whether the current level of well-being can be at least maintained for future generations.

Please specify the key elements that you think should be considered when assessing the sustainability of food systems. We invite you to consult the comments of the panel (see section D in the 'yourname_INDI.pdf' file attached).



A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

This is the third and last round of the "Metrics of Sustainable Diets & Food Systems" online survey! Thank you for connecting again.

We invite you now to confirm or amend your previous choices, considering the overall results from the panel, and further comment the framework and indicators.

You will find the general results of the second round in the questionnaire. Please refer to the "your name_INDI_R3.pdf" file (attached to the last email you received) for individual feedback. We encourage referring to this document to check your previous choices and to the companion document for the details of the indicators.

Thank you for your time.

***Username (your email address):**

***Password:**

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF FOOD SUPPLY

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

WATER DEPLETION

*** 1. As regards nutritional quality (of food supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with water depletion?**

[select from the menu]

EXPOSURE


SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the second round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your previous choices. Individual feedback - with YOUR second round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

RESILIENCE



If you wish, you can explain your choices or comment the indicators in the box below:

BIODIVERSITY LOSS

***2. As regards nutritional quality (of food supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with biodiversity loss?**

[select from the menu]

EXPOSURE


SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the second round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your previous choices. Individual feedback - with YOUR second round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY




A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

RESILIENCE



If you wish, you can explain your choices or comment the indicators in the box below:

FOOD PRICE VOLATILITY


***3. As regards nutritional quality (of food supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with food price volatility?**

[select from the menu]	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the second round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your previous choices. Individual feedback - with YOUR second round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

RESILIENCE



If you wish, you can explain your choices or comment the indicators in the box below:

CHANGING FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS


***4. As regards nutritional quality (of food supply), what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with changing food consumption patterns?**

<input type="text" value="[select from the menu]"/>	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>


Please find below the results from the second round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your previous choices. Individual feedback - with YOUR second round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

RESILIENCE



If you wish, you can explain your choices or comment the indicators in the box below:

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

AFFORDABILITY OF FOOD

Affordability of food refers to the relative cost of feeding oneself.

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

WATER DEPLETION

***5. As regards affordability of food, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with water depletion?**

[select from the menu]

EXPOSURE


SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the second round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your previous choices. Individual feedback - with YOUR second round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

RESILIENCE



If you wish, you can explain your choices or comment the indicators in the box below:

FOOD PRICE VOLATILITY


***6. As regards affordability of food, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with food price volatility?**

	EXPOSURE	SENSITIVITY	RESILIENCE
[select from the menu]			


Please find below the results from the second round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your previous choices. Individual feedback - with YOUR second round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

RESILIENCE



If you wish, you can explain your choices or comment the indicators in the box below:

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

DIETARY ENERGY BALANCE

Dietary energy balance refers to the balance between energy intake and energy expenditure.

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

CHANGING FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS

***7. As regards dietary energy balance, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with changing food consumption patterns?**

[select from the menu]

EXPOSURE


SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the second round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your previous choices. Individual feedback - with YOUR second round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

RESILIENCE



If you wish, you can explain your choices or comment the indicators in the box below:

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

SATISFACTION OF CULTURAL FOOD PREFERENCES

[Extract from the concept note]

- **Exposure:** Nature and degree to which a system is likely to be affected by the occurrence of a change
- **Sensitivity:** Degree to which a system is affected by a change
- **Resilience:** Ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a change in a timely and efficient manner (IPCC, 2012)

BIODIVERSITY LOSS

***8. As regards cultural food preferences, what indicator would best proxy the EXPOSURE/SENSITIVITY/RESILIENCE of a food system confronted with biodiversity loss?**

[select from the menu]

EXPOSURE


SENSITIVITY

RESILIENCE


Please find below the results from the second round. Decide whether to confirm or amend your previous choices. Individual feedback - with YOUR second round choices - is provided in the pdf file attached to the last email you received.

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

EXPOSURE




SENSITIVITY



A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

RESILIENCE



If you wish, you can explain your choices or comment the indicators in the box below:

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3

OPEN QUESTIONS

9. Four Food & Nutrition Security issues, specific to the geographical context considered (Spain, France and Italy), have been identified within the framework. Five new issues have been suggested by participants (see section E in the 'yourname_INDI_R3.pdf' file attached).


