



Synthesis report on food impact pathways

Deliverable D3.2.

Guiding principles for healthy and sustainable diets





DELIVERABLE PLAN'EAT – D3.2

Synthesis report on food impact pathways



| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Project full name | Food systems transformation towards healthy and sustainable dietary behaviour |
| GA number | 101061023 |
| Start date of project | 01/09/2022 |
| Duration of project | 48 months |
| Deliverable n° & name | D3.2 Food impact map |
| Version | Final |
| Work Package n° | 3 |
| Due date of the deliverable | M14 – 31/10/2023 |
| Participant responsible | TMG – Töpfer, Müller, Gaßner GmbH (TMG) |
| Main authors | Marlene Ohlau, Elin Rööös, Anthony Fardet, Katerina Palascha, Eva Martinez Cruz, Aifric O'Sullivan, Edmond Rock, Erik Mathijs, Francesca Vespa, Johanna Spångberg, Lotta Rydhmer, Ludvig Karlsson, Patrick Elliott, Wilhelm Wanecek |
| Website | https://planeat-project.eu/ |

| Nature of the deliverable | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| R | Document, report (excluding the periodic and final reports) | X |
| DEM | Demonstrator, pilot, prototype, plan designs | |
| DEC | Websites, patents filing, press & media actions, videos, etc. | |
| DATA | Data sets, microdata, etc. | |
| DMP | Data management plan | |
| ETHICS | Deliverables related to ethics issues. | |
| SECURITY | Deliverables related to security issues | |
| OTHER | Software, technical diagram, algorithms, models, etc. | |

| Dissemination level | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| PU | Public | X |
| SEN | Sensitive, limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement | |
| CI | Classified, EU RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIAL or SECRET under the Commission Decision No2015/444 | |



| Quality Procedure | | |
|-------------------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Date | Version | Reviewers |
| 05/10/2023 | 3 | Wencke Gwozdz (JLU), Anke Brons (WUR), Jeroen Candela (WUR) |

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Contents | 2 |
| Abbreviations..... | 3 |
| Project abstract | 4 |
| Executive summary..... | 4 |
| Guiding principles to achieve healthy and sustainable diets: from macro to micro..... | 5 |
| Macro/meso: summary of recommended policies/measures to drive healthy and sustainable diets | 5 |
| Micro: Recommendations on how consumers can change their diet for the better..... | 6 |
| 1. Part 1 – Summary Internal Report 2: Environmental Impacts | 7 |
| 1.1 Environmental impacts of the European food system..... | 7 |
| 1.2 Case Study: Environmental performance of baseline diets from the Living Lab countries | 7 |
| 1.2.1 Ireland..... | 8 |
| 1.2.2 Hungary | 9 |
| 1.2.3 Greece..... | 11 |
| 1.2.4 Conclusion | 12 |
| 1.3 Recommended action for consumers and food professionals..... | 13 |
| 2. Part 2 - Summary Internal Report 3: Social and Socio-economic Impacts | 14 |
| 2.1 Social and socio-economic impacts from European food systems | 14 |
| 2.2 Case Study: Performance of the Living Lab diets in terms of animal welfare | 16 |
| 2.2.1 Results and discussion | 17 |
| 2.3 Recommended action for policymakers and food professionals..... | 17 |
| 2.4 Recommended action for consumers | 18 |
| 3. Part 3 – Summary Internal Report 4: Health Impact | 19 |
| 3.1 Food system-related health impacts..... | 19 |
| 3.2 Case Study: Quantifying health impacts of shifting European dietary patterns towards dietary recommendations | 20 |
| 3.2.1 Sweden | 23 |
| 3.2.2 France | 23 |
| 3.2.3 Italy..... | 24 |
| 3.2.4 Conclusion | 25 |
| 3.3 Recommended action for consumers and food professionals..... | 25 |
| References..... | 27 |



Abbreviations

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|
| CO ₂ | Carbon dioxide | MSC | Marine Stewardship Council |
| DALYs | Disability Adjusted Life Years | P | Phosphorus |
| E/MSY | Extinctions per million species years | MD | Mediterranean diet |
| EFSA | European Food Safety Authority | PHD | Planetary health diet |
| EU | European Union | QALYs | Quality Adjusted Life Years |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization | SSBs | Sugar-sweetened beverages |
| GHG | Greenhouse gas | T2DM | Type 2 diabetes |
| N | Nitrogen | UPFs | Ultra-processed foods |
| NCD | Non-communicable diseases | WHO | World Health Organization |
| NH ₃ | Ammonia | | |



Project abstract

The EU food system is under considerable pressure for change due to its negative climate, environmental and health impacts. Food system transition will require changing dietary habits of millions of Europeans. PLAN'EAT aims at advancing the scientific basis on factors influencing dietary behaviour and the health, environmental and socio-economic impacts of dietary patterns, and deliver solutions for transition through a transdisciplinary and multi-level approach.

PLAN'EAT will co-create data and interventions in a pan-EU network of 9 Living Labs and a Policy Lab. These living labs will focus on a broad range of population groups, varying according to age, culture, health and socio-economic status. PLAN'EAT entails four steps that feed into each other:

- (1) A snapshot of European dietary patterns and food environments will be provided by respectively basing on existing data from 11 EU countries and by involving local population groups in LLs.
- (2) Factors and drivers influencing dietary behaviour at macro- (food system), meso- (food environment) and micro- (individual) levels will be deeply investigated.
- (3) A True Cost Accounting database and methodology will be developed and applied, for the first time, on dietary patterns, providing integrated insights into the diverse impacts of current and future diets, including possible synergies and trade-offs.
- (4) A solution package will be co-developed with food chain actors, consumers and policymakers, including:
 - a Food System Dashboard, setting out context-specific food policy recommendations;
 - interventions targeting Farm to Fork actors, supporting farmers, food industries, retailers and food services to create suitable food environments;
 - personalised advisory tools to empower consumers; and
 - improved dietary advice and communication strategies to target populations at large.

PLAN'EAT will enable >58500 European consumers to shift to healthier and more sustainable dietary patterns by 2032, reducing premature mortality by 20% and greenhouse gas emissions from local food supply chains by 23% in 39 EU areas.

Executive summary

Moving toward sustainable food systems is not straightforward, as sustainability is multidimensional. Healthy and sustainable diets aim to achieve optimal growth and development of all individuals and support functioning and physical, mental, and social well-being at all stages of life for present and future generations; contribute to the prevention of all forms of malnutrition (i.e. undernutrition, micronutrient deficiencies, overweight and obesity); reduce the risk of diet-related non-communicable diseases (NCDs); and support the conservation of biodiversity and the health of the planet (1). A food systems approach is a way of thinking and doing that considers the food system in its totality, considering all dimensions of sustainability, their relationships, and related effects (2). It is important to recognize that environmental, health, and social systems are interrelated, and that progress focused on the goals of one system may have implications for the goals of other systems.

An important component of sustainable food systems is healthy and sustainable diets. Achieving such diets requires a strong integration of different policy areas, i.e., health, social and environmental policy, and agricultural policy. Given the goal of the EU Horizon Europe project PLAN'EAT to support a dietary transition towards sustainable diets, this synthesis report aims to summarise key evidence of the sustainability challenges associated with European diets, in relation to health and environmental and social sustainability, and to provide overarching recommendations of what can be done in these domains to move towards more sustainable diets. It integrates key findings from the contributions of several working groups and three project internal reports (IR2-4) based on a series of literature reviews and modelling studies with regional



details while also integrating international dietary recommendations for human and planetary health. The reports provide country-specific analyses of environmental and health impacts and outline the linkages between food consumption and social sustainability in EU Member States. Based on scientific evidence, key findings and recommendations are formulated, summarizing the state of knowledge on the environmental, health, and social impacts of food production and consumption in the EU.

The overarching goal is to provide a holistic picture of the impacts of prominent dietary patterns in the EU and to provide guiding principles for healthy and sustainable diets, helping to create clearer direction for consumers, policymakers and food professionals for the necessary dietary transition. The report is part of the project's efforts to enable European stakeholders to identify hidden positive and negative impacts along the food value chain and transform economic systems in the long term by providing (policy) recommendations on how to reduce and eventually internalise negative externalities (True Cost Accounting).

Guiding principles to achieve healthy and sustainable diets: from macro to micro

MACRO/MESO: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED POLICIES/MEASURES TO DRIVE HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE DIETS

Far-reaching action is needed to shift consumer diets to greater reliance on plant-based foods and less consumption of animal-based foods and highly processed foods. The following actions can help to make healthy and sustainable food available, accessible, affordable, and safe:

| Field of action | Measures |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Embrace and support the consumption of plant-based foods and a reduction of foods high in added sugars, fats and/or salt and/or ingredients not found at home as well as meat and dairy products | Empowering stakeholders in the food sector to integrate country-specific guidelines for healthy and sustainable diets based on the PLAN'EAT project. |
| Shaping healthy and sustainable food environments for consumers | Integrate sustainable and plant-based meals and appropriate portion sizes into community catering, especially for children and adolescents in day-care and school catering, as well as university canteens. Take further measures to restrict the advertising and marketing of unhealthy and unsustainable foods targeted at children, adolescents, and other vulnerable groups. |
| Create financial access to healthy and sustainable foods | Implement fiscal policies, such as taxing products that have a greater impact on human health and the environment and targeting food subsidies and incentives to fruits and vegetables, whole grains, legumes, nuts and seeds to increase the affordability of healthy and sustainable foods. |



MICRO: RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW CONSUMERS CAN CHANGE THEIR DIET FOR THE BETTER

Changing diets to include healthy, high-quality foods and more plant-based is an effective way to protect our planet and improve our health. This does not necessarily mean turning vegetarian or even vegan but eating less and better animal-based foods and focusing on unrefined, minimally processed foods, healthy fats and healthy sources of protein. Here are some tips on how consumers can change their diet to make this happen!

