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1. Introduction

The Finnish National Rescue Association SPEK

SPEK is a national, non-profit expert organisation in fire and rescue services, individual emergency planning and civil protection. SPEK aims to improve the safety of Finnish households and society both in everyday life and in emergency conditions and to help people and organisations to prevent accidents and dangerous situations, to take the appropriate precautionary measures and to know what to do in emergencies.

Self-preparedness means prevention of dangerous situations and a capacity to protect people, property and the environment in any given dangerous situation. Good preparedness should prevent dangerous situations, take into account any irregularities in normal conditions and prepare people for emergency conditions, including disruptions in food supply.

Finnish society protects citizens against disruptions that occur in normal times and emergency conditions. Nevertheless, the starting point is that the entire society, beginning from the individual level, must be aware of questions related to preparedness and to be able to act and help others during emergencies. The independent and self-sufficient functioning of individuals and households is understood to be an elemental part of society’s viability and, moreover, an asset during disruptions. (SPEK 2015.) Hence, in case of potential disruptions it is important to improve the ability of citizens to act independently. The first guide for home emergency preparedness considering food security in Finland was published by the Ministry of Employment and Economy in 1966. (Rautavirta 2010, 171-172).

The third sector plays a significant role in home emergency preparedness. As regards preparedness measures the organizations focus on managing and surviving in situations that disrupt the activities of everyday life. The goal is to activate the citizens and bolster their expertise and competences. It is also important to monitor the transformations in society and evaluate any potential future threats.

The most probable threats for food supply include disturbances in the distribution of electricity, heat and water. The increasingly complex chains of production, processing and distribution of food make it ever more difficult to manage disturbances. (SPEK 2015.).

The Committee for Home Emergency Preparedness (KOVA-committee)

Consisting of 18 associations and organizations, the Committee for Home Emergency Preparedness (KOVA) aims to promote household preparedness and capabilities during disruptions and emergencies. The committee was established in 2012 by the Food Supply Cluster – which in turn operates under the auspices of the National Emergency Supply Agency (NESA) – and is coordinated by the Finnish National Rescue Association (SPEK).

The goal of KOVA is to maintain and improve households’ capabilities by encouraging individuals to utilize and uphold the skills and capabilities needed during emergencies. The associations and organizations range from NGO’s to agencies, with the basis that no professional producers or organizations that are directly linked to the security of supply may take part in it. The associations and organizations promote individual and household preparedness and self-sufficiency for example by education on harvesting and use of natural products; by promoting home growing, domestic
gardening and domestic sources of energy; and by supporting and maintaining the Finnish food culture and basic home economic skills. (SPEK 2016.)

As home emergency preparedness is largely advanced by the KOVA committee in Finland, the participants in the two workshops consisted predominantly of members from the organisations and associations from the committee.

2. Workshop 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Havumäki, Hanna</td>
<td>National Emergency Supply Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Härmälä, Kaisa</td>
<td>The Martha Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juhola, Riku</td>
<td>National Emergency Supply Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolle, Kaarina</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kähkönen, Aili</td>
<td>The Finnish Food and Drink Industries’ Federation (ETL) / National Emergency Supply Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lönnqvist, Irina</td>
<td>The National Defence Training Association of Finland (MPK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mäkipaakkanen, Miikka</td>
<td>Dodo (environmental NGO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paloviita, Ari</td>
<td>University of Jyväskylä, Food System Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peltonen, Karim</td>
<td>The Finnish National Rescue Association (SPEK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouhunkoski, Tuomas</td>
<td>Agency for Rural Affairs (MAVI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seitovirta, Leena</td>
<td>The Finnish National Rescue Association (SPEK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velin, Helena</td>
<td>Rural Women’s Advisory Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first workshop was organized on the 2nd of May from 9.00-16.00. The workshop was attended by twelve participants, two facilitators, two secretaries and Ariella Helfgott as a methodological support. Six of the participants were members of the KOVA-committee, two attended on behalf of the SPEK, two others were representatives of environmental NGO’s, one of the attendees was a researcher from Food system studies research group based on University of Jyväskylä and one was a representative of the Food Supply Cluster.
2.1 Outline and timing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:00</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-11:00</td>
<td>Visioning and goals in plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-13:00</td>
<td>Back-casting in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-16:00</td>
<td>Development of local scenarios (in groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:30</td>
<td>Closing words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop started by introducing the TRANSMANGO-project, the SPEK and the concept of home emergency preparedness. In addition, Ariella Helfgott introduced herself and facilitators gave a short overview to the methodology of scenario working as well as to the programme of the first workshop. In the end of the first session all the participants were asked to introduce themselves and the organisations they were representing.

