

A4NH FSHD Workshop Report

Hanoi, September 14-17, 2016



Process team: Stef de Haan, Brice Even, Jen Kregear and Huyen Tran



Index

	Page
1. Background	1
2. Pre-workshop food system tour	2
3. Setting the stage	3
4. Key research areas	6
5. 2017 work plan (proposed)	10
6. The enabling environment	13
7. Concussions and agreements	18
Annexes	
a. Program	17
b. List of participants	20
c. Crude notes (from note takers)	23
d. Links to presentations	34
e. Link to photographs	34

Glossary

A4NH	Agriculture for Nutrition and Health	IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
CASRAD	Center for Agrarian Systems Research and Development	ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
CIAT	International center for Tropical Agriculture	IRD	<i>L'Institut de Recherche pour le Développement</i>
CIRAD	<i>Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement</i>	MALICA	Markets and Agricultural Linkages for Cities in Asia
CoA	Cluster of Activities	MARD	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
CRP	CGIAR Research Program	MOH	Ministry of Health
FAVRI	Fruit and Vegetable Research Institute	MOIT	Ministry of Industry and Trade
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment	NCDs	Non Communicable Diseases
FP	Flagship Program	NRI	National Research Institutes
FSHD	Food Systems for Healthy Diets	NIN	National Institute of Nutrition
GAIN	Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition	MSE	Medium Small Enterprises
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Center	WUR	Wageningen University & Research

I. Background

The phase II (2017-2022) of the CGIAR Research Program (CRP) on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH¹) will conduct innovative research aiming at improving nutrition and health of poor smallholders and consumers. A4NH is led by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). The A4NH phase II² portfolio will include five so-called Flagship Programs (FP). **Food Systems for Healthier Diets (FP1)** will contribute to the goal of healthier diets for poor and vulnerable populations through better understanding of food system-diet dynamics and through identifying and enabling innovations in value chains and policies. FP1 is led by Wageningen University & Research (WUR³), and responds to concerns about global diet trends (transitions), and demands from countries for systemic solutions that address problems, such as food insecurity, undernutrition, and over nutrition. This FP will focus on catalyzing innovative partnerships between researchers, both within and outside of CGIAR, as well as private, public, and civil society actors in national and sub-national food systems in four target countries, namely Vietnam, Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Nigeria. In Vietnam, FP1 activities will be coordinated by the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT⁴).

The FP1 on Food Systems for Healthier Diets (FSHD) is organized in three so-called Clusters of Activities (CoA). In **CoA 1: diagnosis and foresight**, the initial focus is to fill crucial knowledge gaps on the dynamics of interactions between food systems and diet quality at national and subnational levels. Concrete opportunities to improve diet quality and policies/regulatory frameworks will be identified and tested in **CoA 2: food system innovations**, by identifying and testing interventions that work through food systems to provide a diversity of healthier foods. Through the compilation of results generated from the first two CoAs, **CoA 3: scaling and anchoring**, will identify lessons for scaling up within focus countries.

A planning workshop was held on 14-16 September 2016 in Hanoi, Vietnam. The main objectives of the Workshop were:

- (i) to develop a common understanding on how the FSHD flagship fits within Vietnam's national development agenda and strategy;
- (ii) to identify and review trends, knowledge gaps, opportunities, priorities and ongoing activities for improving diets through sustainable food system pathways in Vietnam;
- (iii) to brainstorm and outline a plan for 2017 activities among CGIAR and other international and national partners, and;
- (iv) to identify key public and private-sector partners in Vietnam, brainstorm on their potential role in FSHD implementation, and define essential mechanisms for effective research collaboration.

¹ <http://a4nh.cgiar.org/>

² <https://library.cgiar.org/handle/10947/4230>

³ <http://www.wur.nl/en.htm>

⁴ <https://ciat.cgiar.org/>

II. Pre-workshop Food System Exploration (day 1)

Prior to the actual workshop a food system exploration or tour was in Hanoi under the knowledgeable guidance of Ms. Nguyen Thi Tan Loc (FAVRI) and Mrs. Huong Pham (CIAT). The objectives were participants to: (i) get a feel and a basic understanding of the market side of food systems, (ii) get a sense of the different channels through which consumers get food in Hanoi, (iii) to briefly interact with market actors. Stops included the Fivimart supermarkets in the Cau Giay district, the Rau Bac Tom retail shop, and the Nghia Tan wet market. The visits to these very different outlets provided a good initial impression of where different types of urban consumers acquire food. For food lovers an additional street food tour was organized on Thursday evening, the second day of the workshop.

Photos Frame 1: Pre-workshop food system exploration



1a. Participants at Fivimart



1b. Fruit section of the supermarket



1c. Staff of the Bac Tom retail shop



1d. Vegetables at the Nghia Tan wet market

III. Setting the Stage: key messages from the background presentations and discussions (day 2)

The workshop was formally opened by Dr. Alan De Brauw, Senior Research Fellow at IFPRI, and Dr. Dindo Campilan, Asia Regional Director for CIAT. Dr. De Brauw provided essential background information on the CRP-A4NH and FP1 on FSHD. Dr. Campilan pointed to some of the specific characteristics of Vietnam, notably the prominence of the informal sector, the blurry boundaries between rural and urban areas and the great disparities within the country, calling for a regional focus of the flagship activities and the need to set boundaries and adjust expectations based on the available resources and foreseeable challenges. Then Dr. Stef de Haan (CIAT) gave an overview of the workshop and provided the audience with the specific objectives of the event.

A second set of introductory presentations was given by Dr. Nancy Johnson (IFPRI⁵), and Prof. Inge Brouwer (WUR). Dr. Johnson shed light on the previous achievements of A4NH phase I and the features of A4NH's new phase II, including more support for target countries, greater engagement with the private sector, and an increased integration with other CRPs. Prof. Brouwer introduced the theoretical framework of FP1 FSHD and reminded the audience about the triple burden of malnutrition, and the need to redirect diets in a healthier direction and to increase nutrition in a sustainable way. She defined key concepts such as “diet quality” and “food systems” and detailed the architecture and the specific objectives of the FP1.

A third set of presentations from CIRAD⁶-MALICA and NIN aimed at providing an overview of the food systems situation in Vietnam from different angles and perspectives. Dr. Delphine Marie-Vivien (CIRAD-MALICA⁷) provided insights into the on-going agricultural transitions of the country in terms of production, distribution and consumption, including vertical integration processes within value chains and persistent concern about food safety. The negative perceptions regarding small-scale farmers ability to provide safe and affordable food in sufficient quantities fuels a shift toward large-scale agriculture (and greater direct control over processes). This model attracts increased levels of public and private investments. She also revealed the strengths and importance of traditional and informal markets in supplying food and the current dynamics of super-marketization in urban areas. From the consumption side, there is a shift from staple grains to greater amounts of animal products and processed food. Food safety was mentioned as a major concern for consumers and decision-makers and several related issues were referred to in the presentation: transparency, certification, value chain restructuring, marketing strategies, awareness and media, exclusion of smallholders, among others.