- Lower the overall intake of meat and dairy products and instead eat more legumes, nuts, and seeds.
- Base the diet on a variety of vegetables, fruit, legumes, nuts, whole grains, and roots, preferably when in season.
- Reducing foods with cosmetic, non-culinary ingredients not commonly used at home ¹, and/or those with too much added fats, sugars, and/or salt.
- Avoid eating more than needed.
- Avoid household food waste, especially the waste of foods with high environmental impact (e.g., meat, dairy, fish, tropical products, etc.).
- Choose organic products to reduce pesticide use.
- Limit consumption of products grown in tropical regions, including coffee, tea, and cocoa for example.
- Buying seafood from sustainably managed stock by looking out for certifications and third-party labels and increasing intake of seaweed and bivalves.
- Choose meat from extensive grazing systems that help preserve biodiversity.

¹ Such foods, called ultra-processed foods (UPF), include mainly carbonated soft drinks; sweet or savoury packaged snacks (e.g., chips); mass-produced packaged breads and buns; margarines and other spreads; breakfast 'cereals' for children; powdered and packaged 'instant' soups and noodles; poultry and fish 'nuggets' and 'sticks'; reconstituted meat products; many (but not all) meat and dairy analogues; industrial ice cream, biscuits, pastries, cakes and cake mixes, candies (confectionery), desserts, sausages, cold cuts, energy or granola bars.



1. Part 1 – Summary Internal Report 2: Environmental Impacts

1.1 Environmental impacts of the European food system

Significant environmental impacts occur along the food supply chain, threatening the environment by contributing to global warming, resource depletion, and loss of habitat and biodiversity. Food is a vital part of our lives, but its impacts are far-reaching and require urgent attention.

1.1. One of the main drivers of the environmental impacts of food production is the conversion of natural ecosystems to agricultural land (3). Global deforestation, often caused by the expansion of agricultural activities such as livestock grazing and crop cultivation and driven by consumption in the EU and other high-income regions of the world, results in the loss of biodiversity and contributes to the release of carbon dioxide (CO₂) into the atmosphere, exacerbating climate change (4).

1.2. The agricultural sector requires intensive use of water resources. Irrigation for crop production accounts for a significant proportion of global freshwater consumption. Excessive withdrawals from rivers and underground aquifers can lead to the depletion of water sources, altering ecosystems and affecting aquatic species (5). Inefficient irrigation practices are at risk of causing water waste and water contamination from agricultural chemical runoff.

1.3. The food system is a major contributor to global GHG emissions, accounting for about one-third of total GHG emissions globally (6). GHG emissions contribute to climate change and associated impacts, such as rising temperatures, extreme weather events, and sea level rise. Along the supply chain, large GHG contributions occur from land use changes and farm activities such as cropping activities that emit nitrous oxide (e.g., as fertilizer application) and manure storage and management (6). Relatively little emissions arise from transport (except air transport). Regarding products, most GHG emissions come from livestock production; red meat in particular is a major source of methane, one of the most potent GHGs.

1.4. Intensive agriculture can also result in high environmental costs related to increased use of chemical inputs such as fertilizers and pesticides. Excessive and inappropriate use of these substances can contaminate soils, water sources, and ecosystems, harming terrestrial and aquatic life (7). Pesticides in particular have been linked to the decline of pollinators such as bees, which play a critical role in maintaining biodiversity and ensuring food security through their role in crop pollination (3).

1.2 Case Study: Environmental performance of baseline diets from the Living Lab countries

The objective of this study was to evaluate the environmental performance of Living Labs' baseline diets, here exemplified by Ireland, Hungary, and Greece², using footprinting and life cycle assessment (LCA) data. Different population groups and age groups were used as target groups for the individual countries. The baseline diets were benchmarked against the boundaries in the report from the EAT-Lancet commission (17) in line with Moberg et al. (18). This means that the global targets for the food system suggested by Willett et al. (17) were divided by the global population (7.5 billion in 2016) to establish per capita boundaries.

In total, the environmental performance of 1426 food products was assessed, using the following indicators: carbon footprint, cropland use, new input of N and phosphorus (P), blue water use, pesticide use, biodiversity impact, and ammonia emissions. All indicators are expressed per kg of food and then used to calculate the performance on an aggregate level for the complete diet. Environmental assessment of diets is associated with major uncertainties associated with modelling complex biological processes (e.g., nitrous oxide emissions from soils), variation in production parameters like yields and manure management systems and uncertainty in assessing the intake of foods in self-reported dietary surveys.

² The data on the environmental performance of all Living Lab countries can be found in Rööös et al. (8).



1.2.1 IRELAND

The Living Lab in Ireland focuses on young university students (18-30 years). The assessed diet was extracted from the National Adult Nutrition Survey conducted in 2008.





Figure 1: Food groups in the baseline diet for the Irish Living Lab. Presented as raw commodities, e.g., ‘Milk and dairy products’ contain also the milk used for e.g., cheese and butter.

ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO THE BOUNDARIES IN EAT-LANCET



ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Carbon footprint | 2.0 t CO _{2e} year ⁻¹ |
| Cropland use | 0.26 ha year ⁻¹ |
| New N input | 53 kg N year ⁻¹ |
| New P input | 3.5 kg P year ⁻¹ |
| Blue water use | 67 m ³ year ⁻¹ |
| Biodiversity impact | 5.6 x 10 ⁻⁷ E/MSY year ⁻¹ |
| Pesticide use | 445 kg a.s. year ⁻¹ |
| Ammonia emissions | 9.1 kg NH ₃ year ⁻¹ |




Figure 2: Environmental performance of the baseline diet in the Irish Living Lab. Benchmarked against the EAT-Lancet boundaries (Willett et al. 2019) (above) and relative contributions from different food groups (below).

1.2.2 HUNGARY

The Hungarian Living lab targets single young parents (18-34 years). To assess their diet a baseline diet was extracted from the Hungarian national food consumption survey conducted in 2018.




Figure 3: Food groups in the baseline diet for the Hungarian Living Lab. Presented as raw commodities, e.g., 'Milk and dairy products' contain also the milk used for e.g., cheese and butter.



ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO THE BOUNDARIES IN EAT-LANCET



ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Carbon footprint | 1.7 t CO ₂ e year ⁻¹ |
| Cropland use | 0.27 ha year ⁻¹ |
| New N input | 43 kg N year ⁻¹ |
| New P input | 3.7 kg P year ⁻¹ |
| Blue water use | 73 m ³ year ⁻¹ |
| Biodiversity impact | 5.7 x 10 ⁻⁷ E/MSY year ⁻¹ |
| Pesticide use | 357 kg a.s. year ⁻¹ |
| Ammonia emissions | 8.2 kg NH ₃ year ⁻¹ |

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM DIFFERENT FOOD GROUPS




Figure 4: Environmental performance of the baseline diet in the Hungarian Living Lab. Benchmarked against the EAT-Lancet boundaries (Willett et al. 2019) (above) and relative contributions from different food groups (below).



1.2.3 GREECE

The focus of the Greek Living Lab is the elderly population (>60 years) with risk factors for NCDs, i.e., chronic disease that are not passes from person to person, such as heart diseases, stroke, cancer, type 2 diabetes. Their baseline diet was extracted from the 2014 national nutrition survey European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)-funded collection of dietary and related data in the general population aged 10-74 years in Greece.




Figure 5: Food groups in the baseline diet for the Greek Living Lab. Presented as raw commodities, e.g., 'Milk and dairy products' contain also the milk used for e.g., cheese and butter.

ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO THE BOUNDARIES IN EAT-LANCET



ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Carbon footprint | 1.4 t CO _{2e} year ⁻¹ |
| Cropland use | 0.20 ha year ⁻¹ |
| New N input | 34 kg N year ⁻¹ |
| New P input | 2.7 kg P year ⁻¹ |
| Blue water use | 106 m ³ year ⁻¹ |
| Biodiversity impact | 2.2 x 10 ⁻⁶ E/MSY year ⁻¹ |
| Pesticide use | 199 kg a.s. year ⁻¹ |
| Ammonia emissions | 5.1 kg NH ₃ year ⁻¹ |




Figure 6: Environmental performance of the baseline diet in the Greek Living Lab. Benchmarked against the EAT-Lancet boundaries (Willett et al. (17)) (above) and relative contributions from different food groups (below).

1.2.4 CONCLUSION

The diets examined here show similar patterns of environmental performance. Meat and dairy products contribute significantly to many environmental indicators. In terms of carbon footprint, the contribution of meat and dairy products is 50% or more in all countries. Meat and dairy products also dominate the contribution to cropland use and new N inputs, as feed production requires land and N fertilizers of N fixing via legumes. For ammonia emissions, livestock production accounts for more than 95%, dominated by emissions from manure storage and handling.

Fruits and vegetables contribute substantially to blue water use, pesticide use, and biodiversity loss.