2.1.1 Activity 1: Visioning and goals

In the second session the visioning of desired future was carried out. At the first phase participants discussed about the elements of hoped-for future in pairs. They wrote the elements to the post-its, one element per note and 5 to 10 per pair. Then the post-its were clustered in plenary in order to find clear outlines for alternative desired futures for home emergency preparedness. We were able to form five different clusters:

1. Personalized preparedness  
2. Communal preparedness  
3. Home Emergency Preparedness as a part of city and community planning  
4. Alternative supply chains and preparedness  
5. Survival and preparedness education (civics)

The plenary was discussing about the clusters and every participant was given eight sticky dots for the vote. Everyone could use the votes according to her/his own preferences. Consequently, it was possible, for example, to give all the votes to the one cluster or share them equally. In the election two of the clusters gathered most of the votes and these clusters were chosen to the goals of the scenario work. The goals were “Home Emergency Preparedness as a part of city and community planning” and “personalized preparedness”. The plenary group of twelve participants was divided to two small-groups according the goals. The small-groups were formed beforehand by facilitators to guarantee the diversity of the groups. Participants decided on the time span for the scenario work. The plenary agreed to work with the time span from 2016 to 2030. In the end of the session the facilitator explained the basic lines of the next task, which was back-casting. It was done by utilizing everyday examples of daily back-casting that people naturally tend to do.
2.1.2 Activity 2: Back-casting
In the session three the small-groups carried out back-casting. There were flip chart papers ready with the drawn timeline from 2016 to 2030 on the table. The goals were written in the left end of the timeline and the group began the vivid discussion about the concrete actions that should be taken to achieve the set aim on 2030. The actions were written to post-its and placed on the timeline. In addition to the concrete proposals of action also plenty of more abstract elements were discussed and included in the back-casting.

2.1.3 Activity 3: Developing local scenarios
After the lunch, in the fourth session, the EU-level scenarios – one to each group – were delivered to the participants. Given the number of attendees, it was reasonable to address two scenarios. The chosen scenarios were The Protein Union and The Price of Health. The facilitator explained the aim and the course of action of the session to the participants. Next they got 10-15 minutes time to read the scenarios, which were translated into Finnish. Participants discussed in pairs what kind of consequences the given scenario would mean in the Finnish context and in the context of home emergency preparedness. All the pairs figured out 5-10 most important elements in the context of home emergency preparedness and wrote one element on the post-it. Then the post-its were clustered to find out the most important themes for the future scenarios in Finnish conditions. The clusters and the reasons for the supposed developments were discussed and validated.

Scenario 1: The Protein Union is a story of a highly proactive response by the EU and its member countries, led by governments but supported by the private sector and civil society, to the challenge of changing European diets and modes of production. The focus is on creating new protein sources, including mainstreaming insect consumption and the production of artificial quasi-meats, supported by new, more integrated means of food production and processing, at the expense of the livelihoods of smaller farmers. This is combined with strong action on reducing sugar consumption closer to 2050, which nevertheless cannot avoid the legacy of unhealthier diets in earlier times.

Scenario 2: The Price of Health is a story that sees many Europeans returning to rural lives, out of necessity due to global pressures, because of changing social norms, and facilitated by technological advances in communications. These changes are supported by strong government policies regarding self-reliance and sustainability. Not everyone, however, is happy to be returning to the land – and the wealthiest do not have to follow suit.

2.2 Outcomes
The main outcomes from the first workshop were the localized scenarios, Protein-innovative Finland and Back to the Rural Future. As the goals and back-castings were expanded and built upon further in the second workshop, these will be presented later in the chapter “2- Workshop”.

2.2.1 Protein-innovative Finland (Proteiini-innovatiivinen Suomi)
Core of the story: Protein-innovative Finland is a story of Finland, where traditional agricultural subsidies are redirected and the state is investing strongly on food technology and developing new protein sources. Agriculture is concentrated on large industrial enterprises, which co-operate actively with research institutes, universities and food industry. There are novel protein sources –
such as processed insects, alternative plant proteins, mushrooms, in vitro meat, lake fish products as well as local protein feedstuffs - under development and some of them already on commercial market. Also traditional livestock farming has survived, although in decreased volume. Climate change impacts are gradually improving agricultural conditions. Immigration grows fast. Because of change in traditional economic structure and mass immigration number of people living at risk of exclusion is growing in Finland even though social differences have generally decreased in Europe. Finnish people are broadly within the service of public catering. NGO’s have a strong national role in food skills education and improving nutrition awareness of the population.

The road to 2030: After 2015 there is a wake-up for Finland that the country, as well as many other European countries, is dependent on imported proteins. Majority of imported soya is used as feed for the cattle. At the same time, climate change awareness grows, animal rights are a hot topic and diet related diseases and obesity increase. The State Nutrition Council and several NGO’s that are committed to promote health and welfare strongly recommend people to switch to vegetable and fish intensive diets. Many of the people are ready for the change. Consequently, developing alternative protein sources and investing in improving food technology is considered to be profitable. The government encourages strongly to trace new innovations, which might have later potential to be productized as export items. Earlier input to bio-economy supports this development.

Traditional agriculture survives but farm sizes grow remarkably and production is strongly intensified. This results in increasing negative environmental impacts in agriculture. Along with rising food technology also novel protein feedstuffs, for example, domestic chicken feed, are developed. Poultry is considered healthy and climate friendly alternative for red meat.

Until 2030 number of farms has decreased dramatically and agricultural production is concentrated to large industrial farms. Research and development on the field of food technology has produced good results. There are novel protein sources under development and some new products, such as insects, alternative plant proteins, mushrooms, synthetic meat, lake fish products and domestic protein feedstuffs, have already been launched to the market. Some of the products have also been successful as export items. Under these circumstances traditional agricultural subsidies are given up and resources are redirected to research and development on food sector. This increases public funding on the field. Farms work intensively in connection to the research and development units and, hence, benefit from the subsidies through co-operation. Gains in terms of synergy are remarkable. There are lots of emerging pop-up enterprises in food processing. The supply chains of processed insects, in vitro meat and lake fish are established by 2040 and the availability of the products is good. Also the number of export items is growing.