Using a scale of 1 to 9 (with 1 being the lowest and 9 being the highest), please rate the priority of the following issues with regard to the geographical context.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nutritional quality (of food supply)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Affordability of food	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dietary energy balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Satisfaction of cultural food preferences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
[NEW] (Physical) Accessibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
[NEW] Food safety	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
[NEW] Food governance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
[NEW] Environmental externalities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
[NEW] Social equity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A Delphi Expert Consultation - Round 3


10. In the previous round, participants mentioned broad key elements that should be considered when assessing the sustainability of food systems (see section F in the 'yourname_INDI_R3.pdf' file attached).

Please give now SPECIFIC ITEMS that need to be included in the Metrics of Sustainable Diets & Food Systems. Feel free to provide examples and/or indicators.



***How would you define the academic discipline you belong to?**

Please answer to this question in the box below.



Paolo PROSPERI
ED 231 - UMR 1110 MOISA Montpellier Supagro & Università di Catania - DiGeSA (Di3A)
PhD Thesis in Agrofood Economics
*Mesures de la sécurité alimentaire et de l'alimentation durable en Méditerranée,
basées sur les approches de la vulnérabilité et de la résilience.*

RÉSUMÉ DÉTAILLÉ

CONTEXTE

Les crises alimentaires récurrentes, les changements globaux, l'épuisement des ressources naturelles et les carences alimentaires en micronutriments placent la sécurité alimentaire et la durabilité environnementale au centre de l'agenda politique. Les analyses des interactions dynamiques entre les modes de consommation et les préoccupations environnementales ont reçu une attention considérable. Les changements socioéconomiques et biophysiques affectent les fonctions du système alimentaire, y compris la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle. Ainsi, la durabilité du système alimentaire est menacée. La construction de systèmes alimentaires durables est devenue un effort majeur pour réorienter les systèmes et les politiques alimentaires vers des objectifs adaptés et vers l'amélioration du bien-être sociétal. L'identification et la modélisation des propriétés intrinsèques du système alimentaire peuvent contribuer à suivre les progrès accomplis vers la durabilité, et participer à la mise en place de politiques de transformation et d'innovation.

OBJECTIFS

L'objectif général de cette thèse est d'analyser la durabilité du système alimentaire à travers l'identification d'un ensemble d'indicateurs dans la région méditerranéenne. Spécifiquement il s'agit de développer un cadre multidimensionnel pour évaluer la durabilité des systèmes alimentaires, d'identifier les principales variables pour formaliser et opérationnaliser le concept abstrait et multidimensionnel des systèmes alimentaires durables, et de définir une série d'indicateurs pour évaluer la durabilité des systèmes à un niveau sous-régional.

APPROCHE MÉTHODOLOGIQUE

A travers une approche de la durabilité dans son sens large, la démarche méthodologique s'appuie sur les théories de la vulnérabilité et de la résilience. Suivant les étapes de l'évaluation de la vulnérabilité aux changements globaux, une analyse causale a été présentée à une échelle géographique concernant trois pays méditerranéens: l'Espagne, la France et l'Italie. Huit modèles causaux de la vulnérabilité ont été identifiés. Une enquête Delphi a ensuite été menée pour sélectionner les indicateurs.

RÉSULTATS

Un cadre conceptuel hiérarchique a été identifié pour modéliser les relations complexes entre la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle et la durabilité. Il a ainsi été possible de formaliser huit modèles causaux de la vulnérabilité et de la résilience. Outre cela, les propriétés intrinsèques du système alimentaire qui modélisent les interactions directes entre les facteurs de changement (l'épuisement des ressources en eau; la perte de la biodiversité; la volatilité des prix; les changements dans les modes de consommation) et les enjeux de la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle au niveau sous-régional (la qualité nutritionnelle de l'approvisionnement; l'accès économique, l'équilibre énergétique; la satisfaction des préférences) ont pu être identifiées. Chaque interaction a été déclinée en exposition, sensibilité et résilience. Ce cadre théorique a été opérationnalisé par l'identification d'une série de 136 indicateurs. L'étude Delphi a révélé des consensus de niveau majoritaire, faible, modéré ou fort sur les indicateurs dans 75% des interactions. Les résultats obtenus, en ce qui concerne les taux de réponse globale, des taux de participation d'experts, et de consensus sur les indicateurs, sont considérés plus que satisfaisants. Aussi, les experts ont confirmé la validité des enjeux et des interactions proposés.