Fish and other seafood contribute relatively little to the dietary impacts captured by the indicators used here. Wild seafood contributes only to greenhouse gas emissions from fishing vessels and has no impact on the other indicators used here as no land, fertilizers or pesticides are used, no feed is produced, and no manure is managed. For farmed seafood, emissions from feed production are substantial. The carbon footprint per kg of seafood is of the same order or magnitude as for meat, but consumption is generally lower.

In terms of biodiversity impacts, diets exceed the EAT-Lancet boundary by a factor of 100, but this limit and its assessment are highly uncertain. Land use is potentially the most straightforward indicator because it is based only on crop yields and available cropland, for which relatively good data are available. For cropland, the EAT-Lancet boundary is exceeded by 18-65% for the diets evaluated here. The carbon footprint of diets is typically twice the sustainable limit.

In all countries, diets exceed all planetary boundaries except for blue water use. The blue water use associated with the diets is low (compared to the other indicators) because agriculture in the Living Lab countries (where most of the food in the diets is grown) is predominantly rainfed. However, we only considered blue water consumption in terms of quantity consumed, not water scarcity. This means that even if the diets are within the limits for total blue water consumption, there may still be water scarcity issues at the local level. In addition, with climate change, the demand for irrigation is expected to increase substantially (18). Therefore, water use by diets should also be monitored, although currently – and based on the data used here – it is still within sustainable limits. Products with high water use per kg include nuts, ruminant meat produced in warm countries and some tropical fruits.



1.3 Recommended action for consumers and food professionals

In the context of the environmental impacts, shifting dietary patterns to more environmentally sustainable ones is becoming ever more important. Here are some recommendations on how consumers and food professionals can change diets for the better.

Decreasing overall intake of meat and dairy, especially individuals that have a high intake of these foods.

Meat and dairy make considerable contributions to many environmental indicators. Replacing meat and dairy products with whole grains, legumes, roots and vegetables is the mitigation option with the greatest potential for improving the environmental performance of the diets.

Reducing food waste, especially the waste of food with high environmental impacts (e.g., meat, dairy, fish, products from tropical regions, etc.).

Wasting food means that impacts from food production are caused without the benefit of food production providing nutrition to diets. Food waste accounts for about 16% of total GHG emissions from the EU food system (14), therefore, reducing food waste is also an important strategy to improve the environmental performance of diets. Packing leftovers into lunch boxes, using them in new creative recipes, or keeping them for future consumption is good for the planet and one's budget.

Avoiding overconsumption and consumption of foods that contribute to little nutritional value (e.g., alcohol, sweets, sugar-sweetened beverages and other foods high in added sugars, fats and/or salt and/or ingredients not found at home and discretionary foods).

Another type of food waste resulting from overconsumption is "metabolic food waste". Consumption of food more than the recommended caloric intake poses a health risk and 'unnecessary' environmental impacts (109). The EU is responsible for the largest amount of metabolic food waste of any region in the world. Much of the excess calories come from foods that contribute little to nutrition or are even detrimental to health, such as UPFs, discretionary and non-core foods, alcohol, etc. Therefore, reducing the intake of such foods and the portion sizes of meals in general could be an effective way to reduce total daily energy intake (113) and contribute to reducing the overall environmental impact of the food, mainly in terms of GHG emissions (115).

Buying seafood from sustainably managed stocks and choosing primarily farmed seaweed and bivalves.

Wild seafood comes with a range of sustainability challenges including overfishing of wild stocks, destruction of seafloors, disruption of food webs, and destruction of coastal ecosystems (12; 3). It is important to also account for such aspects in dietary choice and it can be done by sourcing seafood from sustainably managed stocks (several labels exist to indicate this e.g., MSC, followfood³ and organic labels, e.g., the Swedish KRAV⁴).

Another option for more sustainable seafood consumption is to choose seafood such as farmed seaweed and bivalves like mussels. These species do not require feeding as they – in the case of seaweed – use photosynthesis and nutrients present in the sea to grow and - in the case of bivalves - they feed from plankton filtered from the water. Hence, farming of these species helps clean the oceans of excess nutrients, counteracting eutrophication (13).

Choosing organic foods to reduce the pesticide use associated with diets.

The use of pesticides associated with diet is commonly not reported in diet assessments (15). However, chemical pollution is a major concern with many toxic substances being used in agriculture (16). An effective strategy to reduce the pesticide use associated with the diet is to choose more organic products, as very few synthetic pesticides are allowed according to organic regulations.

³ <https://followfood.de/magazin/beitrag/followfood-fischereirichtlinien>

⁴ <https://www.krav.se/krav-markta-produkter/fisk-och-skaldjur/>



Reducing consumption of products grown in tropical regions (e.g., coffee, tea, cocoa, tropical fruit) to reduce water use and impacts on biodiversity.

Fruit and vegetable production contributes substantially to blue water use (i.e., the water in our surface and groundwater reservoirs), pesticide use, and biodiversity impacts. Many fruits and vegetables require irrigation, especially in warm countries. Many of the pesticides are also used on these crops. Fruit and vegetables from tropical regions can have a high impact on biodiversity as the species affected by using a certain area of land is considerably higher than using the corresponding amount of land in most regions in Europe (11).

Choosing meat from low-intensity grazing systems where grazing helps preserve biodiversity-rich grasslands.

Choosing not only less meat but also meat and dairy from more sustainable production systems can have considerable benefits. For example, in some places, the grazing of animals in semi-natural pastures rich in threatened and unique plant and insect species can help maintain biodiversity. Such ecosystems have developed through low-intensity farming over hundreds or thousands of years and rely on continued grazing values (10).

2. Part 2 - Summary Internal Report 3: Social and Socio-economic Impacts

2.1 Social and socio-economic impacts from European food systems

Among the myriad factors that shape social sustainability, food is of immense importance, touching upon economic, cultural, and ethical dimensions. Food production has profound impacts on, for instance, decent livelihoods, labour rights, and equity. In addition, food affordability, the food environment, and animal welfare, for example, are important social sustainability challenges, although the cause-and-effect chain is long and complex.

2.1. A decent standard of living – one that meets basic needs and provides a life of dignity – is a human right. Yet farmworkers too often live in financial insecurity, even though agriculture drives economically important supply chains. Agricultural commodity prices have recently shown substantial volatility, creating high levels of uncertainty for farmers and threatening their long-term viability (20; 21). In perspective, this leads farmers to invest fewer resources in long-term investments that could increase their productivity, sustainability, and profitability (22).

A major challenge for rural areas across Europe is farm succession. While employment rates are generally declining, the ageing of farmers and the agricultural labour force is increasingly evident. Farmers under the age of 40 manage only 11% of all farms in the European Union (23). Access to land and capital are two major barriers for young people wishing to enter the agricultural sector. This difficulty is amplified, particularly, for young females, further accentuating the barriers they face.

2.2. Downstream segments of agri-food chains (such as processing, wholesale, and retail) tend to be more concentrated than agricultural production, raising concerns about market power and competition in the agri-food sector (30). However, the relationship between concentration and the exercise of market power is complex, and evidence of market power abuse is not necessarily obvious and can be context-specific (31). In addition, international trade plays a critical role in improving the diversity and accessibility of different foods and products across Europe, providing access that might not otherwise be readily available. Nevertheless, farmers are in a structurally weaker position than other actors, and small and medium-sized farms in particular face increasing competitive intensity as the number of large farms increases, land prices rise, and production price indices fluctuate (32).

2.3. Abused labour rights such as forced labour, also called ‘modern slavery’, are pervasive and exist in European countries. While forced labour is most prevalent in low-income countries, its existence is inextricably linked to demand in higher-income countries. It is estimated that G20 countries imported 426 billion euros worth of goods at risk of modern slavery in 2021 (25).



While it is essential to note that not all food or food products are associated with modern slavery, there have been instances of exploitation and forced labour in certain parts of the food supply chain. This might include the production of fruits and vegetables, seafood processing, and even some cases in the restaurant and hospitality industry (26; 27). Cases of forced labour have been documented in agriculture, and in some unfortunate situations, farmers may unintentionally employ seasonal workers who are subjected to conditions akin to modern slavery without their knowledge. Some farmers rely on outside recruitment agencies or labour brokers to obtain seasonal workers, but not all these brokers operate as legitimate and fair businesses. Exploiters pose as legitimate labour brokers while forcing workers into jobs for which they are paid little or nothing (28; 29).

2.4. Inequities are spread systematically throughout the food system and the agricultural sector is not exempt from gender issues and various forms of discrimination. While in Lithuania and Latvia, almost half of all farms are managed by women, in many other countries, such as Malta, Germany, Denmark, and the Netherlands, the proportion of female farm managers remains below 10%, indicating a lower level of gender diversity in agricultural management in these regions (33). Additionally, women working in the agricultural sector worldwide face a significant gender wage gap, earning nearly 20% less than their male counterparts.