Because of change in traditional economic structure and mass immigration the number of people living at risk of exclusion and poverty is growing. For example, sugar tax imposed by the EU, drives many bakeries, confectioners and refreshment producers to bankruptcy. Consequently, tens of thousands of people lose their jobs. Social inequality increases and, even though, food security is mainly guaranteed, there is great deficiencies in the diets of the lowest income quintile. The problem is addressed by nutrition recommendations, improving public catering (i.e. school lunches, work site lunches and meals in day-care centres) and active food and nutrition education done by NGO’s.
Protein-innovative Finland in 2050: In 2050 Finland is protein self-sufficient. Consumers have mainly accepted insects and in vitro meat as a part of their diets. In addition the consumption of mushrooms, lake fish and pulses has increased remarkably. However, minority of the consumers still favour traditional meat- and dairy products. Especially consumption of poultry – which is fed with Finnish protein fodder - is substantial.

Small scale farms have shut down as unprofitable. Large scale industrial farms co-operate actively with research institutes and food processing industry. As a result there is a small but growing group of novel protein sources, which have found their way to export markets and food processing industry is flourishing. Investments in developing functional foodstuff are intensive. Small minority of the Finns prefers to produce some of their food by themselves. Urban agriculture, vegetable patches and different forms of community farming are popular among the people enjoying alternative ways of life.

Increasing social inequality and polarization are great concerns. Although, food security is mainly guaranteed, there are multiple deficiencies in diets of growing number of people living at risk of exclusion or in actual poverty. On the population level diets are clearly class based. Also, diet related diseases are common. Both public and third sector actors are trying to guide dietary habits to more healthy direction. In addition, food industry is active in developing new functional foods. On the other hand, also the number of highly educated people, who are very well aware of the impacts of food and nutrition for health and well-being, has grown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food and nutrition security</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Food industry</th>
<th>Connection to global food security</th>
<th>Climate impacts of the food system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general food security is guaranteed, but diet related diseases are still common. Growing number of people living at risk of exclusion is a specific challenge. Diets are class based and disadvantages cumulate in lower income groups.</td>
<td>Agriculture is concentrated and industrialized. It is strongly connected to the development of food technology. Climate change impacts improve agricultural conditions gradually. Negative environmental impacts of agriculture increase.</td>
<td>Intensive investing in research and development of food technology results in flourishing, innovative, export-driven food industry. Functional foods are a new priority.</td>
<td>Finland acts as a part of EU-level trade policy. Quantitatively export of food is not globally significant. Rather, exports are high quality alternative protein sources.</td>
<td>There is still domestic animal production, but the consumer habits have changed from red meat and dairy products to poultry, lake fish and plant proteins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 Back to the Rural Future (Paluu maaseudun tulevaisuuteen)

Core of the story: Back to the Rural Future is a story of Finland, where increasing uncertainty and the prolonged economic recession in tandem with the fall of universal welfare structures have led to widespread migration to rural areas. Social polarization has emerged between rural and urban citizens as well as between social classes. On the other hand, solidarity and communality characterises the rural areas.
Food production, processing and consumption are governed and guided by environmental legislature and “pro-health-taxes” set forth by the European Union and the Finnish government. Frequent food scandals leading to food scares have led to growing distrust towards foreign food stuff and consumers are increasingly interested in the origin of the food consumed. This, in conjunction with migration to rural areas, has contributed to a bottom-up professionalization of grassroots activities and cooperative means of production.

**Road to 2050:** The economic crisis endures; northbound migration from Northern Africa, the Middle East and Southern Europe continues; social polarization increases; the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) trade agreement has not brought about the foreseen positive impact on European economy; and in Finland the anti-EU parties win the next elections. Speculations and discussion on the possible Finnish NATO membership strain the Finnish-Russian-relations and hinder export of goods to east. Global tensions and the geopolitical position of Finland cause collective fear among the population.

The security of food stuff originating outside Europe is challenged after frequent food scandals and food scares. Citizens are increasingly interested in the origin of food and prefer to acquire food as locally as possible. Distrust extends throughout the food system, including processing and retail, which leads to consumers bypassing parts of the supply chain, preferring to either purchase directly from the producers or even producing food themselves. Grassroots production, such as allotment gardening, urban agriculture and food circles, quickly transform into broader cooperative models and enterprises. At the same time export-oriented production – directed mostly towards internal EU-markets – concentrates to a few large operators.

As economic recession continues, structures of the Finnish welfare state begin to fall apart. This hastens the polarization of the nation and mediates the need for individual household preparedness. However the divided groups find common cause in smaller units and communities, and communality and cooperation is especially characteristic in the rural areas. Individualistic responsibility takes precedence over universalistic ethos, and eventually legislation comes to include a clause on citizens’ responsibility in emergency preparedness. The food and nutrition aspect of preparedness is expensive for those who live in urban areas and have to buy their food stuff wholly from retail. Hence, the polarization of society is expressly present in urban areas, where the slowly-but-surely decaying “skid rows” contrast the elite districts.