Dr. Mai Truong Tuyet (NIN⁸) gave a comprehensive overview of the nutritional situation of Vietnam. Since 1985, national diets have dramatically increased in protein and lipid intake. Underweight, stunting, and wasting decreased nearly by half on the period 2000-2015, but especially stunting remains high in certain pockets in Vietnam. Micronutrient deficiencies are particularly high in Northwest and Central Vietnam's highland areas and overlap with the presence of so-called ethnic minority groups. Obesity has increased since 2000, especially in urban areas. Over the years NIN has promoted multiple interventions, including fortification and

⁵ <http://www.ifpri.org/>

⁶ <http://www.cirad.fr/en>

⁷ <http://asie-sud-est.cirad.fr/content/download/5555/49195/version/1/file/FicheDP15-MALICA-GB.pdf>

⁸ <http://viendinhduong.vn/home/en/Default.aspx>

supplementation. Food-based approaches have also been supported (e.g. home gardens). NIN collects anthropometric and consumption data on a regular basis (5 / 10 years).

A fourth set of key presentations was provided by Fresh Studio and CASRAD-MALICA, and specifically addressed agri-food value chains and food safety issues in Vietnam. Ir. Marion Klaver (Fresh Studio⁹) started by reminding the audience that Vietnamese diet, which is diverse and appears healthy still suffer from a lack of nutrients and an excess of sugar, fat and salt, resulting in an increase of diet-related diseases. A key message of the presentation was that a focus on value chains and consumers, and specifically on education, knowledge and awareness raising, hold a huge potential to steer food system transition into a healthier direction. The role of the private sector was also emphasized in contributing to improved standardized procedures, traceability, seed systems and post-harvest management. Several examples were mentioned ranging from potato to avocado value chains.

Dr. Dao The Anh (CASRAD¹⁰-MALICA) presented on food safety issues in Vietnam. Although food poisoning cases have reduced during the period 2000-2014, concerns about food safety continue to grow among Vietnamese consumers. Especially the use of chemicals at the different stages of the food chains, including pesticides and antibiotics at the farm level and chemical additives added during processing or storage, make regular consumers lose confidence. Data collection and systematic control capacity is still weak in the country. Yet, food safety is a key policy concern now due to the perceptions of the consumers. There is a lack of trust within the system (including for certified products), and little is known about the impacts of this mistrust on diet choices. Dr. The Anh also mentioned the need to update the food safety law, and stressed the need for an increased inter-ministerial coordination to enforce food safety regulations. The regulatory framework does not fit within Vietnam's national context as its food system is characterized by numerous scattered small-scale actors. Food safety interventions have to be redesigned to fit with the specific Vietnamese context and to enable the inclusion of smallholders and small businesses into future initiatives.

Presentations were discussed and questioned by participants and gave rich "food for thought" for the following brainstorming sessions aimed at shaping and planning a grounded FSHD research agenda for Vietnam. PDF files of the background presentations can be downloaded via the link provided in Annex D.

⁹ <http://www.freshstudio.vn/>

¹⁰ <http://casrad.org.vn/index.php?page=en>

Photo Frame 2: Background presentations from complementary perspectives



2a. Dr. Mai Truong Tuyet (NIN)



2b. Dr. Delphine Marie-Vivien (CIRAD-MALICA)



2c. Ir. Marion Klaver (Fresh Studio)



2d. Dr. Dao The Anh (CASRAD-MALICA)

IV. Key research areas (Day 3)

Four breakout groups were formed with a mixed composition: (i) Healthy Diets, (ii) Value Chains, (iii) Policy, and (iv) System Dimensions. Each group discussed, identified and prioritized key research & development areas to be addressed, taking into account the Vietnamese context and perceived user demands.

Breakout group – Healthy Diets & Nutrition

1. Research on dietary quality / dietary diversity. Determination of healthy / unhealthy components in the Vietnamese diet.
2. Strengthen human capacity (capacity building): (i) training and qualification, (ii) data management and use of the general survey on diet intake that is conducted every 5 years, (iii) review of current training program to health workers at different levels.
3. Enhance knowledge at the national level of links between food, diets and health.
4. Deepening the understanding of links between food systems and micronutrient deficiencies (Zn, Fe). Also between food systems and rising obesity and NCDs.
5. Nutrition behavioral analysis of various groups (including ethnic minority people): diet and consumption surveys in various regions. Including assessment of diet quality and adequacy.
6. Research on links between agrobiodiversity, dietary diversity / quality and health outcomes.
7. Research and action on street food: (i) role in diets, (ii) sourcing of ingredient, (iii) data collection, (iv) eventually training on nutrition and food safety for street vendors.
8. Others ideas: (i) quality control in supermarkets (is it really better), (ii) healthy diet for school lunch, (iii) focus on youth.

Breakout group – Value Chains & Private Sector

1. Production side: test small scale versus large scale systems (i.e.: coffee sector under monocrop or agroforestry, potatoes, avocados).
2. How does confidence / trust in food safety affect consumption (= trust versus consumption behavior)?
3. Choices program / reduction of “baddies” (fat, sugar, etc.) in processed food. Will this affect transition to processed foods? Net effect on diets? Work together between science, industry and government to provide information / certification on processed foods.
4. What type and level of organization is in vegetable value chains is most effective? Farmer, trader to retail analysis, including post-harvest losses.
5. Comparison of export versus domestic standards. Link with Albert Heijn in the Netherlands? Potatoes and link to PepsiCo.
6. The role of Small and Medium Enterprises (SME's) in flows / diets to consumers. Formulate the right research questions.

Breakout group – Policy

The policy group focused on many different questions and multiple components of food system policy. Detailed notes below, but the key priority research question coming out of the breakout group was: which policies actually impact diet-food system linkages and how? This in recognition

that there is no food system policy as such, but rather trade, health, production, education and other policies that influence health outcomes.

- What are the key areas of research that are relevant for the Vietnamese context based on demand? Current knowledge gaps, relevance, adding value, demand driven opportunities.
- What are the key drivers of policy discourse and how does it affect consumption. patterns? MARD for food security, food safety, agricultural intensification, agricultural export; MOH focus on nutrition, lack of coordination leads to fragmentation in policy; MOIT MARD and MOH coordinate only on food safety issues which could provide an example for system coordination, policies for value chain promotion.
- What is the impact of food system policy on key actors: producers, retailers, consumers?
- What is "food system" policy in Vietnam? Policy has traditionally been driven by production rather than consumption. Private sector is driver for change.
- What factors drove the creation of the food safety law? Consumers, private sector, international actors.
- Defining the policy making dynamic and drivers of policy making, case study for food safety law.
- What is the discourse around evaluating the current development strategy and developing the next strategy document? Food safety law 2010, nutrition development strategy.
- How to promote coordination between ministerial strategies? What is a framework for that coordination? What policy issue is a priority for ministries to coordinate?
- Define boundaries of the food system in Vietnam, identify a policy priority to be addressed, develop a framework for ministries to coordinate around policy development, understand the policy-making process around food systems.
- Have a better understanding of what agenda, goals, visions, philosophies contribute to policy-making process.
- What are the drivers? International trade, agriculture policies, consumers, private sectors, relations with China, communist party, narratives/discourse, export markets, central government, socio-economic situation.
- Not a lot of foreign direct investment (FDI) in agricultural production because of land policies, private sector is limited because of government intervention in business.
- What is the food system policy framework made of?
- Move beyond understanding the process to look at how policy affects change within the food system.
- Are farmers and producers included in the policy-making process?
- Food safety is first issue that came from civil society to government in an environment lacking transparency and trust (fishermen protest over poisoned fish from industrial plant).
- What are the key drivers? Who are the key actors? Food safety law case, national nutrition policy case. How does the policy-making process affect the food system? What incentives do the policies give to the consumers and other actors? What are the effects of the outcomes of the policy-making process? Causal mechanism process mapping of driver and actors of policy through to the decisions of producers and nutrition of consumers.
- Cost-benefit analysis of malnutrition *versus* agricultural bio-diversification, human and environmental costs.