2.5. Improving socio-economic well-being goes beyond physical health to include mental well-being, cognitive abilities, and future opportunities (34; 35; 36). It is important to recognize that nutrition and healthy food choices play an essential role in maintaining optimal cognitive function, energy levels, and improved concentration (37). However, adequate nutrition and healthy dietary choices can have economic implications, particularly for those with limited incomes. Affordability and access to nutritious foods play a critical role in facilitating healthy choices. Healthy diets may be more expensive than less healthy diets (38; 39) because energy-dense foods are cheaper than nutrient-dense foods when expressed per unit of energy (40). The relatively high cost of fruits and vegetables affects people's economic access to recommended healthy and sustainable diets, especially in Eastern and Southern European countries (Table 2).

| Table 1: Cost of food items in 2017 PPP dollar/capita/day* (41) | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Affordability of healthy diet** | Cost of vegetables | Cost of fruits | Cost of legumes, nuts and seeds | Cost of starchy staples | Costs of oils and fats | Cost of animal sourced foods |
| Hungary | 0.49 | 0.75 | 0.83 | 0.42 | 0.41 | 0.09 | 0.81 |
| Ireland | 0.49 | 0.58 | 0.62 | 0.29 | 0.33 | 0.06 | 0.52 |
| Sweden | 0.42 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.35 | 0.47 | 0.09 | 0.64 |
| Netherlands | 0.39 | 0.89 | 0.61 | 0.26 | 0.32 | 0.05 | 0.61 |
| Germany | 0.38 | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.30 | 0.24 | 0.05 | 0.67 |
| Poland | 0.38 | 0.89 | 0.65 | 0.38 | 0.32 | 0.09 | 0.58 |
| France | 0.37 | 0.85 | 0.86 | 0.28 | 0.25 | 0.07 | 0.64 |
| Spain | 0.37 | 0.74 | 0.80 | 0.21 | 0.28 | 0.05 | 0.62 |
| Belgium | 0.35 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 0.37 | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.75 |
| Greece | 0.35 | 0.74 | 0.58 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.10 | 0.80 |
| Italy | 0.33 | 0.75 | 0.81 | 0.27 | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.78 |

Overview of the cost of food items in 2017 PPP dollars/capita/day for PLAN'EAT partner countries. The first column shows the cost of the lowest-cost basket of foods that would meet requirements for food-based dietary guidelines, in comparison to the total food budget. So, as the ratio approaches 1, the more unaffordable the healthy diet. As the ratio approaches 0, the more affordable the healthy diet. The data further clearly shows the high costs of fruit and vegetables, particularly when compared to starchy staples. Despite the common market, price differences can be quite substantial between EU countries.



Note: A recent modelling study showed that the cost of a healthy and sustainable diet in high- and middle-income countries could decrease by 22-34% when external costs are considered (42). External costs occur when producing or consuming a good imposes a cost upon society through a negative effect. If there are external costs in consuming a good (negative externalities), the societal costs are higher than the private costs of one's own diet. However, according to Springmann et al. (42), a healthy and sustainable diet would be the most cost-effective dietary option in most countries in the future.

2.6. Consumers face a food environment that makes it difficult to purchase and eat more sustainably (114). These include exposure to products and dishes with unfavourable nutritional profiles high in added fats, sugar and/or salt (e.g., fast food, soft drinks) and high environmental impacts, or portion sizes that are too large. Offerings (e.g., price, convenience, portion sizes) influence how much, when, and where consumers can consume which foods. In addition, consumers are confronted with advertisements and social media content that make unhealthy foods appealing, whereas more sustainable food choices often lack reductive and easy-to-understand information. The challenge is to create a food environment, including access, price, and marketing, that supports more conscious food choices by consumers, i.e., environmentally friendly, nutrient-rich, less processed, and fair food.

2.7. Because food of animal origin is included in the diet, animal welfare is an important aspect of social sustainability. Animal welfare can be defined as the physical and mental state of an animal concerning the conditions in which it lives and dies (110). Often, high stocking densities in intensive production systems not only compromise the animals' freedom of movement but also provide too little space for them to engage in behaviours they are motivated to perform, such as rooting or retreating, thus increasing the risk of aggressive interactions and the spread of infections in the group.

2.8. Management systems and regulations on animal husbandry are not only relevant for animal welfare but also for human health. Antibiotics are an important part of both human and veterinary medicine to cure and prevent infections. A large proportion of all antibiotics sold worldwide are used to produce food of animal origin (43). Food from animals treated with antibiotics does not cause immediate health problems for consumers, but it can potentially increase resistance to antibiotics, threatening human and animal health and welfare (44). In general, the more antibiotics we use, the worse the problems with antibiotic resistance become.

2.2 Case Study: Performance of the Living Lab diets in terms of animal welfare

The objective was to assess how the Living Lab diets contribute to negative animal welfare impacts, using an animal welfare index for animals used for the production of animal-sourced primary products. The animal welfare index value considers the number of animals involved in the production of one kg of food for different species, these animals' ability to perceive the negative effects of being used by humans (based on a questionnaire answered by 15 animal scientists and veterinarians) and a judgement of the welfare level in the production system (based on national data from scientific literature and 'grey literature' from various organisations' and authorities' web pages and reports). The welfare level in the production system is based on frequencies of mortality (at the farm) and disease or injury, available space to body size and duration of the slaughter process. The different components are included in the animal welfare index with different weights. These weights have been identified by the researchers in PLAN'EAT based on scientific literature (e.g., 112) and discussions with colleagues.



2.2.1 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results for the different Living Lab diets are presented in Figure 8.




Figure 7: Animal welfare impact from the Living Lab diets.

Although dairy consumption is high in terms of kg consumed in all diets, the overall contribution to animal welfare is low due to a low animal welfare index value per kg of milk. This is a result of the dairy cow producing large amounts of milk, i.e., the animal welfare impact is shared by a large mass of food products. The same is true for eggs where each hen lays a large number of eggs. The animal welfare impacts from the diets reflect meat consumption to a high degree, with the Hungarian and Irish diets having the highest animal welfare impacts mainly due to high total meat consumption levels in the diets assessed here. These diets also have the highest consumption of chicken which has a high animal welfare index value, partly due to the high numbers of animal lives involved in 1 kg chicken meat (as compared to 1 kg beef). That small animals have a higher negative animal welfare impact on the sustainability of diets than large animals has also been shown in studies by Scherer et al. (46) and Paris et al. (47), assessing diets including a variety of animals from cattle to shrimps and insects. The relatively lower animal welfare impact to total consumption from Swedish and German diets is partly explained by a lower share of chicken meat in diets and partly by higher animal welfare standards.

2.3 Recommended action for policymakers and food professionals

The food system is influenced by various social sustainability aspects and, in turn, has an impact on them. In this report, we have provided a summary of some of the most important aspects to consider. These aspects are related to dietary choices to varying degrees. While some are directly affected by dietary choices, others have a looser connection to the specific types of food consumed. In the case of the former category, dietary choices play a crucial role in mitigating challenges. However, for the latter category, alternative mitigation options and policies that target e.g., food production is required. Since the focus of the PLAN'EAT project is on changing dietary patterns, we here focus on actions that food stakeholders can take to achieve such goals. That is, we do not give recommendations on what can be done to improve food production more directly like regulations in production (e.g., for pesticides) or the use of the Common Agricultural Policy to steer agriculture in a greener direction.



Embrace and support the consumption of plant-based foods and a reduction of foods high in added sugars, fats and/or salt and/or ingredients not found at home as well as meat and dairy products

Food can be a powerful driver for change. A fundamental stage in the process of dietary change is the distribution of country-specific guidelines to consumers or the adoption of country-specific guidelines by food professionals and public health organisations working for policy change and support for infrastructure to improve the food environment. It is important to empower food sector actors to integrate recommendations for healthy and sustainable diets based on the PLAN'EAT project.

Shaping sustainable and healthy food environments for consumers.

Consumers need to be supported through the design of appropriate food environments. Requiring actions from governments, food services and retailers, more health-promoting, socially, and environmentally acceptable choices need to be offered and promoted. Important measures would be, for example, easier access to information to identify more sustainable options; appropriate price incentives to increase affordability and access to more sustainable options; restrictions on social media advertising (social influencing); and high-quality community catering and appropriate portion sizes, especially for all children in day-care and school catering. Integrating more sustainable and plant-based options into public food venues, such as restaurants and cafés, creates positive taste experiences among consumers and increases familiarity with such foods.

In the long term, creating a food environment that enables healthier and more sustainable food choices is fundamental to a society in which individuals can succeed physically, mentally, and economically.

Create financial access to healthy and sustainable foods

Affordability and access to nutritious food are crucial in promoting healthy choices. Therefore, it is important to implement fiscal policies such as taxing products that have a greater impact on human health and the environment and targeting food subsidies and incentives towards fruits and vegetables, whole grains, pulses, nuts and seeds to make healthy and sustainable food more affordable.

2.4 Recommended action for consumers

Sourcing food from a wide variety of independent producers (e.g., at farmers' markets).

Sourcing food from small and local farmers, such as farmer's markets or nearby producers, supports local food systems, and rural development, and might prevent poor labour conditions. However, local food cannot simply be equated with sustainable food, as it, in most cases, can neither ensure food security nor necessarily have a lower carbon footprint (45). Therefore, diversifying our sources by buying food from both large and small producers is crucial. This approach not only fosters healthy competition but also mitigates risks associated with over-reliance on a few large suppliers. In essence, it is about achieving a balanced approach that combines the strengths of various producers, regardless of their size, to ensure a robust and resilient food system.

Buying food from certified systems that include aspects of social sustainability, such as 'Naturland Fair' and 'Fairtrade'.

Adhering to certifications that include social aspects can support ethical and sustainable practices throughout the food supply chain, such as ensuring suppliers are paid fairly while promoting supplier transparency and accountability.



Reducing the consumption of animal products in general and choosing organically produced meat or meat from extensive grazing systems.