By the 2020’s environmental degradation is a widely recognized issue, which leads to a preference of organic food and shorter supply chains. Simultaneously, partially due to increasing concern over pollinators, harsh environmental politics and legislature is widely considered justified. The attitudes towards genetic modification and industrial biocides are progressively more negative.

On one hand, these developments are a return to a circa 1950’s, pre-urbanization, rural Finland. On the other hand, the technological advances are present, most notably in energy production. National energy production is decentralized, which renders the production and supply of electricity more resilient than before. Agriculture provides full-time employment for some, while others work part-time in both food production and in other fields of business – the latter most often as remote.

**Finland in 2050:** Urbanization has reversed into migration to rural areas. Participation in cooperative means of production and other pursuits towards self-sufficiency are common due to the decline in individual income. Many urban-dwellers consider this development as a return to the past. Social
polarization is present between urban and rural areas as well as between immigrants (and those of immigrant decent) and those who perceive themselves as “original” or “native” Finns.

EU- and government-imposed laws on unhealthy food govern consumption. Only the rich can afford expensive and unhealthy products and imported, luxury foodstuff. In general, diets are vegetarian-oriented and healthy. Improved public health has reduced the expenses of public healthcare.

Technological advances, increase in automation and new means of energy production penetrate the food supply chain. Logistics chains are shorter and local production is preferred. Agriculture has become the mainstay of the country’s economy, supported by both cooperative means as well as the few large industries. The links between consumers and producers are formed online and the use of new information and communication technologies is high. Due to these technology mediated forms of communication and trade, retail is often bypassed, which has led to the dismantling of the dominating market positions of S-Group and Kesko. A few new innovations in plant-based (export-oriented) products have emerged, such as pulled oats. The national clean water reserves are also utilized and exported, though in strict state supervision and national ownership.

Food is held in high respect, which is apparent in the time spent in producing, processing and preparing food. Traditional welfare state structures notwithstanding, the responsibility for preparedness lies on the level of individuals and households, and regional differences between rural and urban areas are glaring; in rural areas, preparedness revolves around self-sufficiency, local production and solidarity, whilst in urban areas individual FNS and preparedness is dependent on the level of income and economic situation of individuals or households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food and nutrition security</th>
<th>Agricultural systems</th>
<th>Post-farm food system activities</th>
<th>Interactions with global food security</th>
<th>Environmental impacts of the food system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals and households are responsible for maintaining FNS. The level of FNS varies; especially the urban poor are struggling to maintain FNS. In general, dietary habits are healthy due to the “pro-health” taxation.</td>
<td>Agriculture is run by a few large corporations in tandem with a large number of cooperative farms and other associations that produce locally. Farms are principally self-sufficient in energy production, technologically highly advanced and environmentally friendly and sustainable. A portion of the production is dictated by the EU and for the internal markets. Low levels of animal based production.</td>
<td>Technological advances alongside increasingly tough attitudes towards heavily processed foodstuff have resulted in smaller production units and a preference of local products. The duopoly of S Group and Kesko has dismantled and the era of hypermarkets has come to an end.</td>
<td>Finnish exports consist of plant-based, high-protein innovations and the national fresh water supply. In other respect, the protectionist policies of the EU and Finland limit further possibilities for interactions.</td>
<td>Sustainability and organic production are held in high value and new technologies have reduced emissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Workshop 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juhola, Riku</td>
<td>National Emergency Supply Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalervo, Laura</td>
<td>Suomen Partiolaiset – Finlands Scouter ry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kähkönen, Alli</td>
<td>The Finnish Food and Drink Industries’ Federation (ETL) / National Emergency Supply Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurikainen, Heikki</td>
<td>The Finnish National Rescue Association (SPEK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peltonen, Karim</td>
<td>The Finnish National Rescue Association (SPEK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rautavirta, Kaija</td>
<td>University of Helsinki, Department of Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouhunkoski, Tuomas</td>
<td>Agency for Rural Affairs (MAVI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seitovirta, Leena</td>
<td>The Finnish National Rescue Association (SPEK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second workshop was organized on the 17th of May from 9.00-16.00. The workshop was attended by eight participants, two facilitators and two secretaries. There were some no-shows and two of the attendees were able to stay only half of the day, because of some overlapping events. Also, this time our methodological support Ariella Helfgott was unfortunately prevented. Five of the participants were members of The Committee for Home Emergency Preparedness (KOVA) and three of them represented SPEK.

3.1 Outline and timing

| Day 2               |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Time                | Activity                                                                    |
| 9:00-09:30          | Recap and reminder                                                          |
| 9:30-10:00          | Scenario review and changes                                                 |
| 10:00-11:30         | Scenario-guided review of plans (part 1)                                    |
| 11:30-12:30         | Lunch                                                                       |
| 12:30-14:00         | Scenario-guided review of plans (part 2)                                    |
| 14:00-15:00         | Discussion and comments                                                     |
| 15:00-15:30         | Next steps and wrapping up                                                  |

Because some of the attendees were first timers the workshop started by introduction of the TRANSMANGO-project, SPEK and the concept of home emergency preparedness. In addition, facilitators gave a short overview to the methodology of scenario working as well as to the programme of the workshop. In the end of the first session all the participants were asked to introduce themselves and the organisations they were representing.
3.1.1 Activity 1: Scenario review and changes
In the second session the participants were divided to two small groups that were formed beforehand to guarantee the diversity of the groups. The scenarios created in the first workshop were delivered to the participants. They were given 10 minutes time to read the transcribed scenarios and next there was a general discussion in the small groups to check that the transcribed scenarios correspond to the scenarios created at the first workshop. In the end of the session the scenarios were named as Protein innovative Finland and Back to the Rural Future.