- What is the center of the food system? Does the food system center around individual consumers? Crops? Value chains? Production methods?
- What are some priority areas in policy on which the research may focus? Food safety policy and animal-source food policy.
- Use the policy process to structure priorities: agenda-setting, design, adoption, evaluation, reform.
- Keep the role of other CRPs in mind when developing food system research question and how we can complement or build on that work.
- Can we add value to the food safety flagship by examining the policy aspect from a food system lens?
- Examine first how the food safety law impacts the food system, and then how does it affect consumer diets and health specifically
- How does production, land use and trade policy affect consumption of animal products?
- Focus on consumption drivers as entry point for policy selection
- Examination of policy process:
 - Key current policies affecting diets (COA1)
 - Key stakeholder in the policy processes (COA3)
 - Understand the agenda setting process of food policy (COA3)
 - Institutional coordination and capacity building (COA2)
 - Identify key policy case studies: food safety policy, animal-source food (COA1)
 - Food certification within value chain (COA2)

Breakout group – System Dimensions

1. Development of methods, metrics and tools for food systems diagnosis or characterization. These methods would ideally have minimal components and metrics for standardized spatial (cross-site), temporal (transition) and monitoring across the FSHD countries and benchmark sites. Gender needs to be part of the methods, including segregated data sets.
2. Implementation of actual food system characterization in Vietnam across a rural, periurban to urban gradient. With attention to: (i) typologies, (ii) dynamics, (iii) mapping or data management for time series comparison.
3. Conduct targeting and priority setting early on. Who are the actual impact audience: rural-urban poor, youth (including middle income and those at risk of NCDs), other? Also geographical targeting.
4. Conduct trade-off analysis, i.e. between health, environment, economics and food safety.
5. Research on bridging scales in food systems. Better understanding of the emergent properties from household, community or city level, national to the international level. Start early on a with a big data approach at different scales in Vietnam.

Photo Frame 3: Work sessions of the breakout groups



3a. Output of the Value Chain & Private Sector breakout group (day 2)



3b. Output of the Healthy Diets & Nutrition breakout group (day 2)



3c. Output of the Policy breakout group (day 2)



3d. CoA3 breakout group (day 3)

V. 2017 Work Plan (Day 3)

Three breakout groups with mixed members took the cards with main suggested research areas from the previous day and classified them by CoA, prioritizing those that might be started in 2017: (1) Diagnosis and Foresight, (2) Food System Innovations, (3) Upscaling and Anchoring of Food System Transformation. The activities suggested below are a first list which might change according to new insights, budget availability or agreements in upcoming meetings. They are not fixed in stone, but provide a first list of options.

Group 1 (Diagnosis and Foresight)

Research areas or component	Where to start? Possible 2017 activities	Methods, tools	Key actors, participants	Link to existing platforms, databases, initiatives
1 Characterising dietary patterns-food system linkages	a.) Develop framework, methods, tools; b.) Analysis of existing data linking diet (NIN) with food system / transition indicators c.) Design and plan data collection in rural (northwest, peri-urban and urban Hanoi)	- literature / discussion (postdoc, SUSFANS) - Workshop in Hohenheim on Food Systems analysis (CGIAR workshop on metrics) - Secondary data analysis	WUR, CIAT NIN, Hanoi Medical School, Bioversity, Healthbridge, Malica	GSO, Fresh Studio, (Human Tropics projects on nutrition sensitive landscapes), Surfood (CIRAD / Malica), UNICEF (food system / diet transition)
2. Drivers of diet-food system linkages	Scoping exercise on what data and knowledge is available in Vietnam on drivers at the level of: - Consumers (preferences, food choices) - Food actors - Food production In 2018: link with data collection on diet-food system linkages with (NIN)	Documents, literature review, stakeholder discussions, primary data collection	WUR, CIAT, NIN, Fresh Studio, Bioversity, ILRI, Malica	Drivers of food choice project, (BI) RIA (ILRI), ACIAR (Food consumption in north and Hanoi: nutrition sensitive project)
3. Policy analysis with a diet lens	Scoping exercise on which policies impact diet-food system linkages and how?	Literature review, surveys, stakeholder discussions	IFPRI, CIAT, WUR, Malica, Medical School of Hanoi, NIN	Link with PIM

Group 2 (Food System Innovations)

Research areas or component	Where to start? Possible 2017 activities	Methods, tools	Key actors, participants	Link to existing platforms, databases, initiatives
1 Choices Programme / Labelling	Stakeholder workshop, Adaptation of international nutrition profiling to local situation, Design test market	Leverage international experience	NIN, Lead food industries, Fresh Studio, scientific advisory group	Choices Programme ¹¹ , Malica, VietGAP
2 Fresh produce Value chain innovation	Review Vissan case study (2016), wet market innovation, assess relevant dietary problem to tackle, identify relevant partners, design relevant intervention (bottom-up)	Farmer & postharvest actors training, QC systems & certification, branding and consumer education, evaluation of shopping behavior	Vissan, Bac Tom, Fivimarket	Fresh Studio, Malica
3 Farmer / worker nutrition in commercial Value Chains	Identify partner(s), formative research to guide intervention design, Intervention design	Behavior Change communication, home gardening, access to seeds, intercropping, Delivered through existing extension structures	Commercial value chain actors (e.g. coffee, tea, cashew...)	GAIN Cash Crop Nutrition program, Malica, GRET
4. School feeding / education	<i>Not elaborated</i>	<i>Idem</i>	<i>Idem</i>	<i>Idem</i>

Group 3 (Upscaling and Anchoring)

Research areas or component	Where to start? Possible 2017 activities	Methods, tools	Key actors, participants	Link to existing platforms, databases, initiatives
1. Capacity building	- Assessment of existing capacity (national institutions, private sector, researchers), building on and complementary to existing capacity assessments - Assessment of capacity building efforts and curricula for nutrition in FS	- Capacity building on nutrition for staff in FS related sectors - Capacity of field workers (ag, health) to link production and nutrition - Review current training programs	NIN, Women unions, Private sector, Hanoi Medical School and public health school	-

¹¹ <http://www.choicesprogramme.org/>

	related sectors (ag, nut, education, health, businesses)	on diet and nutrition - Capacity for systems research		
2. Influencing agenda-setting and engaging stakeholders	- Stakeholder/ key actor mapping exercise and analysis - Stakeholder engagement meeting - Policy (public and private) process analysis: how are agendas being shaped in Vietnam [+ link to policy analyses as drivers as part of CoA 1]	- Identify and engage key stakeholders for upscaling - Understanding agenda setting in public and private policies	Networks: Malica, CANSEA, ALISEA, (VCCI), Ministries: MoA, MoH, MoTrade, Women unions, CGIAR Site integration partners IPSARD, Social movements e.g. 'I need organic', PPPs (e.g. coffee, tea)	-
3. M&E of upscaling processes (link to SPEAR, PIM)	- Review examples in Vietnam of successful / unsuccessful upscaling/ anchoring of innovations tools - Formulate lessons learned for nutrition food systems scaling - Review lessons learned from systems CRPs?	- M&E tools for food system upscaling processes - Platform on lessons learned	Health Bridge, SPEAR, PIM, Other CRPs	-
4. Tools and data	- Assess demand for and use of tools and data	- Diet monitoring systems - Tools that help guide upscaling (targeting tools, adaptive management tools) - Extend use vs. expand tools to higher level?	-	-

VI. The Enabling Environment (Day 3)

This session focused on the main components or key ingredients for an enabling collaborative research environment for the FSHD FP in Vietnam. It was recognized that given the complexity and interdisciplinarity of systems research, diversity of partners and context in Vietnam the following challenges or risks need consideration:

- Uncoordinated and unrelated research being scattered within and between FSHD countries. Such risks were evident in other system CRP's in Phase I. Specific elements mentioned include: poor partner coordination, overly ambitious goals, lack of shared or common goals, lack of clear outputs, internal competition among CG centers, lack of CRP resources
- Limiting buy-in and/or trust from NRI partners. It was pointed out that during Phase I of the CRPs the national partners were often not involved in the planning but only in the execution.