Dietary choices have a direct impact on animal welfare and the use of antibiotics. Choosing not only less meat but opting for less but better meat, i.e., products from countries with stricter animal welfare laws, and production systems with higher animal welfare standards, such as organic or private sector animal welfare labels, substantially influences animal welfare outcomes. State animal husbandry labels and the EU-eco label can support sustainable food choices in this regard.

3. Part 3 – Summary Internal Report 4: Health Impact

3.1 Food system-related health impacts

The association between food intake and chronic disease must be linked holistically to dietary patterns, while also considering specific dimensions of dietary patterns, i.e., the ratio of animal to plant foods in the diet, the degree of food processing, and food diversity (including organic, local, and seasonal aspects) (111). Besides the diet-related health impacts, the agri-food sector as a workplace, the environmental contamination, and pathogenic contamination associated with agricultural activities and livestock production pose serious risks of communicable and non-communicable diseases and premature mortality.

3.1 Dietary patterns characterized by low intake of plant foods but high intake of red and processed meats, refined grains, high-fat milk, ultra-processed foods (UPFs), alcohol, and foods/beverages with added sugars have been associated with increased risk of chronic diseases such as coronary heart disease (CHD) (49), type 2 diabetes (T2DM) (e.g., 49, 50, 51), and cancer (52, 53, 54). In contrast, a plant-based diet rich in fruits, vegetables, whole grains, legumes, low-fat dairy products, white meats, and nuts is inversely associated with disease risk and mortality outcomes (55, 56, 57).

3.2. To assess the relationship between diet and human health, the simultaneous consideration of several potential dimensions of dietary patterns is required. These dimensions include the relationship between animal and plant foods in the diet.

The inclusion of more plant-based foods (e.g., fruits, vegetables, whole grains, legumes, nuts/seeds) in the diet is consistently favourable for human metabolism (e.g., less inflammation (58; 59), oxidative stress (60), and cardiovascular disease risk factors (61; 62)) and for decreasing all-cause mortality (-10%) (56), T2DM (-23%) (63), and coronary heart disease (-23%) (57) risk. Great benefits can be achieved when replacing meat with minimally processed plant-based protein foods, such as legumes (64). It has been shown that substituting various animal proteins, especially red and/or processed meat protein with plant proteins may reduce the risk of all-cause and CVD mortality, T2DM, and CHD (65; 66) and may improve glycaemic control in individuals with T2DM (67). This is particularly important considering that red meat consumption is associated with higher chronic disease risks, particularly stroke (+10%) (68), colorectal cancer (69), and prostate cancer (+4%) (70).

3.3 Another dimension relates to the degree of food processing. With the increasing hyper-industrialization of food processing in recent decades, there has been an increase in the prevalence of chronic diseases. Related to this is the consumption of UPFs, which have often higher levels of added sugars, salt and/or saturated fatty acids and are associated with an increased risk of all-cause early mortality and various chronic diseases (71; 72; 73; 74, 75; 76; 77; 78; 79). UPFs, such as soft drinks, sweet or savoury packaged snacks, and pre-prepared frozen dishes, are formulations made mostly or entirely from ingredients derived from foods and additives that result from a series of industrial processes (hence 'ultra-processed') (80). However, it should be noted that UPFs are a very broad category and, in some cases, include foods that are not always or equally harmful to health (e.g., dark/whole-grain bread, fruit-based products, and yoghurt/dairy-based desserts) (81). Therefore, it is important to assess the impact of UPFs as part of a holistic dietary pattern. When UPFs are considered within this broader context (i.e., an ultra-processed dietary pattern), the compositional differences between them become less important and the whole ultra-processed dietary pattern contributes to the detrimental impacts on health (82).



3.4. Dietary variety scores are more strongly related to nutrient adequacy than health outcomes (84). However, there is evidence suggesting that a higher food variety might protect, e.g., from degraded quality of life over time in human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) patients (85), overweight/obesity (86), T2DM (87), metabolic syndrome (87), and certain cancer (88, 89). Yet, further studies are warranted to substantiate these effects.

Concerning the consumption of organically certified foods, it has been found that some organic foods are more nutritionally dense than their conventional counterparts, notably, meat, dairy, and some plant-based products (90, 91). The first results point to the direction of increasing organic food intake as a means of reducing risks of overall cancers (92), T2DM (93), obesity (94), and metabolic syndrome (95). Possible major explanations for these negative associations are the prohibition of synthetic chemical pesticides in organic farming and the difference in bioactive components between organic and conventional foods (e.g., n-3 fatty acids (FA) and antioxidants) (96).

3.5 A well-planned plant-based diet that ensures adequate nutrient intake may be further supported by the consumption of fortified foods and/or supplements for important nutrients (e.g., vitamin B12, vitamin D, iodine). This is because plant-based diets may be at increased risk for deficiencies of certain essential nutrients such as vitamin B12, vitamin D, calcium, iron, zinc, and iodine, which are primarily or preferentially available from animal foods. This applies to adults but especially to children and adolescents. Plant-based diets have been shown to support normal growth in children/adolescents, but care must be taken to ensure that they are nutritionally adequate (97; 98).

3.6. Obesity significantly increases the risk of chronic diseases such as cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, hypertension, coronary heart disease, and certain cancers (99; 100). Obesity can also be associated with a range of mental health problems (101). Weight problems and obesity are increasing rapidly in most EU Member States. According to WHO, almost 60% of adults in the European Region are overweight or obese. Children are also affected: 8% of children under 5 and one in three school-age children are overweight or obese (102).

3.7. Occupational risks at sites of food production and processing make the agri-food sector one of the most dangerous workplaces. Exposure to chemicals, biological agents, physical hazards, and injuries increase the risks of communicable (e.g., Influenza Viruses (103)) and non-communicable diseases (e.g., male infertility, eye and digestive complications, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, specific types of cancer (104; 105) hearing loss (106)). Moreover, our food systems account to a large extent for the rising burden of environmental (e.g., air and water pollution, global warming) and pathogenic (e.g., zoonotic diseases) risk factors, which pose serious threats to public health and increase the burden on health care systems.

3.2 Case Study: Quantifying health impacts of shifting European dietary patterns towards dietary recommendations

The objective of this study was to use a health impact model to assess how the large-scale adoption of the Mediterranean diet (MD) and the Planetary Health Diet (PHD) (hereafter referred to as the target diets), would affect the annual burden of major chronic diseases (i.e., CVD, T2DM, and cancer) in three European countries: Sweden, France, and Italy; as consumption data were freely accessible for these countries.

The health effects of changing dietary patterns were assessed using data from national food consumption surveys. Table 3 summarizes the composition of the baseline diets as calculated using data from adult individuals (≥ 18 years) in each dataset. The percentage of daily energy intake per food group was calculated for the target diets (see Table 4 for recommended intakes in an adult diet). As shown in Table 4, the MD gives more emphasis to increasing fruits and vegetables, moderately decreasing red and processed meat, and largely decreasing added sugars, while the PHD prioritizes the increase in legumes and nuts and the reduction in red and processed meat.



The effects of 10 dietary factors on the risk of up to nine chronic diseases (i.e., CHD, ischemic stroke, subarachnoid and intracerebral haemorrhage, colorectal cancer, breast cancer, oesophageal cancer, tracheal/bronchial/lung cancer, and T2DM) were calculated. These chronic diseases, which are partly attributable to diet-related risk factors, are a major cause of disease burden and together account for more than 715 million Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs)⁵ worldwide.

| Table 2. Composition of baseline diets in the test countries | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|
| | Sweden | | France | | Italy | |
| | % energy intake | g/d | % energy intake | g/d | % energy intake | g/d |
| Fruits | 4.5±4.3 | 121±110 | 3.6±3.8 | 131±128 | 4.7±3.8 | 217±161 |
| Vegetables | 3.7±3.6 | 137±98 | 4.4±3.9 | 185±129 | 2.3±1.5 | 209±107 |
| Grains | 20.9±9.1 | 210±119 | 20.6±9.8 | 185±115 | 31.5±8.6 | 219±93 |
| Legumes | 0.8±2.0 | 12±26 | 0.6±1.6 | 10±25 | 0.8±1.6 | 18±30 |
| Fish | 4.0±4.8 | 45±50 | 2.7±3.8 | 37±49 | 2.2±2.5 | 45±51 |
| Dairy | 6.9±5.5 | 241±201 | 5.9±5.6 | 178±185 | 3.7±3.5 | 128±115 |
| Nuts/seeds | 1.0±2.9 | 3±11 | 0.7±2.1 | 3±8 | 0.3±1.0 | 1±5 |
| Red meat | 6.8±5.8 | 75±64 | 4.9±5.2 | 53±56 | 4.1±3.5 | 59±50 |
| Processed meat | 3.9±4.4 | 32±36 | 4.1±5.3 | 36±48 | 3.8±3.6 | 27±27 |
| SSBs | 1.4±2.6 | 80±150 | 2.4±3.6 | 128±210 | 0.9±1.9 | 49±101 |

Values are presented as percentages of daily energy intake and average grams per day from selected food groups (mean ± standard deviation). The selected food groups represent only a proportion of daily energy intake. Grains refers to total grains (whole grains and refined grains). Vegetables refers to non-starchy vegetables. Dairy refers to milk and yoghurt. SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages.