3.1.2 Activity 2: Scenario guided review of plans (part 1)
In the third session the action plans / transition pathways were modified to be compatible with the accepted scenarios. During the first hour the group imagined what kind of situation there was in Finland when the scenario had come true and what kind of challenges that reality would cause to the action plan made in the first workshop. We chose one of the participants to act as a secretary, who made notes and presented the results later in the fifth session to the plenary. The strengths and weaknesses of the action plan were recognized. Then it was discussed about the possibilities to strengthen the weak points and the most important development goals were chosen. Next there was a discussion about the concrete ways to promote the action plan in the conditions of given scenario. In the end of this session the small group got first time the scenario of another group to read and discuss.

3.1.3 Activity 3: Scenario guided review of plans (part 2)
The fourth session had same kind of structure than the previous one. The only difference was that now the small groups were modifying the action plan that they made during the first workshop compatible with another scenario, which was totally new for them. During the first hour the group imagined what kind of Finland there were, if the second scenario had come true, and what kind of challenges that reality would cause to the action plan in hands. The strengths and weaknesses of the action plan were recognized, it was discussed about the possibilities to strengthen the weak points and the most important development goals were chosen. Then we discussed about the concrete ways to promote the action plan in the conditions of given scenario.

3.1.4 Activity 4: Feedback on plans and scenarios
The fifth session was plenary where both of the groups presented their scenarios and action plans on the conditions the chosen scenario came true. Both of the groups gave feedback for each other and the action plans were still slightly modified on base of this feedback.

This was followed with a general discussion and closing of the workshop by the cup of coffee and refreshments.

3.2 Outcomes
The goal of the second workshop was to “bombard” the goals and backcastings from the previous workshop with the obstacles and impediments as well as the chances and possibilities provided in the localized scenarios.
3.2.1 Protein-innovative Finland (PiF)

Additions to scenario
The role of media (both mainstream and alternative) and trust in mainstream media as an outlet for nutrition and health advice was discussed briefly. The polarization of the people begins at an early age, which is especially relevant in the case of national nutrition guidelines.

Another topic was the general trust in the quality of foodstuff: at the moment the Finnish people are more or less content with the safety and overall quality of food, but what if this trust is contested in the future?

Main goal: Home Emergency Preparedness as a part of city and community planning
The table below presents the back casted plan towards Home Emergency Preparedness as a part of city and community planning. The main goal was divided into four sub-goals:

1. Increasing awareness and stimulating interest
2. Integrating administration to the goal of home emergency preparedness
3. To integrate urban and community planning as well as regulations for planning permissions to support preparedness
4. Productising home emergency preparedness

Comments and feedback from the second workshop are presented in **bolded & italics**.
### General remarks:
- **Protein-innovative Finland:**
- **Are communal kitchens etc. possible? A question of individualism vs. communality**
- **Back to the Rural Future:**
  - The key vulnerable group is the urban population (polarization between rural and urban population is high)
  - Are cooperatives responsible for preparedness?
  - Communicating HEP is harder in this scenario

### Main goal: Preparedness as a part of urban and community planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-2020</th>
<th>2021+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-goal 1:</strong> Increasing awareness and stimulating interest</td>
<td><strong>General goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Change of attitudes on all levels of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lobbying</td>
<td>• Change of attitudes on all levels of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilizing social media</td>
<td>• The people are aware of the actors and responsibilities on the field of preparedness i.e. division of labour between the state, municipalities, housing cooperatives and individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introducing the motto of 72 hours (everyone should be able to cope for 72 hours without outside assistance)</td>
<td>• Maintaining awareness of preparedness as well as “preparedness behaviour” as a part of everyday routine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activating the third sector</td>
<td>o <em>PIF-scenario: HEP should not be about potential threats and dangers (negativities) but rather about feeling secure in everyday life.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifying vulnerable groups</td>
<td>• Ability to cope for 72 hours without outside assistance as self-evident routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <em>PIF-scenario: Multiple means of communication according to various groups identified + communicating to the relatives of those who are otherwise non-responsive to communication</em></td>
<td>o <em>PIF-scenario: What is the timespan in this scenario? How about in other possible futures?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoting and educating people to utilize natural products</td>
<td>• PIF-scenario: Reliance on shops being always open hampers preparedness-thinking. Also, communication must be aware of the risk of hoarding (sense of security is crucial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>PIF-scenario: Civics back in schools? To promote knowledge of preparedness both at the national and individual levels.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>BttRF-scenario: In urban areas the poorer you are the less likely you are to be able to be prepared – how can this be solved? Universal basic income?</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sub-goal 2: Integrating administration | Disseminating good practices nationally and internationally |
| Lobbying the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health | |
| Lobbying the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry | |
| Lobbying the Ministry of the Interior | |
| Lobbying the Ministry of Education and Culture | |
## to the goal of home emergency preparedness

