

VEGGIEAT NOTES Lyon, 22nd April 2015

1.0 IN ATTENDANCE

Steering Committee Members in Attendance	Institution
Professor Heather Hartwell	Professor, Bournemouth University, UK
Professor F. J. Armando Perez-Cueto	Associate Professor of Public Health Nutrition, Department of Development and Planning, Copenhagen University, Denmark
Professor Erminio Monteleone	Sensory Food Science Professor and Head of the Sensory Unit at GESAAF, University of Firenze, Italy
Dr Agnes Giboreau	Research Director, Centre De Recherche, Institute Paul Bocuse, France
Dr Laurence Depezay	Bonduelle, France
Advisory Committee Members in Attendance	Institution
Professor John S. A. Edwards	Professor of Foodservice, Bournemouth University, UK
Other Participants in Attendance	Institution
Professor Ann Hemingway	Professor, Bournemouth University, UK
Dr Katherine Appleton	Associate Professor, Bournemouth University, UK
Dr Ann Bevan	Senior Lecture, Bournemouth University, UK
Ms Carmen Martins	Project Administrator, Bournemouth University, UK
Dr David Morizet	Consumer Science, Bonduelle, France
Dr Laure Saulais	Centre De Recherche, Institute Paul Bocuse, France
Ms Olga Melique	Administrator, Centre De Recherche, Institute Paul Bocuse, France
Dr Caterina Dinnella	University of Firenze, Italy
Ms Camila Masi	PhD Student, University of Firenze, Italy
Ms Serena Trapani	PhD Student, University of Firenze, Italy

2.0 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received as all the partners were represented at this meeting, as well as the Chair from the advisory board.

3.0 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Professor Heather Hartwell (HH) from Bournemouth University (BU) welcomed the partners to the third day of meeting and thanked them for the efforts and inputs during those three days and for the success achieved during the mid-term review. HH revealed that the evaluator was very positive regarding the progress of the project. The EU Officer congratulated the tight management of the project and the project will continue to progress.

Dr Agnes Giboreau (AG) thanked Dr Laure Saulais (LS) for all her efforts regarding the organization of these three days of meeting.

4.0 THE PHILOSOPHY OF MARIE CURIE

The philosophy and uniqueness of this Marie Curie project is to demonstrate that researchers are developing both personally and professionally. For that reason the professional development plan is an important tool to report the progress of each secondee – it's all about the outcome and the personal and professional benefits.

HH clarified the aim of the secondments; remembering that it is important to enhance research, learn new languages, to be integrated in a new team and research activities outside the university. To be on secondment is more than data collection – it is teamwork and learning. A secondee on secondment should integrate into a new team, mix and match activities and learn from them.

5.0 DROPBOX

Carmen Martins (CM) proceeded with a brief explanation of how BU will use dropbox. This tool will only be used to share administration documents, dissemination, timesheets and agreements, facilitating the communication between Bournemouth University and the partners. The commercial information will not be uploaded.

6.0 PUBLISHING PROTOCOL

HH has sent an excel file to partners for papers / publications organization, two weeks before the meeting, but some partners advised that the document didn't reach their email inbox. HH talked about the need to capture all the information regarding publishing and protocols, for that reason Institute Paul Bocuse (IPB) will create a document for partners to follow.

Further, AG presented suggested publishing protocol guidelines for VeggiEAT. Dr Katherine Appleton (KA) argued that there should not be a limitation for authors and it's not an advantage at all, the more authors, the bigger the project looks. The aim is to help young researchers to start publishing and expand their network. Professor Armando Perez-Cueto (AP-C) claimed the attention that some institutions don't count papers with more than three authors for the researcher professional development, for that reason papers with a long number of authors won't count for Copenhagen University.

After discussion between the PI's it was agreed that the lead author should decide how many people should have on each paper. Although, if it is a journal that only accepts a limited number of authors - the PI should decide the most appropriate team member to contribute, following the journals guidelines. HH referred that each PI know better who needs to be on each paper, and what their field of expertise – the aim is to help and develop young researchers and encourage them to go to conferences. EM advised that is necessary an equilibrium regarding the field of the researchers and the amount of data from each work package. Dr Laurence Depezay (LD) raised her concern regarding publishing outside each work package. AG commented saying the more papers the better – the PI's should send an email/fill in the spread sheet with a proposal for publication and each PI should answer within fifteen days. The spread sheet will be an index for possible, current and past publications. This will also capture conference attendance too.