⁵ One DALY represents the loss of the equivalent of one year of full health. DALYs for a disease or health condition are the sum of the years of life lost due to premature mortality and the years lived with a disability due to prevalent cases of the disease or health condition in a population (WHO; <https://www.who.int/data/gho/indicator-metadata-registry/imr-details/158>).



| Table 3. Composition of the target diets | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| | Mediterranean diet | | Planetary health diet | |
| | % energy intake | g/d* | % energy intake | g/d* |
| Fruits | 6.9 | 276 | 5.0 | 200 |
| Vegetables | 9.6 | 919 | 3.1 | 300 |
| Starchy vegetables | 1.8 | 59 | 1.6 | 50 |
| Grains | 33.7 | 241 | 32.4 | 232 |
| Legumes | 5.0 | 33 | 11.3 | 75 |
| Red meat | 2.2 | 26 | 1.2 | 14 |
| Processed meat | 1.2 | 14 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Fish | 1.6 | 28 | 1.6 | 28 |
| Poultry | 2.3 | 27 | 2.5 | 29 |
| Eggs | 2.3 | 39 | 0.8 | 13 |
| Dairy | 7.5 | 306 | 6.1 | 250 |
| Nuts/seeds | 8.0 | 34 | 11.6 | 50 |
| Added sugars | 1.4 | 9 | 4.8 | 31 |
| Saturated fat | NS | NS | 3.8 | 12 |
| Unsaturated fat | 16.5 | 47 | 14.1 | 40 |

Values are presented as percentages of daily energy intake and grams per day from main food groups.

* Based on an average energy intake of 2500kcal per day. Values in the Planetary health diet correspond to the scientific targets as outlined in the summary report of the EAT–Lancet Commission (109). Grains refers to total grains (whole grains and refined grains). Vegetables refers to non-starchy vegetables. Energy from added sugars and sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs) is treated as synonymous in this study. NS: Not specified.



3.2.1 SWEDEN

The baseline diet in Sweden was closer to the PHD recommendations for fruit intake and closer to the MD recommendation for SSB (i.e., added sugars) intake, while it deviated from both target diets in terms of other food groups. In general, the intake of grains, legumes, and nuts was below the recommendations of both diets, red meat, processed meat, and fish intake was above recommendations, and vegetable and dairy intakes were in between the recommended intakes of the target diets. The MD scenario was estimated to save a total of 15,369 DALYs/year with main contributions from increased consumption of legumes, grains, nuts/seeds, and vegetables and reduced consumption of red and processed meat (Fig. 2). This corresponded to 6,5% reduction in aggregate disease burden (Fig. 5). In turn, the PHD scenario was estimated to save 18,942 DALYs/year (8% reduction in aggregate disease burden), with main contributions from increased consumption of legumes, grains, and nuts/seeds, and reduced consumption of red and processed meat.




Figure 8: DALYs saved or lost per year following each dietary shift scenario in Sweden. CVD: cardiovascular disease, SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages, T2DM: type 2 diabetes mellitus.

3.2.2 FRANCE

The **French** diet was low in fruits, grains, legumes, dairy, and nuts/seeds and high in red meat, processed meat, and fish compared to the target diets, while the intake of vegetables and SSBs was in between the recommended intakes of the target diets. Shifting the French diet towards the principles of the MD was estimated to save 70,346 DALYs/year (6% reduction in aggregate disease burden) with main contributions from increased consumption of grains, legumes, nuts/seeds, fruits, and vegetables, and reduced consumption of red and processed meat (Fig. 3). Shifting to the PHD was estimated to have a larger health impact with 80,901 DALYs saved per year (6.9% reduction in aggregate disease burden) and main contributions were from increased consumption of legumes, grains, and nuts/seeds, and reduced consumption of red and processed meat.




Figure 9: DALYs saved or lost per year following each dietary shift scenario in France. CVD: cardiovascular disease, SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages, T2DM: type 2 diabetes mellitus.

3.2.3 ITALY

Finally, the baseline diet in Italy was low in vegetables, legumes, nuts/seeds, and SSBs and high in red meat, processed meat, and fish compared to recommended intakes in the target diets. Fruit intake was close to the PHD recommendation and grain intake was close to the recommendations of both target diets. A total of 72,017 saved DALYs/year (4.9% reduction in aggregate disease burden) was estimated for the MD scenario, while the PHD scenario was found to have a larger health impact with 88,964 DALYs saved per year (6% reduction in aggregate disease burden) (Fig. 4). In both scenarios, main contributions were from increased consumption of legumes and nuts/seeds and reduced consumption of red and processed meat.




Figure 10: DALYs saved or lost per year following each dietary shift scenario in Italy. CVD: cardiovascular disease, SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages, T2DM: type 2 diabetes mellitus.



3.2.4 CONCLUSION

Although both dietary shift scenarios proved to be healthier alternatives compared to the baseline diets in the test countries, the PHD scenario was found to have a more pronounced health impact than the MD scenario across countries (6%-8% versus 5%-6.5% reductions in disease burden for PHD and MD, respectively). This was largely due to the fact that PHD prioritizes the consumption of legumes and nuts/seeds as protein sources while also reducing red and processed meat consumption considerably. On the contrary, the MD prioritizes increased consumption of fruits and vegetables, and is more moderate in legumes, and recommends smaller reductions in red and processed meat compared to the PHD. Given that, across countries, legume and nut/seed intakes were considerably below recommended intakes of both target diets and red and processed meat intakes were considerably above, these dietary factors were the most determinative of the overall health impact associated with each dietary shift.

Interestingly, baseline fish intake in all countries was higher than recommended intakes in both target diets, thus both dietary shift scenarios, in fact, led to lost DALYs for this dietary risk factor. The same was the case for vegetable intake in Sweden and France. Conversely, baseline SSB intake was lower than the recommended intake of added sugars in the PHD, thereby also leading to DALYs lost in all countries in this scenario.




Figure 11: Percentage of reduction in disease burden associated with each dietary shift scenario in Sweden, France, and Italy. CVD: cardiovascular disease, SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages, T2DM: type 2 diabetes mellitus.

3.3 Recommended action for consumers and food professionals

Following a diet characterized by high consumption of fruit, vegetables, whole grains, legumes, and nuts/seeds, moderate consumption of low-fat dairy and white meat, and limited consumption of red and processed meats, foods high in added sugars, fats and/or salt, and/or ingredients not found at home, and alcohol.

Starting from the end of the farm-to-fork chain (i.e., consumption stage), a large-scale transition in consumers' dietary choices could help reduce health impacts associated with unhealthy food consumption and could perhaps work as a driver of change in preceding links of the chain (i.e., production and processing stages). A large-scale adoption of a diet high in a variety of minimally processed foods, preferably plant-based foods, and a moderate quantity of animal-based foods of high quality would reduce the burden of key chronic diseases such as cardiovascular diseases, T2DM, and various types of cancer (by 5%-8%) (107).



Prioritizing the replacement of red and processed meats, rather than that of other animal-sourced foods, such as dairy products, poultry, and fish.

Fish as a source of omega-3 fatty acids can be consumed several times a week, as well as optional moderate consumption of poultry, which provides protein and micronutrients such as vitamin B12, tryptophan, choline, zinc, iron, and copper (16).

Embracing alternative sources of protein.

When decreasing meat and meat products, the individually required protein intake should be provided by protein-rich, plant-based foods, as well as low-fat dairy and eggs as alternatives. However, many plants are both healthy and sustainable sources of dietary protein. The aim is to consume 3 servings of beans, lentils, peas, and other legumes per week (1 serving for an adult diet: 70 g raw / 125 g cooked).

When following a primarily plant-based diet, make sure to frequently consume foods rich in calcium, iron, and zinc.

For example, tofu, beans, lentils, and nuts can be good sources of calcium, iron, and zinc. Eating or drinking a source of vitamin C (e.g., citrus fruits, bell peppers) will improve iron absorption from plant foods, as will avoiding the consumption of tea and coffee ~1 hour before or after meals.

When following a primarily plant-based diet, consider adding fortified foods to the diet and/or supplementing adequate intakes of nutrients.

Following a vegetarian or vegan diet with no or little consumption of animal products has implications for nutrient intake, as it is difficult to meet the needs for certain nutrients like vitamin B12, vitamin D, and iodine when restricting all animal foods or consuming very little amounts of them. In some circumstances, it can lead to nutrient deficiencies and increased risk of malnutrition. The consumption of fortified foods like breakfast cereals (preferably not ultra-processed), whole grain bread, and plant milk/yogurt alternatives (preferably not ultra-processed) and/or supplements will ensure adequate intakes of these key nutrients.

Limiting the consumption of UPFs and products with high levels of added sugars, fats, and/or salt.

The consumption of UPFs is associated with increased risks of early all-cause mortality and several chronic diseases, this suggests that limiting UPFs (particularly refined breads, sauces, spreads, condiments, artificially and sugar-sweetened beverages, processed animal-sourced foods, most industrial ready-to-eat mixed dishes, and desserts) in the diet may be beneficial to prevent and reduce health impacts.

Favouring whole grain products instead of refined grains.

Carbohydrates should primarily be sourced from whole grains with a low intake of refined grains and less than 5% of energy from free sugar (i.e., from fruit juices, honey and added table or industrial sugars).