- Lobbying the Ministry of Employment and the Economy
- Strengthening the role of the National Emergency Supply Agency
- Strengthening the cooperation between private, public and the third sector
  - **PIF-scenario**: As the role of retail and catering becomes the key element, strengthening preparedness in retail sector is vital (preparedness planning in public catering is administrated by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health)
- **PIF-scenario**: What is the role of citizens from the ministry point of view?
- **PIF-scenario**: Workforce during crisis in municipality level? Those that cannot come to catering services must be provided with the same services at homes, institutions etc.
- **PIF-scenario**: Level of preparedness in the energy sector? Especially in the processing industry.
- **BttRF-scenario**: Universal basic income could be beneficial in the (re)ruralisation process, as it would allow more time for day-to-day/casual preparedness

## Sub-goal 3:

### To integrate urban and community planning as well as regulations for planning permissions to support preparedness

- Planning permissions to support spontaneous preparedness
- Adequate storages in apartments
  - **PIF-scenario**: Housing in the future? Kitchens, storage etc.
- Fresh water tanks in housing cooperations
- Common grills and gas stoves in housing cooperations
- Fire places, cold stores, common small dryers for drying e.g. mushrooms, fruits, herbs
- Utilizing solar and wind energy, geothermal heat and renewable bioenergy
- Supporting and promoting urban agriculture in urban and community planning
  - **PIF-scenario**: Piloting housing cooperatives?
  - **BttRF-scenario**: If social unrest and criminal behaviour are widespread in urban areas, is it possible or reasonable to build and maintain this kind of infrastructure?
- Favouring edible landcapes in planning parks and greeneries.
- Bomb shelters – if there is one in the housing cooperation, it is usually not in any use – to service preparedness

- Increasing urban domestic animal production e.g. city chickens.
- Promoting community kitchens
- Decreasing dependency on centralized distribution structures
- Green rooms for domestic vegetable production and terrariums for insect production as a norm
- Promoting local, renewable, alternative sources of energy
- Establishing experimental “Spontaneous preparedness housing cooperation” and including in as many supportive elements to individual preparedness as possible in order to test impacts of planning to the “preparedness behavior” of the residents.
### Sub-goal 4: Productising home emergency preparedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BttRF-scenario</strong></td>
<td>Storage facilities are especially vital in urban areas (bomb shelters could be the answer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PiF-scenario</strong></td>
<td>How much personalization is possible in a future where preparedness is based on catering? How divided are individual eating habits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BttRF-scenario</strong></td>
<td>Cooperatives are significant stakeholders in this scenario and hence should be targeted and treated as such (for example the Finnish fire brigade has its roots in similar progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BttRF-scenario</strong></td>
<td>Networks (both official and unofficial) play a major part in this scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BttRF-scenario</strong></td>
<td>Market places could be promoted as the intersection for urban-rural exchange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PiF-scenario**:
- The need of piloting and consultation of consumers
- Refining the timespan of individual preparedness (72h) according to possible changes in the overall preparedness planning
- Preparedness should be marketed in a positive manner, not through fear mongering.

**Emerging innovations to productizing the idea of spontaneous preparedness**
- Emerging business models for the innovations
  - The Finnish Funding Agency for Innovation (Tekes) and The Finnish Innovation Fund Sitra invest on emerging business models and the first products will be on the market.
3.2.2 Back to the Rural Future (BttRF)

**Additions to scenario**
The reason and root cause for the scenario was discussed again, with the general remark being that the localized scenario did not provide a coherent reason for this particular string of events to unfold. Economic recession by itself was deemed an insufficient reason for ruralisation and the urban decay. It was therefore proposed, that the introduction to *Back to the Rural Future* should include a paragraph that shortly informs the reader that the social structure and societal harmony have fallen apart.

**Main goal: Personalized preparedness**
The table below presents the back casted plan towards personalized preparedness. The main goal was divided into five sub-goals:

1. Citizens are interested in home emergency preparedness and in maintaining the emergency supply
2. Preparedness takes into account both the individual skills & know-how as well as values, ideologies and cultural differences
3. Differences in housing and living conditions acknowledged
4. Different age groups etc. taken into account
5. Preparedness in the light of new innovations

Comments and feedback from the second workshop are presented in *bolded & italics.*
### General remarks:

- **Back to the Rural Future:**
  - HEP is above all an idea (as opposed to a boxed supply kit)
  - How can KOVA committee reach immigrants in Finland?

- **Protein-innovative Finland:**
  - How can KOVA make preparedness interesting to the population that is rather well off?
  - Change in focus: from citizens’ guidance to working between citizens and public catering (in the case of a larger crisis)
  - Citizens rely solely on catering practices and retail (minimal connections to agriculture or alternative production chains)

### Main goal:

**Personalized preparedness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-2020</th>
<th>2021+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Personalization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest group &amp; stakeholder analysis → essential groups identified for further communications and activities</td>
<td>New partners and cooperation with private sector → HEP is adequately resourced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential in both scenarios</td>
<td>BttRF-scenario: KOVA committee’s role could be expanded further? Governance of preparedness activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the “dissolution of norms”, personalized preparedness is unfeasible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential in both scenarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized KOVA committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOVA is constantly on the lookout for new NGO’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of immigrants? Focal point especially in the BttRF-scenario.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction and cooperation with e.g. the EU or other international entities/organizations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of private industries?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PiF-scenario: KOVA’s main agenda is to normalize preparedness (not survivalism, but a normal procedure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-goal 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-2020</th>
<th>2021+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media coverage:</strong></td>
<td><strong>HEP and household preparedness is well known</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Citizens are interested in home emergency preparedness and in maintaining the emergency supply**

- Public figures as representatives of HEP → interest group specific marketing
- “Branding” of HEP
- **Essential in PiF-scenario**
  - PiF-scenario: Is the role of KOVA to be the harbinger – to remind citizens of possible threats?
  - PiF-scenario: Information and guidance is not enough – concrete preparedness rehearsals, black-out-simulations etc.