AG and LS will finish and refine the publishing protocol, putting together an improved spread sheet with the initial capture of each paper, lead author, and focus of the paper, journal and timing for submission. It was agreed among partners to have the an excel spread sheet template with:

- (1) Table for publications
- (2) Table for conferences
- (3) Table for dissemination

PI's only communicate with PI's and then they can delegate. HH reinforced that it is necessary to capture all different types of dissemination, that includes news and press releases – but it is not necessary to send news for PI's approval - the project works on a trust and professional basis – but it is necessary to keep track of the events.

ACTION: AG to send the excel spread sheet to CM. CM to upload the publishing and conferences document to dropbox. Partners to update the document, or email CM to update the file.

7.0 WORK PACKAGE 4

AP-C introduced WP4 deliverables explaining the transition from WP3. AP-C started with a quick overview of the WP4 – develop the market and achieve a systematic intelligence of sustainable eating, contributing to the wellbeing of Europeans. Preliminary work has been done, after the last meeting in Florence, regarding choice architecture. Next steps towards field work are:

- VeggiEAT definition of living laboratories – a practicality that needs to be defined;
- Selection of intervention sites in each country and for each group;
- Revision of the questionnaire for baseline and follow-up;

After the data collected the project will move towards WP5 with the collaboration of the post-doc to complete the data analysis and start writing papers. HH advised that there is no budget for post-docs mobility, although the management budget of each partner can be used for data collection reasons. AP-C raised a management question regarding the official salary of Denmark and the amount provided by the project.

Interventions will follow the same cross-over design:

- ABBA;
- Less sample, more power;
- Online baseline and follow up questionnaires: save time in data entry;
- Follow-up: outcome variables, e.g. amount of vegetable eaten, only target products;

AG raised the concern regarding the choice architecture factors that the project is going to study. AP-C agreed and said that this goes back to WP3 and both WP should work together to understand the choice architecture factors – as they change in a cultural perspective.

HH suggested that the principle the project is looking at, is providing a meal within a community – where that community comes together in the setting can be stretched, but the most important thinking is that they are eating together – as in a real life setting. The idea is to look at a population perspective and not as an individual.

The partners agreed to define VeggiEAT definition of living laboratories as a community having a meal together, choosing one dish on its own and then with choice architecture. It was also agreed that the dishes will be piloted on a cultural perspective.

HH explained that the recipe is presenting the vegetables in a new but familiar way, which will be shown and demonstrated by WP3. Then, WP4 will take that recipe which has been developed and add an extra nudge to it, to be selected greater intake – that's why it is necessary to understand real eating situation.

HH further suggested three steps: baseline control, dish and dish plus choice architecture.

1. The project invite 10 old people to eat a meal, a normal meal, then measure by visual estimation that intake;
2. Then, the project provide within the menu, the developed vegetable dish - visual intake;
3. A visual dish plus choice architecture nudge.

The principle is the population eating in a community and the three dishes are going to be pilot in a cultural perspective.

ACTION: Agnes and Armando to decide on the food choice architecture design and send a proposal on how to take it out to field work.

8.0 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

HH reinforced the importance about disseminating the project, it's all about the outcomes and impacts, making a difference in the society. Outcomes for practice and public engagement are very important for the project, e.g. the ESRC, Festival of Social Science. Each partner in each country should think about ideas for public engagement highlighting the project dissemination.

ACTION: Partners to organize dissemination events.

9.0 DATE AND PLACE FOR NEXT MEETING

AG discuss the need to discuss the methodology before 2016 meeting and plan WP4 – HH proposed to have the next meeting in the beginning of 2016.

Partners agree to have next meeting in Lille, FR – 1st and 2nd February 2016.

HH suggest having Professor John Edwards representing the Advisory Board and thanked Laurence for organizing. Partner's agreed.

ACTION: Laurence to confirm dates for next management meeting.

10.0 AOB

As part of the meeting the partners and advisory board were given the opportunity to talk about any other business (AOB).

AG suggested planning the secondments in advance, improving the management for both institutions. AG also asked the Danish team to clarify their next secondments. HH clarified that due to the change of institution, AP-C needed to wait for a 12 month period, until he can start secondments.

AG welcomed partners in June, July, October, November and December, preparing field work and analysis.

Financial questions were raised and it was suggested by HH to forward them to Philip Leahy-Harland pharland@bournemouth.ac.uk – to avoid misunderstanding. No further AOB.

ACTION: All secondees to organize and plan their secondments in advance.

11.0 CONCLUSION

HH thanked all the partners for their contribution and efforts and for their participation during these three days meetings.