Main suggestions coming out of the discussion on how to establish a solid platform with conducive coordination, communication and planning at the country level were:

- A coordination unit or **steering committee** would ideally be established for coherent planning, communication and execution in Vietnam. Such a unit or committee would need to include national partners and at the same time build on existing initiatives.
- Specific **working groups** could be established for tasks such as fund raising or technical issues such as nutrition, value chain upgrading and private sector linkages, big data, etc. Such working groups could involve the NRI; e.g. it was suggested that NIN would be part of a nutrition working group.
- MALICA's success was recognized. CIAT is a member of MALICA and possibly a MALICA representative could be part of the FSHD coordination unit or steering committee. Ingredients of MALICA success: dynamic research, strong capacity within the group, connections with government, evidence of success, steering committee coordination (meets quarterly), bottom-up approach for research prioritization, effective working groups on key topics.
- A geographical focus with attention to **research benchmark sites** would allow partners to come together. A rural – periurban – urban transect was proposed which would tentatively include Northwest Vietnam (rural space) and the city of Hanoi (urban space).
- A **common framework** which would allow mapping of each project. Elements of a common framework could include methods, metrics and databases. But also clarity on the role of partners and their contributions.
- Regular meetings ideally need to be held; i.e. of the coordination unit / steering committee and of country-level partners involved.
- Other key ingredients for success mentioned included: (i) proactive and coordinated fundraising, (ii) start-up identification of the key knowledge gaps, (iii) support and incentives for joint proposal development, (iv) involvement of local government in each of the anticipated benchmark sites, (v) clarity on reporting responsibilities and decision making.

It was mentioned that soon MALICA is commencing an assessment of its past work in order to create a new plan for the future. This planning effort could include A4NH (FP1 and others). It was also suggested that FP1 FSHD could link to existing working groups in Vietnam; for example the nutrition working group (led by NIN) and the food safety working group (World Bank involvement).

VII. Conclusions and main agreements

Conclusions on the Vietnam context:

1. A rich data and research environment in the food system area already exists in Vietnam. The data environment does generally not have “open access”. The rich existing multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral networks and innovative private - public partnerships in existence offer a clear potential for the FSHD FP to link to.
2. Equally a rich policy environment exists with implications for nutrition, food literacy, value chain development and food safety. There is no such thing as “food system policy”, but a range of health, trade, food and other policies that influence the food system arena.
3. A lot of focus has been given to and progress made on reducing undernutrition in Vietnam. Less so on overnutrition and diet-related NCDs which have only recently appeared on the radar screen, yet are on growing in incidence. This is where the FSHD FP can clearly add value.
4. There are many good elements within the Vietnamese food system that may require reevaluation. Intervention logic should build on these positive elements, including high daily vegetable intake, high levels of dietary diversity, and consumer accessibility of fresh produce on wet markets, among others.
5. The importance and relevance of a rural to urban gradient in terms of food system characterization and innovations to be conducted through the FSHD FP is evident. Rural urban linkages through trade and migration are fluent and represent a clear opportunity to explore geographical scales (local, national to cross-border) in temporally defined food system transitions.
6. A large seemingly “informal” sector exists in urban Hanoi. This sector is frequented by the (urban) poor and offers multiple entry points for FSHD action research, including for valuation, upgrading, and regulation, among others.
7. Food safety issues are a major driver of food system change in urban spaces. The importance of food safety in the Vietnam context needs to be taken into account within the FSHD FP and provides a clear opportunity to link to link to the Food Safety FP within CRP-A4NH. Other drivers of food system change include changes in income, markets and regulations.

Conclusions of FSHD implementation:

1. For the food system’s characterization there is a need to develop the metrics, tools, definitions and indicators. It was suggested that FSHD could build on the experience of the SUSFANS project and hold a specific workshop on the topic, possibly to be aligned with a “food system’s analysis” in Hohenheim, Germany, in the second quarter of 2017.
2. Food system dimensions to be prioritized early on in the FSHD FP operative plan are: (i) development of methods, metrics and tools for food systems diagnosis, (ii) implementation of food system characterization along a rural to urban gradient, (iii) conduct targeting and priority setting, (iv) implement trade-off analysis, (v) research on bridging scales in food systems, and (vi) laying the foundations for a big data approach to track transitions.
3. Diets and nutrition components identified and prioritized by workshop participants for implementation include: (i) research on dietary quality / dietary diversity, (ii) strengthen human capacity (training), (iii) enhanced knowledge of links between food, diets and health, (iv) a food system’s approach to persisting micronutrient deficiencies and rising

obesity and NCDs, (v) nutrition behavioral analysis, (vi) linkages between agrobiodiversity, dietary diversity and health outcomes, (vii) research and action on street food, (viii) school programs and youth engagement.

4. Value chain and possible private sector actions identified during the workshop included: (i) testing of small scale versus large scale production systems, (ii) research on trust versus consumption behavior, (iii) possible collaborative implementation of the Choices Program for / processed food (information, certification), (iv) research on organizational models in vegetable value chains, (v) upgrading of wet markets based on bottom-up planning, (vi) comparison of export versus domestic standards, and (vii) studies on the role of SMEs.
5. The priorities of policy research would basically depend on the question: which policies actually impact diet-food system linkages and how? Many possible angles were identified, including: (i) food safety policy, (ii) trade policy, (iii) urban and subregional policies, among others.
6. Possible activities for each CoA have been identified (see section V). These activities are suggested by the workshop participants and details about their implementation need to be further specified.

Conclusions of the FSHD PD enabling environment in Vietnam:

The main elements coming out of the workshop plenary discussion for an enabling environment and nationally coherent implementation are: (i) establishment of a coordination unit or steering committee (involving NRI), (ii) create specific working groups for tasks such as fund raising or key technical issues, (iii) link to the existing MALICA platform, (iv) assure a geographical focus with attention to research benchmark sites, (v) develop a common framework (methods, metrics, databases, partner roles and contributions), (vi) have regular meetings with partners, among other recommendations (see section VI).

Agreements:

It was agreed that CIAT would prepare the report of the workshop (*this document*) and share the contact list (Annex B), PDFs of presentations (Annex D) and photographs (Annex E). Also that WUR, as the lead coordinator of the flagship will provide clear guidelines on national leadership, coordination, and expectations. A decision about A4NH phase II funding is expected in November, thus before the January 1 2017 start date. A separate workshop to plan the details of the 2017 work in Vietnam and the other three target countries might take place before the end of the year.