- HEP as an export
- Citizens are interested in preparedness – both their own and others’
- BttRF-scenario: Citizens are, by circumstances provided in the scenario, already interested in preparedness and some even self-sufficient → no need for widespread branding.

**Sub-goal 2: Preparedness takes into account both the individual skills & know-how as well as values, ideologies and cultural differences**

- Involving citizens in preparedness planning
- Dissolution of norms: ensuring the legislature enables novel producer-consumer chains  
  → citizens’ direct linkages to producers 
  → food chains in social media (power outages?)
- Grassroots, small-scale and cooperative production preparedness-wise (demands a report?)

- BttRF-scenario: Respect for food will rise and the concept of food will change, which makes it hard to foresee cultural and ideological values related to food and preparedness
- PiF-scenario: If citizens are heavily relying on public catering, does this lead to a false sense of security? Are there even people with no individual food skills left?

**Sub-goal 3: Differences in housing and living conditions acknowledged**

- Survey to map the need for certain services (communal drying, juicing etc.)
  (→ creating demand) 
  → impacting the service structure

- Communal preparedness in urban areas
- BttRF-scenario: Is there a possibility for preparedness in decayed urban areas?
- BttRF-scenario: The divide between rural and urban Finland broadens → different HEP-activities in rural and urban areas.
- BttRF-scenario: Linkages between urban/hi-tech and rural/organic preparedness? (E.g. barter economy)
- BttRF-scenario: Local-level preparedness within Finland, e.g. Lapland compared to more densely inhabited areas?
- PiF-scenario: is urban housing heading towards a future, where kitchens are deemed unnecessary?  
  Urban preparedness might consist of processed foods that do not require cooking or are easily cooked in microwave etc. (danger of reducing HEP to a supply
### Sub-goal 4: Different age groups etc. taken into account

- Civics/civil know-how and skills from an early stage
  - Organizations and schools in collaboration
  - Civics, skills and know-how in afternoon clubs
- **PiF-scenario:** HEP in accordance with the national nutrition guidelines

- Preparedness in the curriculum
- Level of self-sufficiency in schools
- Changes in demography are hard to forecast (especially in the scenarios), but this has to be taken into account.
- BttRF-scenario: if the state is no longer responsible for individual preparedness, the groups at risk now will become even more vulnerable → leads to a broader definition of the nuclear family?
- PiF-scenario: If public catering takes primary responsibility for HEP, it has to take into account different cultural as well as nutritional needs.

### Sub-goal 5: Preparedness in the light of new innovations

- Attitude education towards accepting quasi-meat, insects and other novel food stuff

- New technologies and other advances taken into account (3D-printed food, quasi-meat, insects etc.)
- BttRF-scenario: In the scenario, people are forced to accept new food stuff, regardless of attitudes.
- PiF-scenario: is HEP turning into a ready-to-eat supply kit in this scenario? Energy bars, canned food, quasi-meats etc. could be mixed and matched to individual’s preferences.

### Added sub-goal: Public trust and confidence in individual preparedness (Protein-innovative Finland)

- Reliance on public catering might lead to a false sense of security → what happens in time of a (infrastructural) crisis?
- Public confidence in preparedness should be focused on (lack of public trust could lead to hoarding etc.)
3.2.3 General remarks

In this section we have gathered some general remarks and discussion from the latter part of the second workshop that were not presented in the tables above.

Protein-innovative Finland

The main issue in the scenario was, in the scope of HEP, a “too well-off society”; when the reliance on uninterrupted daily food shopping and/or use of catering services becomes taken for granted, preparedness might not interest citizens and the public trust in individual preparedness is bound to be low. This begs the question, what is the driver for trust in this scenario and how is this communicated to the public? It was suggested, that in times of societal polarization, the longing for a sense of security will rise and that food and nutrition will be crucial in creating that feeling of security.

High-priced housing in tandem with high use of public catering services will reduce the role of home cooking, which might even lead to the disappearance of kitchens in some flats. This might have several implications in regards to HEP – e.g. the possibility of food mailboxes was considered (a service that would deliver foodstuff directly to the vicinity of kitchenless block of flats, perhaps even in an automated tube system) – but all in all, a creation of an additional link to the food system would increase the vulnerabilities (e.g. automated delivery systems and blackouts etc.).

The infrastructures that maintain and enable preparedness can also benefit other goals, such as eco-efficiency throughout society, national self-sufficiency in energy etc. Centralization and large production and other units are a double-edged sword: this development might inflict vulnerabilities and increase challenges on a local level, but it also enables innovation and technological advances.