References

- 1 FAO and WHO (2019): Sustainable healthy diets – Guiding principles. Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture und World Health Organization. Rome.
- 2 TEEB (2018). TEEB for Agriculture & Food: Scientific and Economic Foundations. Geneva: UN Environment
- 3 IPBES (2019): Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.
- 4 IPCC (2019): Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. The Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change. Geneva, Switzerland.
- 5 Falkenmark, M.; Rockström, J. (2005): Balancing water for humans and nature. The new approach in ecohydrology. Repr. London: Earthscan.
- 6 Crippa, M.; Solazzo, E.; Guizzardi, D.; Monforti-Ferrario, F.; Tubiello, F. N.; Leip, A. (2021): Food systems are responsible for a third of global anthropogenic GHG emissions. In: *Nature food* 2 (3), S. 198–209. DOI: 10.1038/s43016-021-00225-9.
- 7 Billen, G.; Aguilera, E.; Einarsson, R.; Garnier, J.; Gingrich, S.; Grizzetti, B. et al. (2021): Reshaping the European agro-food system and closing its nitrogen cycle: The potential of combining dietary change, agroecology, and circularity. In: *One Earth* 4 (6), S. 839–850. DOI: 10.1016/j.oneear.2021.05.008.
- 8 Rööös, E., Karlsson, L., Wanecek, W., Spångberg, J. (2023): Environmental performance of baseline diets from the Living Lab countries (PLANEAT - Internal report 2).
- 9 Poore, J.; Nemecek, T. (2018): Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and consumers. In: *Science* (New York, N.Y.) 360 (6392), S. 987–992. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaq0216.
- 10 Eriksson, O. (2022): Coproduction of Food, Cultural Heritage and Biodiversity by Livestock Grazing in Swedish Semi-natural Grasslands. In: *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.* 6, Artikel 801327, S102. DOI: 10.3389/fsufs.2022.801327.
- 11 Chaudhary, A.; Brooks, T. M. (2018): Land Use Intensity-Specific Global Characterization Factors to Assess Product Biodiversity Footprints. In: *Environmental science & technology* 52 (9), S. 5094–5104. DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.7b05570.
- 12 FAO (2022): The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2022. Towards Blue Transformation. Rome, FAO. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc0461en>.
- 13 Gephart, J. A.; Henriksson, P. J. G.; Parker, Robert W. R.; Shepon, Alon; Gorospe, Kelvin D.; Bergman, Kristina et al. (2021): Environmental performance of blue foods. In: *Nature* 597 (7876), S. 360–365. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-021-03889-2.
- 14 JRC (2023): Less food waste could bring lower EU food prices and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. European Commission Joint Research Centre. Hg. v. European Commission und Joint Research Centre. Online verfügbar unter https://joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu/jrc-news-and-updates/less-food-waste-could-bring-lower-eu-food-prices-and-decrease-greenhouse-gas-emissions-2023-07-06_en.
- 15 Harrison, M. R.; Palma, G.; Buendia, T.; Bueno-Tarodo, M.; Quell, D.; Hachem, F. (2022): A Scoping Review of Indicators for Sustainable Healthy Diets. In: *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.* 5, Artikel 822263, S. 2627. DOI: 10.3389/fsufs.2021.822263.
- 16 Persson, L.; Carney A., Bethanie M.; Collins, C. D.; Cornell, S.; Wit, C. A. de; Diamond, M. L. et al. (2022): Outside the Safe Operating Space of the Planetary Boundary for Novel Entities. In: *Environmental science & technology* 56 (3), S. 1510–1521. DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.1c04158.
- 17 Willett, W.; Rockström, J.; Loken, B.; Springmann, M.; Lang, T.; Vermeulen, S., et al. (2019): Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. In: *Lancet* (London, England) 393 (10170), S. 447–492. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4.
- 18 Moberg, E.; Karlsson Potter, H.; Wood, A.; Hansson, P.-A.; Rööös, E. (2020): Benchmarking the Swedish Diet Relative to Global and National Environmental Targets—Identification of Indicator Limitations and Data Gaps. In: *Sustainability* 12 (4), S. 1407. DOI: 10.3390/su12041407.



- 19 Rosa, L.; Chiarelli, D. D.; Sangiorgio, M.; Beltran-Peña, A.; Rulli, M C.; D'Odorico, P.; Fung, I. (2020): Potential for sustainable irrigation expansion in a 3 °C warmer climate. In: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 117 (47), S. 29526–29534. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2017796117.
- 20 Swinnen, J. F. M.; Knops, L.; van Herck, K.(2013): Food policy volatility and EU policies. Helsinki: WIDER (Working paper / World Institute for Development Economics Research, 2013/032). Online verfügbar unter http://www.wider.unu.edu/publications/working-papers/2013/en_GB/wp2013-032/.
- 21 Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (2023): Price fluctuations (volatility) on commodity futures markets for agricultural raw materials. Berlin/Bonn.
- 22 Hofstrand D. (2014) Can we meet the world's growing demand for food? AgMRC Renewable Energy & Climate Change Newsletter.<https://www.agmrc.org/renewable-energy/renewable-energy-climate-change-report/renewable-energy-climate-change-report/january--february-2014-newsletter/can-we-meet-the-worlds-growing-demand-for-food>
- 23 EC (European Commission) (n.d.) *Young people in farming*. Agriculture and rural development. Retrieved from: https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/common-agricultural-policy/income-support/young-farmers_en
- 24 EUROSTAT (2020): Farmers and the agricultural labour force – statistics. EUROSTAT. Online verfügbar unter https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Farmers_and_the_agricultural_labour_force_-_statistic.
- 25 Global Slavery Index. (n.d). *Understanding the scale of modern slavery*. Retrieved from: <https://www.walkfree.org/global-slavery-index/#the-scale>.
- 26 EPRS (2021): Migrant seasonal workers in the European agricultural sector. European Parliamentary Research Service. Online verfügbar unter [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/689347/EPRS_BRI\(2021\)689347_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/689347/EPRS_BRI(2021)689347_EN.pdf)
- 27 Scaturro, R. (2021): Modern Slavery Made in Italy—Causes and Consequences of Labour Exploitation in the Italian Agricultural Sector. In: Journal of Illicit Economies and Development 3 (2), S. 181–189. DOI: 10.31389/jied.95.
- 28 Trautrim, A.; Schleper, M. C.; Cakir, M. S.; Gold, S. (2020): Survival at the expense of the weakest? Managing modern slavery risks in supply chains during COVID-19. In: Journal of Risk Research 23 (7-8), S. 1067–1072. DOI: 10.1080/13669877.2020.1772347.
- 29 Barrientos, S W (2013): 'Labour Chains': Analysing the Role of Labour Contractors in Global Production Networks. In: The Journal of Development Studies 49 (8), S. 1058–1071. DOI: 10.1080/00220388.2013.780040.
- 30 Deconinck, K. (2021): Concentration and market power in the food chain. OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Papers. Hg. v. OECD Publishing. Paris.
- 31 Hernandez M., Espinoza A., Deconinck K., Swinnen J. and Vos R. (2023): The role of market concentration in the agrifood industry. IFPRI Discussion paper 02168. Online verfügbar unter <https://ebrary.ifpri.org/utils/getfile/collection/p15738coll2/id/136567/filename/136780.pdf>.
- 32 Nybom, J.; Hunter, E.; Micheels, E.; Melin, M. (2021): Farmers' strategic responses to competitive intensity and the impact on perceived performance. In: SN Bus Econ 1 (6), S. 339. DOI: 10.1007/s43546-021-00078-1.
- 33 EC (2021): Females in the field. Agriculture and development. Hg. v. European Commission. Online verfügbar unter https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/news/females-field-2021-03-08_en.
- 34 Strang, S.; Hoeber, C.; Uhl, O.; Koletzko, B.; Münte, T. F.; Lehnert, H. et al. (2017): Impact of nutrition on social decision making. In: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 114 (25), S. 6510–6514. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1620245114.
- 35 Firth, J.; Gangwisch, J. E.; Borisini, A.; Wootton, Robyn E.; Mayer, E. A. (2020): Food and mood: how do diet and nutrition affect mental wellbeing? In: BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 369, m2382. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.m2382.



