

## Comment Form [Pre-Research]

February 25, 2016

<b>Title of the Project</b>	<b>Lifeworlds of Sustainable Food Consumption and Production: Agrifood Systems in Transition</b>		
<b>Research Term</b>	<b>PR</b>	<b>Project Leader</b>	<b>MCGREEVY, Steven R.</b>
<b>General advice and comments of the PEC:</b>			
<p>The PEC found the overall issue at stake in the project important and noted some progress in comparison to last year. Nevertheless, the PEC has some serious reservations about this project.</p>			
<p>First, the overall impression is one of an advocacy project, with a strong normative, almost ideological stance, as opposed to a neutral, analytical, scientific approach. What is the overall objective of study? What are the expected scientific outcomes of this research? A set of clear overall research questions is needed to guide and sharpen the research. Major drivers of the problem are to be identified and it needs to be shown that the research is addressing these. A thorough review of the literature needs to be presented in order to show what is new or cutting edge in this project. Otherwise, this project will be journalistic in nature.</p>			
<p>Second, it also needs to be shown what the project aims to achieve in practical and real-world terms. What is the change that is needed? What is new in how the project strives to effect such change? What are the expected outcomes? Perhaps one way to achieve more clarity and focus would be to concentrate on behavioral or perception change. Designing the research in such a way that it evaluates or “measures” the expected changes will also go a long way to establish a stronger science aspect to the project.</p>			
<p>Third, the materials and presentation still seem to reveal a rich but somewhat overwhelming variety and diversity of activities. The organization of the project seems to reflect this, with a large number of working groups. A framework is needed to integrate the work of the working groups. There is some expectation a model would help such integration, but it remains unspecified. Similarly, lifecycle assessment seems to be deemed important in linking different activities, but it was suggested a supply chain analysis might be more useful in this respect. Including examination of the role of institutions may help connect and bridge across scales. A deeper treatment of culture (and including relevant specialists) was also raised as important.</p>			
<p>Fourth, emphasis is placed on co-design together with stakeholders, but it was not clear to what extent this was happening (possibly an indication of a move from a transdisciplinary approach to action</p>			

research). The relevant stakeholders need to be clearly identified and ways formulated to bring them into the project at this early stage.

Finally, the rationale for the selection of sites and countries needs to be clearly presented.