As the role of (public) catering is central in this scenario, the question of “who should prepare” was proposed – should the HEP activities be implemented on a public service level, rather than the individual or household level? In contrast to the Back to the Rural Future, in this scenario the communication and branding of HEP is essential. A more hands-on approach to preparedness was proposed (simulations, training sessions etc.), though at the same time the sense of security remains a focal point – i.e. how to create a sense of trust in preparedness without sparking feelings of insecurity among the people. In the end, a “Home Emergency Preparedness is everyday life management” approach was deemed the most suitable communications strategy.

This scenario was perceived and interpreted highly differently by the two groups, which lead to a vivid and lively discussion.

Back to the Rural Future

This scenario was perceived as a gloomy future in which the importance of networks is emphasized. Thus, if there are ruptures in these networks or in the cooperation between groups within society, there is little resilience concerning preparedness. Trust is a central issue: Finland at the present is a high-trust society, but what are the implications of veering into polarization, as is suggested in the scenario?

Fragmented and polarized people will increase the challenges in communicating HEP, as the communication needs are manifold. The lack of mention of mid-level governance, and subsequently
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of what role this would play in communicating and governing preparedness in this particular scenario, was problematic for the discussion.

The possibilities and prospects for urban agriculture were a contested topic in the discussion. On the one hand, lack of trust and scarcities make urban gardening vulnerable to for example theft, but on the other hand the scenario can be interpreted in a way that these vulnerabilities can be counteracted by communal solutions and cooperation.

In this scenario, the willingness to prepare and the know-how are, by default, high (especially in rural areas), which would suggest that personalized preparedness is a plausible goal. HEP as part of city and community planning on the other hand was deemed problematic, as the role of state and municipalities in preparedness is lesser.

The discussion concluded, that this scenario contained more contradicting elements and raised more questions than Protein-innovative Finland, which made it harder to immerse into.

General discussion
A focal point for preparedness is both the citizens’ lack of knowledge on food supply chain (i.e. the complexity of the food system) and preparedness on a larger scale (national preparedness strategies, self-sufficiency levels etc.). Could more knowledge on these matters lead to a better understanding of the role of individual or household level preparedness?

The discussion of whether HEP should be branded as an idea of preparedness or a concrete supply kit was concluded with the remark that perhaps, through personalization, KOVA and SPEK could promote both; as situations in life and lifestyles differ, in some cases the idea of circulating an emergency food supply as part of daily routines works best, but in other cases a (personalizable) supply kit could work better – the latter could also be branded as an export product. HEP has also been communicated as a list of things to have in store, which could in either case still be distributed on websites etc.

To some degree, hard-core survivalism has reared its head in Finland. In this context, crisis means a loss of trust among citizens – a worst case scenario being that the survivalists turn against other people, whom they perceive as potential hazards – which is something that has to be taken into account in communication of HEP.

Children, youth and young adults are an important group for HEP education – how to reach them? Brochures and other “old-fashioned” means should be abandoned in favour of more practical means of education (e.g. scouting activities). Educational games were also discussed, both role playing (for example the Red Cross has organized “a refugees journey” role-play in Finland) and electronic gaming. The possibility of implementing preparedness education in compulsory education (civics, home economics etc.) was also briefly discussed.
4. Reflections on process

What changes were made to the originally proposed method? Which were made based on learning from other TRANSMANGO case studies (by all involved including the method designers); which were made to respond to specific case study limitations or stakeholder needs?

In the second workshop, in the end of the session three only the scenarios – not action plans at all – were switched between the small groups. This made working a little bit easier for the participants and it was a good choice.

What were the major challenges in terms of the facilitation process and challenges created by stakeholder behaviour and group composition? + What insights can be made on relational dynamics among participants and between participants and facilitators?

Because of no-shows, illness and parallel meetings in the second workshop there were only eight participants and many of them attended only half of the day. Also, many of them were first timers, meaning that they did not participate in the first workshop. As the second workshop is partly based on the work done in the first workshop, this was a little bit problematic.

Group dynamics among participants was good. Some of them knew each other beforehand and it made communication between participants smoother. Relational dynamics between facilitators and participants was also nice and smooth. The good and constructing attitude of our partners from the SPEK helped to create very nice and easy atmosphere for cooperation as well as for facilitation.

What were the major physical/organizational challenges?

The venue Tapahtumatalo Bank was very nice and there were no physical or organizational challenges. However the costs were quite high. The workshops took place in Helsinki, because most of the participants are placed there. It meant that facilitators and secretaries had to travel from Jyväskylä to Helsinki and to stay overnight there, which also increased the costs. This is to say, that budgetary issues have to be considered carefully, when planning scenario workshops.

Our methodological support Ariella Helfgott was prevented during the second workshop, but we got instructions beforehand through skype and it worked well.

What were the major methodological challenges in the workshop?

Together with Ariella Helfgott we decided at the end of the first workshop to give up causal mapping. We thought that there was not enough time and strength to continue the work for gaining results good enough.

Further remarks

Our team had a positive experience in organizing the two local workshops together with the SPEK. The reactions from the SPEK were also positive and they want to continue collaboration with our team later. This is very good when thinking about dissemination of TRANSMANGO results. Our team is already invited to give a speech on a national seminar on preparedness on September this year.
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