Annex A – Meeting Program



PROGRAM - FOOD SYSTEMS FOR HEALTHIER DIETS A4NH Phase II Proposal Planning meeting Vietnam Country Team (September 14 - 17, 2016)

VENUE: International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)
Agricultural Genetics Institute (AGI), Tu Liem, Hanoi

DAY 1 – Wednesday 14 September

- Morning Arrival of participant
- 12:30 – 13:30 Lunch
- 13:30 – 17:00 Fieldtrip/city trip – exploring food system in Hanoi
- 14:00 Visit of a supermarket: Fivimart on Cau Giay district
 - 15:00 Visit of Rau Bac Tom retail shop
 - 16:00 Visit of the Nghia Tan wet market and exploration of surrounding small streets with street vendors
- 17:00 Back to the hotel

DAY 2 – Thursday 15 September

- 09:00 – 09:30 Welcome (Dr. Alan De Brauw, A4NH-IFPRI, WUR; Dr. Dindo Campilan, CIAT)
- Workshop overview (Dr. Stef de Haan, CIAT)
- 09:30 – 10:15 Session 1: Introduction to A4NH/FSHD
- Presentation A4NH: Dr. Nancy Johnson (IFPRI)
 - Presentation FSDH: Prof. Inge Brouwer (WUR) 10:15 – 10:30 Tea break
- 10:30 – 12:00 Session 2: Food systems for healthier diets: What do we know and what is unknown?
- Presentation Food System Overview: Dr. Delphine Marie-Vivien (CIRAD, MALICA)
 - Presentation Nutrition Situation: Dr. Mai Truong Tuyet (NIN)
 - Panel discussion
- 12:00 – 13:00 Lunch

- 13:00 – 14:30 Session 3: How does FSHD fit in the Vietnamese Development Strategy?
- Presentation Private Sector – Value Chains: Dr. Marion Klaver (Fresh Studio)
 - Presentation Food Safety Issues: Dr. Dao The Anh (CASRAD, MALICA)
 - Panel discussion
- 14:30 – 16:00 Work session in smaller break-out groups: Initial identification of research priorities
- value chains / private sector
 - nutrition / healthy diets
 - policy framework
 - system dimensions
- 16:00 – 16:15 Tea break
- 16:15 – 17:00 Breakout group feedback / wrap up of the day
- 19:00 Street Food Tour (*optional, please register with Ms. Tran, Huyen*)

DAY 3 – Friday 16 September

- 09:00 – 09:15 Welcome and recap of day 2
- 09:15 - 11:00 Session 4: Food Systems in Vietnam - ongoing activities possible 2017 activities
- Work session in smaller break-out groups
 - Guiding questions: What projects are implemented in Vietnam? What is missing? Who are the key actors?
 - Diagnostics and foresight: Which databases are available? What data are missing?
 - Innovative food system action research activities
 - Multi-sectoral/multi-stakeholder platforms on food systems
 - Capacity building on food systems research
- 11:00 – 11:15 Coffee/tea
- 11:15 – 12:30 Session 5: Breakout group feedback and plenary discussion
- Identification of key priorities, data infrastructure, and partners in FSHD in Vietnam
 - Roundtable discussion
- 12:30 – 13:30 Lunch
- 13:30 – 15:00 Outline a 2017 plan of activities among CGIAR and non-CGIAR international and national partners (priority setting)

15:00 – 15:30 Tea break

15:30 – 16:30 Action points and timeline

- Research, including (i) diagnostics and foresight, (ii) food systems innovations
- Scaling and anchoring (including capacity building)
- Others: benchmarking, focus, coordination and communication

16:30 – 17:00 Round-table and wrap up

Side meeting with private partners (facilitated by AIM/GAIN)

15:30 – 17:00 Introduction to FSHD and identified knowledge gaps on innovative food system innovations

- Discussion on ongoing activities and possible interests among private partners to collaborate

17:00 – 18:00 Reception

Only for CGIAR Partners

19:00 – 22:00 Cross CRP meeting to align planned activities and national site integration

DAY 4 – Saturday 17 September

09:00 – 09:30 Introduction, policy impact pathway (Dr. Nancy Johnson, IFPRI)

09:30 – 12:00 Grounding the impact pathway for Vietnam

12:00 – 13:00 Group Lunch

Annex B – List of Participants

List of A4NH-FSHD workshop participants, Hanoi, 15-16 September, 2016

No	Full name	Position	Organization	Signature
1	Mr. Dao The Anh	Director	CASRAD	daotheanh@gmail.com
2	Ms. Nguyen Thi Tan Loc	Department Head	FAVRI	nguyen.thi.tan.loc@gmail.com
3	Mr. Dang Duc Chien	Researcher - Malica Coordinator	RUDEC	dangducchien.rudec@gmail.com
4	Mrs. Mai Truong Tuyet	Vice-Director	NIN	truongmai1976@yahoo.com
5	Mr. Nguyen Van Bac	Researcher	NIN	nguyenhuubac2001@yahoo.com
6	Ms. Nguyen Minh Ngoc	Researcher	NIN	
7	Mrs. Delphine Marie Vivien	Researcher - Malica Facilitator	CIRAD	delphine.marie-vivien@cirad.fr
8	Mrs. Estelle Bienabe	Agricultural Economist	CIRAD	bienabe@cirad.fr
9	Mrs. Le Thi Nga	Researcher	Health Bridge	ngale@healthbridge.org.vn
10	Mrs. Marion Klaver	Marketing & Business Development Consultant	Fresh Studio	marion.klaver@freshstudio.vn
11	Mr. Pierre Ferrand	Coordinator	GRET	ferrand@gret.org
12	Ms. Nguyen Hong Nhung	Researcher	MOIT	nhungnth@moit.gov.vn
13	Mr. Nguyen Minh Nhat	Program Coordinator	FAO	Nhat.Nguyen@fao.org
14	Mr. Stef De Haan	Regional Program Management Officer	CIAT	s.dehaan@cgiar.org
15	Mr. Guy Henry	International Agricultural Economist	CIAT	g.henry@cgiar.org

16	Mr. Christophe Bene	Senior Policy Advisor	CIAT	c.bene@cgiar.org
17	Mr. Brice Even	Market Access Specialist	CIAT	b.even@cgiar.org
18	Mr. Dindo Campilan	Regional Director	CIAT	d.campilan@cgiar.org
19	Ms. Jennifer Kregear	PhD Student	CIAT	jkregear@ucsc.edu
20	Mr. Alan De Brauw	Senior Research Fellow	IFPRI	A.DEBRAUW@CGIAR.ORG
21	Mrs. Nancy Johnson	Agricultural Economist	IFPRI	N.Johnson@cgiar.org
22	Mrs. Inge Brouwer	Associate Professor	WUR	inge.brouwer@wur.nl
23	Mrs. Marrit Van Den Berg	Associate Professor	WUR	marrit.vandenberg@wur.nl
24	Mr. Thom Achterbosch	Senior Researcher	WUR	thom.achterbosch@wur.nl
25	Mr. Herbert Smorenburg	Senior Manager	GAIN	hsmorenburg@gainhealth.org
26	Mrs. Hoang Thi Lua	Project Field Coordinator	ICRAF	L.HoangThi@cgiar.org
27	Mr. Nguyen Viet Hung	Senior Scientist	ILRI	H.Nguyen@cgiar.org
28	Mrs. Roseline Remans	Research Fellow	Biodiversity International	r.remans@cgiar.org
29	Do Nam Khanh	Lecturer	Hanoi Medical School	
30	Ha Lan Anh	Senior marketing and business development consultant	Fresh Studio	anh.ha@freshstudio.vn
31	Le Mai Khanh	Senior Consultant	Fresh Studio	
32	Bhawana Upadhyay	Researcher	RTB-CIP	B.Upadhyay@cgiar.org