CONCLUSION

Cet exercice de modélisation théorique, ainsi que l'enquête Delphi, ont permis l'identification d'une première série d'indicateurs des systèmes alimentaire durables, et d'obtenir un consensus tout en évitant le risque d'une évaluation individuelle et subjective, afin de supporter le processus décisionnel. L'opérationnalisation des théories de la vulnérabilité et de la résilience, grâce à une approche basée sur des indicateurs, a fourni une démarche spécifique pour l'analyse des problèmes de la durabilité du système alimentaire.

Mots clés: Systèmes alimentaires, Sécurité alimentaire, Durabilité, Résilience, Méditerranée, Indicateurs.

Paolo PROSPERI
ED 231 - UMR 1110 MOISA Montpellier Supagro & Università di Catania - DiGeSA (Di3A)
PhD Thesis in Agrofood Economics
Sustainability and food and nutrition security:
An indicator-based vulnerability and resilience approach for the Mediterranean Region

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND

Recurrent food crises and global change, along with habitat loss and micronutrient deficiencies, placed food security and environmental sustainability at the top of the political agenda. Analyses of the dynamic interlinkages between food consumption patterns and environmental concerns recently received considerable attention from the international community. Socioeconomic and biophysical changes affect the food system functions including food and nutrition security. The sustainability of food system is at risk. Building sustainable food systems has become a key effort to redirect our food systems and policies towards better-adjusted goals and improved societal welfare. Food systems involve multiple interactions between human and natural components. The systemic nature of these interactions calls for systems approaches and integrated assessment tools. Identifying and modeling the intrinsic properties of the food system can help tracking progress towards sustainability and setting policies towards positive transformations.

AIMS

The general objective of this thesis is to analyze and explore the sustainability of the food system through identifying a set of metrics at the Mediterranean region level. The specific aims consist of developing a multidimensional framework to evaluate the sustainability of food systems and diets, identifying the main variables to formalize and operationalize the abstract and multidimensional concept of sustainable food systems, and defining metrics for assessing the sustainability of food systems and diets, at a subregional level.

METHODS

Through a broad understanding of sustainability, the methodological approach of this thesis builds on the theories of vulnerability and resilience. Following the steps of the global change vulnerability assessment a causal factor analysis is presented concerning three Mediterranean countries, namely Spain, France and Italy. Formulating "what is vulnerable to what" hypotheses, we identified eight causal models of vulnerability. A three-round Delphi survey was then applied to select indicators on the basis of the vulnerability/resilience theoretical framework.

RESULTS

A conceptual hierarchical framework was identified for modeling the complex relationships between food and nutrition security and sustainability for developing potential indicators of sustainable diets and food systems. A feedback-structured framework of the food system formalized eight selected causal models of vulnerability and resilience and identified intrinsic properties of the food system, shaping the interactions where a set of drivers of change (Water depletion; Biodiversity loss; Food price volatility; Changes in food consumption patterns) directly affect food and nutrition security outcomes at a subregional level (Nutritional quality of food supply; Affordability of food; Dietary energy balance; Satisfaction of cultural food preferences). Each interaction was disentangled in exposure, sensitivity and resilience. This theoretical framework was operationalized through the identification of a set of 136 indicators. The Delphi study revealed low, medium, and high consensus and majority level on indicators in 75% of the interactions out of the 24 initial ones. The results obtained in terms of global response, expert participation rates, and consensus on indicators were then satisfactory. Also, experts confirmed with positive feedback the appraisal of the components of the framework.

CONCLUSIONS

This theoretical modeling exercise and the Delphi survey allowed the identification of a first suite of indicators, moving beyond single and subjective evaluation, and reaching consensus on metrics of sustainable diets and food systems for supporting decision-making. The operationalization of the theories of vulnerability and resilience, through an indicator-based approach, can contribute to further analyses on the socioeconomic and biophysical aspects and interlinkages concerning the sustainability of diets and food systems.

Keywords: Food systems, Food Security, Sustainability, Resilience, Mediterranean, Metrics.