33	Frédéric Thomas	Scientist	IRD	Frederic.thomas@ird.fr
34	Madelline Romero	Communications Coordinator	CIAT	m.romero@cgiar.org

Annex C – Crude Notes (from note takers)

Unedited notes from the different sessions (organized in chronological order)

Wednesday, 14 September – Day 1

- Lunch
- Site visit to Fivimart, supermarket
- Site visit Bac Tom, safe vegetable vendor
- Site visit to traditional wet market

Thursday, 15 September - Day 2

- Dr. Alan De Brauw, Senior Research Fellow, IFPRI
 - Flagship focus countries will be Vietnam, Ethiopia, Bangladesh, Nigeria
- Dr. Dindo Campilan, Regional Director, CIAT
 - Vietnam food system has a very large informal sector
 - Rural and urban sectors are blurred
 - Regional disparity calls for a regional focus within Vietnam
 - What are the challenges as food moves across boundaries?
 - Examine food system through a social/cultural lens
 - Set boundaries and expectations given the available resources and foreseeable challenges
- Dr. Stef De Haan, Program Manager, CIAT
 - Develop common understanding and perspectives of how the FSHD flagship fits in the Vietnam context
 - Identify and review trends, knowledge gaps, opportunities, priorities and ongoing activities for improving diets through sustainable food system pathways in Vietnam
 - Brainstorm and outline plan for 2017 activities among partners
 - How to define the food system?
 - Systems research: scales, feedback loops, systems theory and practice, soft and hard systems
- Dr. Nancy Johnson, IFPRI
 - A4NH is a collaborative effort among 12-15 CGIAR centers
 - Strategic goals are improved nutritional and health status
 - Outcomes: Improved diet quality, empowerment of women and poor communities, reduced exposure to agriculture-associated disease, better cross-sector policies and programs and investments
 - Research: value chains, bio-fortification, disease, integrated programs
 - Partnerships driven by impact pathways, researchers, value chain actors, development programs, policy makers
 - Phase one developed new frameworks for understanding pathways through agriculture, evidence, support decision-making, strengthen partnerships, gender integration
 - Goals for phase II: similar results framework, aligned global goals with SDGs

- Budget increased slightly, five CGIAR centers, two university partners, five countries, program structure revised to reflect lessons learned from phase I
- Five flagship programs: Food Systems for Healthier Diets, Bio-fortification, Food Safety, (other two?)
- More support for countries, greater engagement with private sector, more strategic research partners, increased support for other CRPs
- Professor Inge Brouwer, WUR
 - Reduce triple burden of malnutrition, redirect diet trends in a healthier direction, increase nutrition in a sustainable way
 - Diet quality: adequacy moderation, affordable, safe, and desirable
 - Food system: all activities by a broad range of stakeholders in a socio-political, economic, technological and natural environment to create health, synergies, wealth and environment
 - How changes in food systems can lead to healthier diets and what entry points exist for change intervention for all populations, sectors, and on all levels
 - Activities include foods system diagnosis, innovations, and upscaling and anchoring
 - Focus will be on both rural and urban areas and the gradient in between
 - FSHD will compare findings from focus countries to examine cross-national trends
 - Even though other flagships focus on specific aspects of healthy diets, FSHD will examine them through a systems approach
 - Research priorities will vary by country
- Dr. Mai Truong Tuyet, NIN
 - National Nutrition Strategy for 2011-2020, with a look toward 2030: improve diet quantity and quality of the population, focus on mothers and children, improve micronutrient deficiencies
 - National diets have increased protein and lipid intake, and reduced glucid intake since 1985
 - Underweight, stunting, wasting decreased nearly by half 2000-2015, but still ranks high globally
 - Regional micronutrient deficiency disparity: mountains > rural > total > urban
 - Obesity has increased since 2000, especially in urban areas
 - Specific interventions - salt iodization, breastfeeding promotion, education, vitamin A supplement, micronutrient supplements, WASH, home gardening, social protection, women empowerment
 - Poor nutrition concentrated in northwest and central highlands
 - Challenges: not prioritized, few resources, poor management, low capacity, inactive involvement by key actors
 - National Nutritional Action Plan of Action 2016-2020 - food security and zero hunger
 - Micronutrient deficiencies are high possibly due to reduction in vegetable consumption and consumption of high-quality foods
- Dr. Delphine Marie-Vivien, CIRAD, MALICA
 - MALICA research platform for agricultural transition, value chains, quality governance

- Agriculture is key economic sector in Vietnam, with continuous state investment
- Family-run farms are slowly giving away to big private companies
- Agriculture has contributed to economic growth, food security, and poverty reduction
- Consumption transition: fewer staple grains, more animal products, more processed food, more food consumed outside of home, macronutrients improved from 2004-2014, link with calorie intake and income with poor, less strong with middle-class
- Distribution: traditional markets play important role, street vending offers affordability, convenience, freshness, and relationship, government restricting informal markets
- Production: large-scale agriculture seen as more economic, safe, efficient, with more investment; subsistence farmers seen as incapable farm workers, focused on shifting to large-scale agriculture, livestock less dependent than crops, vertical integration, more input and processing actors, large-scale investments, government support shifting to private company financing
- Food safety: high urban demand for food safety, transparency in urban areas, interventions include clean production areas, certification training, value chain restructuring, vertical integration, marketing strategies and brand development to differentiate producers
- Food quality and safety challenges: lack of information, media stresses additives, underemphasizing nutrition, lack of awareness, weak regulation due to competition, lack of resources, lack of infrastructure
- Regional Trade: domestic production responded quickly to the shift in consumption and urbanization, animal feed imports increased, role of agribusiness, ASEAN, China, TPP
- Focus more on healthy foods than healthy diets, food safety and quality, risk of exclusion, diversity in food system, modern does not mean safe
- Panel discussion
 - Where does the perception of small-scale versus large-scale farms originate? How does the increase in large-scale farmers affect diversity? Policy-makers push this perception, depends on the definition of food safety and balance of cash crops and domestic consumption
 - Promoting new cooperatives to increase diversification, Vietnam imports a lot of food, exports a lot of rice, monocultures, diversify local food system to ensure local food security
 - How can the informal food sector feed the growing cities in the future? How do you make sure informal/traditional actors remains involved? Modern does not mean safe, better or more efficient
 - Food from informal market can be safer than food in formal market, but it is hard to communicate this.
 - Traditional markets are not informal but they are being restricted in favor of modern markets, differentiate more between healthy food and healthy diets
 - What factors enable domestic production to keep up with shifting dietary demands? How specific are the issues to specific regions, rather than nationally? Good communication and research system investment by government to

coordinate industry trends, agricultural policies need to shift to responds to new issues that emerge as the food system changes from food security to food safety, different regions are affected differently by climate change making regional challenges very different

- Focusing on healthy foods over healthy diets could address the challenge of micronutrient deficiencies, however, micronutrient deficiencies still persist even when healthy food is available
- Disconnection between the perception of policy-makers with the reality on the ground, how is this explained? Not very strong belief in local research data at government level, evidence from abroad and government-level data more trusted
- Healthy food might be replaced by safe food within a healthy diet, what effect does the certification programs have on prices and livelihoods? Not many studies on effects of certification on consumer side, but it does help on the producer
- Ms. Marion Klaver, Fresh Studio
 - Daily diets, budget, access to healthy food, knowledge, openness, strategies, food safety research through observations, interviews, survey, focus groups
 - Diets appear healthy but suffer from poor nutrition and too much sweet and fat
 - Diet-related diseases are increasing
 - A value chain approach includes quality of agri-food, access to wholesome food, and knowledge and awareness
 - Private sector involvement as a means to the end goal
 - Private sector contributes to standardized procedures, traceability, high quality seeds, post-harvest management
 - Private sector contributes to access through affordability & availability, budget controls dietary choices, improvement of cultivation techniques, raise yields and improves farmer productivity, lower cost price, lower market price, markets are essential for daily vegetable consumption, rationale drives choices, wholesome in the action radius of consumers, increase demand and awareness, education along the value chain from farmer to consumer, create demand through testing, convenience, and innovation
 - What production, retail, government interventions can promote healthy diets?
 - In what channels and socio-economic class are the education campaigns targeted? All consumers are targeted in both supermarkets and traditional markets, and all socio-economic groups are involved in research strategies, different geographical priorities are also considered
 - Do you have access to data collected by private companies? Is the marketing data open access? Raw data is often not available from private sector, and Fresh Studio provides frequent reports of the data they collect, some data sets available for sale
 - Is there research on how consumers define freshness and quality of the product? Perceptions toward quality and freshness are captured and available on the website
 - What are your expectations for involvement in the project and what could Fresh Studio contribute? They are a local business with network in production, consumption and retail sectors, can work to create a domestic food system that is sustainable so that their private sector projects are also sustainable

- How does the government's involvement in the private sector affect their business incentives? Most companies are not state-owned, both international and national companies
- Who are the main clients of Fresh Studio? Would their clients be interested in collaboration with project researchers? Broad range of clients and often work in collaboration with other clients because everything is connected.
- Dr. Dao The Anh
 - The food system has experienced rapid change in the last 5 years, which is often absent from the latest available data
 - Increasing consumer demand for variety in food due to globalization
 - Food safety issues gaining global focus
 - New Food Safety law
 - Food poisoning cases has reduced from 2000-2014
 - Food safety issues include too much pesticide, chemical use in livestock production, transportation inefficiencies, quality of testing methods
 - Asia has high incidence of food borne disease, mainly microbial
 - Food safety issues affect Vietnamese exports
 - Food safety approaches include supply chain focus, preventative measures, regulation coordination, bilateral partnerships, transparency of information
 - Need increase institutional capacity and inter-ministerial and interdepartmental coordination to implement food safety law, or create a single food control agency, currently responsibility of MOH, MARD, MOIT
 - Capacity disparity between national regulation and local regulation, fragmented enforcement, not practical for small-holder farmers
 - Risks include overuse of pesticides, chemical contaminations, but testing resources are not concentrated in the production areas of highest risk, testing focused on market level
 - Consumers do not trust government certifications
 - Focus more of preventative controls, adapt food safety interventions to correlate with traditional food culture, improving food production over infrastructure, good practices over testing
 - Update food safety law, revise institutional arrangement, enhance cooperation, effective risk management, enhance capacities, scaling and adaptability to small producers, low cost implementation, agro-ecology technology, enhanced consumer education
 - Traceability is difficult because small actors rely on pen and paper, no digital documents
 - The perception of the importance of food safety in the food system is not consistent with the importance placed on it by the data. Should we continue to push this agenda given the small risk? Regardless of perception, food safety is a key policy concern and solutions are needed to shift perceptions. Food safety is not just a fatality issue but also one of long-term personal and environmental health and data is weak.
 - How do we increase local capacity for food safety enforcement and implementation? Quality control in food safety testing labs is weak and

- unreliable, lack information sharing, create a value chain that integrates food safety practices throughout, increase efficiency before increasing investment
- Is there research on how food safety effects the food system as a whole and food waste specifically? How does the food system approach add value to the food safety flagship? These issues are not researched
- National working group on food safety launching a report in a couple weeks, food safety is overemphasized through dialogue, local data on the issue is unavailable for a broad risk assessment
- Literature presents food safety as a driver for change in the supply chain. Is change in the supply chain inevitable with increased food safety? The current food safety policy is not working because it does not adapt to the current food market
- Attract private sector in post-harvest of supply chain
- Is there any research on consumer perceptions about regulated food safety labels? Government has refocused their effort on consumer education recently.
- Break-out group – Policy
 - What are the key areas of research that are relevant for the Vietnamese context based on demand? Current knowledge gaps, relevance, adding value, demand driven opportunities
 - What are the key drivers of policy discourse and how does it direct consumption patterns? MARD for food security, food safety, agricultural intensification, ag export; MOH focus on nutrition, lack of coordination leads to fragmentation in policy; MOIT MARD and MOH coordinate only on food safety issues which could provide an example for system coordination, policies for value chain promotion
 - What is "food system" policy in Vietnam? Policy has traditionally been driven by production rather than consumption
 - Private sector is driver for change
 - What factors drove the creation of the food safety law? Consumers, private sector, international actors
 - Defining the policy making dynamic and drivers of policy making, case study for food safety law
 - What is the discourse around evaluating the current development strategy and developing the next strategy document? Food safety law 2010, nutrition development strategy
 - How to promote coordination between ministerial strategy? What is a framework for that coordination? What policy issue is a priority for ministries to coordinate?
 - Define boundaries of the food system in Vietnam, identify a policy priority to be addressed, develop a framework for ministries to coordinate around policy development, understand the policy-making process around food systems
 - Have a better understanding of what agenda, goals, visions, philosophies contribute to policy-making process.
 - What are the drivers? International trade, agriculture policies, consumers, private sectors, relations with China, communist party, narratives/discourse, export markets, central government, socio-economic situation

- Not a lot of FDI in agricultural production because of land policies, private sector is limited because of government intervention in business
- What is the food system policy framework made of?
- Move beyond understanding the process to look at how policy affects change within the food system
- Are farmers and producers included in the policy-making process?
- Food safety is first issue that came from civil society to government in an environment lacking transparency and trust (fishermen protest over poisoned fish from industrial plant)
- What are the key drivers? Who are the key actors? Food safety law case, national nutrition policy case. How does the policy-making process affect the food system? What incentives do the policies give to the consumers and other actors? What are the effects of the outcomes of the policy-making process? Casual mechanism process mapping of driver and actors of policy through to the decisions of producers and nutrition of consumers
- Cost-benefit analysis of malnutrition versus agricultural bio-diversification, human and environmental costs
- What is the center of the food system? Does the food system center around individual consumers? Crops? Value chains? Production methods?

Friday, 16 September

- Break-out group – Policy
 - What are some priority areas in policy on which the research may focus? Food safety policy and animal-source food policy
 - Use the policy process to structure priorities: agenda-setting, design, adoption, evaluation, reform
 - Keep the role of other CRPs in mind when developing food system research question and how we can complement or build on that work
 - Can we add value to the food safety flagship by examining the policy aspect from a food system lens
 - Examine first how the food safety law impacts the food system, and then how does it affect consumer diets and health specifically
 - How does production, land use and trade policy affect consumption of animal products?
 - Focus on consumption drivers as entry point for policy selection
 - Examination of policy process
 - Key current policies affecting diets (COA1)
 - Key stakeholder in the policy processes (COA3)
 - Understand the agenda setting process of food policy (COA3)
 - Institutional coordination and capacity building (COA2)
 - Identify key policy case studies: food safety policy, animal-source food (COA1)
 - Food certification within value chain (COA2)
- Activity cluster break-out – COA2
 - Research Area: methods, tools, metrics becomes first activity for methodological framework

- Where to start: data gap for diet information, need a decent survey of current diets to answer many of the initial diagnostic questions, focus survey on specific locations or demographics (mountains, urban, rural, peri-urban, poor, wealthy), analyze difference between groups, how do we link it to the food system?
 - Metrics need to be combined with analysis of drivers in the system
 - Methods need to remain comparable to other country studies
 - Food system is cluster of available products, socio-economic status, and availability of basic services
- Research area (2017) - dietary pattern in relation to the food system, rural (northern mountains) - peri-urban (Red River delta) - urban (Hanoi, vulnerable populations?), point of access, variation in population density, food preparation, livestock, etc., correspond to agro-ecological zones
- Where do we start –
 - develop metrics, tools, definitions, indicators (SUSFANS, postdoc, workshop/seminar second quarter 2017), food system analysis workshop in Hohenheim, Germany
 - look at existing data/models/knowledge (IPSARD, NIN, GSO, University of Hanoi, MALICA, HealthBridge, Fresh Studio, Bioversity, CIAT, UNICEF)
 - Characterize consumer diets (individual/household level consider gender component) by linking NIN data with LSMS/VHLSS data
 - Identify entry point for innovation
 - Design plan to implement/collect/analyze data and food system linkages
 - Focus - relationship between food source and diets, point of purchase
- Research area (2018) - Examine the drivers of behavior of actors (consumers)
 - Link to data collection on diets in 2018, RIA
 - Consumer food preferences, food choices
 - Level of food chain actors and food chain producers
- Where to start - documents, literature review, stakeholder discussions, scoping exercise on what is available (WUR, CIAT, Fresh Studio, Bioversity, ILRI, MALICA, ACIAR)
- Research area (2017) – policy, Which policies are influencing and how? Diet-food system integration, food safety, agricultural policies, on household level, social protection, consumer protection, supermarketization, trade/FDI, nutrition
- Where to start –
 - scoping paper on policies, documents, literature review, stakeholder discussions
 - key partners from COA3
 - link to drivers, link with PIM (CIAT, WUR, IFPRI, MALICA, Hanoi Medical University)
 - Identify entry point for innovation
 - How can we leverage existing bilateral projects to fund activities? How do we budget for these activities?
- Priority Setting
 - Research area - choices program/labeling
 - Start - Stakeholder workshop, adaptation of international nutritional profiling to local situation, design test market

- Methods - leverage international experience
 - Actors - NIN, lead food industries, Fresh Studio, scientific advisory group
 - Databases - choicesinternational.com, MALICA, VietGAP
- Research area - fresh produce value chain innovation
 - Start - Review Vissan case study, wet market innovation, assess relevant dietary problem to tackle, find relevant partners, design relevant intervention
 - Methods - farmer and postharvest actors training, QC systems & certification, branding and consumer education, evaluation of shopping behavior
 - Actors - Vissan, BacTom, Fivimart
 - Databases - Fresh Studio, MALICA
- Research area - farmer/worker nutrition in organized value chains
 - Start - identify partners, formative research to guide, intervention design
 - Methods - behavior change, communication, home gardening, access to seeds, intercropping, delivered through existing ag extension structures
 - Actors - Commercial value chain actors
 - Databases - GAIN cash crop nutrition program, MALICA, GRET
- Research area - School feeding
- COA1 and COA2 are disjointed in the target audience and goals, innovations do not build on diagnosis
- Be clear about the potential impact pathways on health before implementing innovation
- Can we work with innovation grants to test local innovation proposals instead of creating new ones?
- How can we connect the COA2 ideas with the reality and relevance in Vietnam
- Research area - capacity building
 - Capacity building on nutrition for staff in food system-related sectors, capacity of field workers to link production and nutrition, review current training programs on diet and nutrition, capacity for systems research
 - Start - Assessment of existing capacity, building on and complementary to existing capacity assessments, assessments of capacity building efforts and curricula for nutrition in food system-related sectors
 - Actors - NIN, Women unions, private sector, Hanoi medical university and school of public health
- Research area - engaging with stakeholders and agenda setting
 - Identify and engage key stakeholders for upscaling, understanding agenda setting in public and private policies
 - 2017 - Stakeholders/key actor mapping exercise and analysis, stakeholder engagement meeting, policy process analysis: how are agendas being shaped in Vietnam
 - Networks: MALICA, CANESA, ALISEA (VCCI), ministries: MOA, MOH, MOIT, women's union, CGIAR, social movement networks ("I need organic"), PPPs
- Research area - M&E of upscaling processes
 - M&E tools for food system upscaling processes, platform on lessons learned

- Review examples in Vietnam of successful/unsuccessful upscaling/anchoring of innovations/tools, formulate lessons learned for nutrition food systems scaling, review lessons learned from systems CRPs
 - HealthBridge, SPEAR, PIM, other CRPs
 - Research area - Tools and data
 - Diet monitoring systems, tools that help guide upscaling, extend use vs. expand tools to higher level
 - Assess demand for and use of tools and data
 - What is it that gets us to scale? Capacity, large-scale investment
 - How can we make the COA3 more A4NH specific?
 - Scaling can begin simultaneously with COA1 and COA2 by setting the stage for a facilitating environment
 - What are the enabling factors that allow actors in traditional system and strategies to participate?
 - Does A4NH have plans for data management among CRPs? The scaling up process will monitor the progress of upscaling successful innovation for that flagship, and do not necessarily need to coordinate data across flagships
- Action points and timeline
 - Challenge is the numerous partners; we need to establish key contacts (team) for the country level
 - There is a risk of silos between countries, we need to establish a common framework and decide where each project fits within the system, partner role and contribution
 - Annual gathering?
 - Establish an enabling environment in Vietnam
 - What challenges have the other CRPs experienced in Vietnam and other countries? Too ambitious, poor partner coordination, lack single goal and clear outputs, internal competition among CGs, lack of CRP resources
 - Be proactive on fundraising, identify knowledge gaps, coordinate proposal development, support for resource mobilization, focal points for each actor, clear coordination with local partners and local government, include more Vietnamese organizations or create a steering coming to facilitate in-country coordination from the beginning
 - MALICA's success comes from dynamic research, strong capacity, connections with government, evidence of success, steering committee (meets quarterly), bottom-up approach from the field, effective working groups
 - Establish both an A4NH and a FSHD team in Vietnam to meet regularly in person
 - Create a proposal writing team to secure funding immediately
 - Flagship can formalize coordination through MALICA, include a MALICA representative in the flagship team
 - MALICA is commencing an assessment of past work in order to create a plan for the future, can include A4NH in future planning
 - NIN would be the focal point on the nutrition side, they have monthly network meeting, contact NIN for coordination
 - What are the conditions on which NIN and MALICA would be willing to serve on the country steering committee? What would be their role on the committee?

How do we coordinate data management between the committee members/partners?

- What processes are used for reporting and decision-making?
- Committee members - CIAT Director, VAAS Director, NIN Director, CIRAD Director
- Share research project sites, but be open to other sites
- Wrap-up
 - CIAT will draft a report on the work that's been done during this workshop, including the presentation and group photos
 - Expecting a decision about A4NH phase II funding in November for January 1 start date
 - WUR will lead flagship, leadership, coordination, expectations will be finalized the first three months
 - Attempt to integrate with other CRPs

Thanks everyone!

Annex D – Link to presentations

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/qxdnixgs2kigyIp/AAA73RBQd2xAwIt1bunH3YRna?dl=0>

Annex E – Link to photographs

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/d959dqd1thliuwk/AACNspPcZ1WRPJyrgvBxo11ya?dl=0>