- 36 Carson, T. L.; Hidalgo, B.; Ard, J. D.; Affuso, O. (2014): Dietary interventions and quality of life: a systematic review of the literature. In: *Journal of nutrition education and behavior* 46 (2), S. 90–101. DOI: 10.1016/j.jneb.2013.09.005.
- 37 FAO (2001): *The state of food and agriculture 2001*. Hg. v. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Online verfügbar unter <https://www.fao.org/3/x9800e/x9800e00.htm#TopOfPage>.
- 38 Rao, M.; Afshin, A.; Singh, G.; Mozaffarian, D. (2013): Do healthier foods and diet patterns cost more than less healthy options? A systematic review and meta-analysis. In: *BMJ open* 3 (12), e004277. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004277.
- 39 Darmon, N.; Drewnowski, A. (2015): Contribution of food prices and diet cost to socioeconomic disparities in diet quality and health: a systematic review and analysis. In: *Nutrition reviews* 73 (10), S. 643–660. DOI: 10.1093/nutrit/nuv027.
- 40 James, W. P.; Nelson, M.; Ralph, A.; Leather, S. (1997): Socioeconomic determinants of health. The contribution of nutrition to inequalities in health. In: *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)* 314 (7093), S. 1545–1549. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.314.7093.1545.
- 41 The Food Systems Dashboard. (2020). Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) and Johns Hopkins University. Geneva, Switzerland. <https://www.foodsystemsdashboard.org>
- 42 Springmann, M.; Clark, M. A.; Rayner, M.; Scarborough, P.; Webb, P. (2021): The global and regional costs of healthy and sustainable dietary patterns: a modelling study. In: *The Lancet. Planetary health* 5 (11), e797–e807. DOI: 10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00251-5.
- 43 Tiseo, K.; Huber, L.; Gilbert, M.; Robinson, T. P.; van Boeckel, T. P. (2020): Global Trends in Antimicrobial Use in Food Animals from 2017 to 2030. In: *Antibiotics (Basel, Switzerland)* 9 (12). DOI: 10.3390/antibiotics9120918.
- 44 Pokharel, S.; Adhikari, B. (2020): Antimicrobial resistance and over the counter use of drugs in Nepal. In: *Journal of global health* 10 (1), S. 10360. DOI: 10.7189/jogh.10.010360.
- 45 Stein, A. J.; Santini, F. (2022): The sustainability of “local” food: a review for policy-makers. In: *Rev Agric Food Environ Stud* 103 (1), S. 77–89. DOI: 10.1007/s41130-021-00148-w.
- 46 Scherer, L.; Tomasik, B.; Rueda, O.; Pfister, S. (2018): Framework for integrating animal welfare into life cycle sustainability assessment. In: *The international journal of life cycle assessment* 23 (7), S. 1476–1490. DOI: 10.1007/s11367-017-1420-x.
- 47 Paris, J. Minetto Gellert; Falkenberg, T.; Nöthlings, U.; Heinzl, C.; Borgemeister, C.; Escobar, N. (2022): Changing dietary patterns is necessary to improve the sustainability of Western diets from a One Health perspective. In: *The Science of the total environment* 811, S. 151437. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151437.
- 48 Zhang, X.; Shu, L.; Si, C.; Yu, X.-L.; Liao, D.; Gao, W. et al. (2015): Dietary Patterns, Alcohol Consumption and Risk of Coronary Heart Disease in Adults: A Meta-Analysis. In: *Nutrients* 7 (8), S. 6582–6605. DOI: 10.3390/nu7085300.
- 49 Hassani Z., Shirin; Boffetta, P.; Hosseinzadeh, M. (2020): Dietary patterns and risk of gestational diabetes mellitus: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. In: *Clinical nutrition ESPEN* 36, S. 1–9. DOI: 10.1016/j.clnesp.2020.02.009.
- 50 Haghghatdoost, F.; Riahi, R.; Safari, S.; Heidari, Z. (2023): Dose-response association between dietary patterns and gestational diabetes mellitus risk: A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. In: *Food science & nutrition* 11 (1), S. 57–92. DOI: 10.1002/fsn3.3042.
- 51 Quan, W.; Zeng, Maomao; J., Ye; Li, Y.; Xue, C.; Liu, G. et al. (2021): Western Dietary Patterns, Foods, and Risk of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. In: *Advances in nutrition (Bethesda, Md.)* 12 (4), S. 1353–1364. DOI: 10.1093/advances/nmaa184.
- 52 Bu, Y.; Qu, J.; Ji, S.; Zhou, J.; Xue, M.; Qu, J. et al. (2022): Dietary patterns and breast cancer risk, prognosis, and quality of life: A systematic review. In: *Frontiers in nutrition* 9, S. 1057057. DOI: 10.3389/fnut.2022.1057057.



- 53 Fabiani, R.; Minelli, L.; Bertarelli, G.; Bacci, S. (2016): A Western Dietary Pattern Increases Prostate Cancer Risk: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. In: *Nutrients* 8 (10). DOI: 10.3390/nu8100626.
- 54 Boushey, C.; Ard, J.; Bazzano, L.; Heymsfield, S.; Mayer-Davis, E.; Sabaté, J. et al. (2020): Dietary Patterns and Breast, Colorectal, Lung, and Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review. Alexandria (VA).
- 55 Jafari, S.; Hezaveh, E.; Jalilpiran, Y.; Jayedi, A.; Wong, A.; Safaiyan, A.; Barzegar, A. (2022): Plant-based diets and risk of disease mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. In: *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition* 62 (28), S. 7760–7772. DOI: 10.1080/10408398.2021.1918628.
- 56 English, L. K.; Ard, J. D.; Bailey, R. L.; Bates, M.; Bazzano, L. A.; Boushey, C. J. et al. (2021): Evaluation of Dietary Patterns and All-Cause Mortality: A Systematic Review. In: *JAMA network open* 4 (8), e2122277. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.22277.
- 57 Li, F.; Hou, Li-na; Chen, W.; Chen, P.; Lei, C.; Wei, Q. et al. (2015): Associations of dietary patterns with the risk of all-cause, CVD and stroke mortality: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. In: *The British journal of nutrition* 113 (1), S. 16–24. DOI: 10.1017/S000711451400289X.
- 58 Eichelmann, F.; Schwingshackl, L.; Fedirko, V.; Aleksandrova, K. (2016): Effect of plant-based diets on obesity-related inflammatory profiles: a systematic review and meta-analysis of intervention trials. In: *Obesity reviews : an official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity* 17 (11), S. 1067–1079. DOI: 10.1111/obr.12439.
- 59 Medawar, E.; Huhn, S.; Villringer, A.; Veronica W., A. (2019): The effects of plant-based diets on the body and the brain: a systematic review. In: *Translational psychiatry* 9 (1), S. 226. DOI: 10.1038/s41398-019-0552-0.
- 60 Lettieri-Barbato, D.; Tomei, F.; Sancini, A.; Morabito, G.; Serafini, M. (2013): Effect of plant foods and beverages on plasma non-enzymatic antioxidant capacity in human subjects: a meta-analysis. In: *The British journal of nutrition* 109 (9), S. 1544–1556. DOI: 10.1017/S0007114513000263.
- 61 Gibbs, J.; Gaskin, E.; Ji, Chen; Miller, M. A.; Cappuccio, F. P. (2021): The effect of plant-based dietary patterns on blood pressure: a systematic review and meta-analysis of controlled intervention trials. In: *Journal of hypertension* 39 (1), S. 23–37. DOI: 10.1097/HJH.0000000000002604.
- 62 Yokoyama, Y.; Levin, S. M.; Barnard, N. D. (2017): Association between plant-based diets and plasma lipids: a systematic review and meta-analysis. In: *Nutrition reviews* 75 (9), S. 683–698. DOI: 10.1093/nutrit/nux030.
- 63 Qian F, Liu G, Hu FB et al. Association Between Plant-Based Dietary Patterns and Risk of Type 2 Diabetes: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2019, Vol. 179, 10, pp. 1335-1344.
- 64 Reynolds, A. N.; Mhurchu, C. Ni; Kok, Z.; Cleghorn, C. (2023): The neglected potential of red and processed meat replacement with alternative protein sources: Simulation modelling and systematic review. In: *EClinicalMedicine* 56, S. 101774. DOI: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101774.
- 65 Zheng, J.; Zhu, T.; Yang, G.; Zhao, L.; Li, F.; Park, Y-M et al. (2022): The Isocaloric Substitution of Plant-Based and Animal-Based Protein in Relation to Aging-Related Health Outcomes: A Systematic Review. In: *Nutrients* 14 (2). DOI: 10.3390/nu14020272.
- 66 Hidayat, K.; Chen, J; Wang, H; Wang, T; Liu, Y; Zhang, X et al. (2022): Is replacing red meat with other protein sources associated with lower risks of coronary heart disease and all-cause mortality? A meta-analysis of prospective studies. In: *Nutrition reviews* 80 (9), S. 1959–1973. DOI: 10.1093/nutrit/nuac017.
- 67 Vigiouliouk, E.; Stewart, S. E.; Jayalath, V. H.; Ng, Alena P.; Mirrahimi, A.; Souza, R. J. de et al. (2015): Effect of Replacing Animal Protein with Plant Protein on Glycemic Control in Diabetes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. In: *Nutrients* 7 (12), S. 9804–9824. DOI: 10.3390/nu7125509.
- 68 Medeiros, G. C. B. S. de; Mesquita, G. X. B.; Lima, S. C. V. C.; Silva, D. F. de O.; Azevedo, K. P. M. de; Pimenta, I. D. S. F. et al. (2022): Associations of the consumption of unprocessed red meat and processed meat with the incidence of cardiovascular disease and mortality, and the dose-response relationship: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. In: *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition*, S. 1–14. DOI: 10.1080/10408398.2022.2058461.



- 69 IARC (2018): IARC monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans, volume 114 ; red meat and processed meat. Lyon: IARC Press (IARC monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans, 114).
- 70 Nouri-Majd S., Salari-Moghaddam A., Aminianfar A. et al. Association Between Red and Processed Meat Consumption and Risk of Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Nutr.* 2022, Vol. 9, p. 801722.
- 71 Yuan, L.; Hu, H.; Li, T.; Zhang, J.; Feng, Y.; Yang, X. et al. (2023): Dose-response meta-analysis of ultra-processed food with the risk of cardiovascular events and all-cause mortality: evidence from prospective cohort studies. In: *Food & function* 14 (6), S. 2586–2596. DOI: 10.1039/D2FO02628G.
- 72 Moradi, S.; Entezari, M. H.; Mohammadi, H.; Jayedi, A.; Lazaridi, A.-V.; Kermani, M. A. H.; Miraghajani, M. (2023): Ultra-processed food consumption and adult obesity risk: a systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis. In: *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition* 63 (2), S. 249–260. DOI: 10.1080/10408398.2021.1946005.
- 73 Moradi, S.; Hojjati Kermani, Mohammad Ali; Bagheri, R.; Mohammadi, H.; Jayedi, A.; Lane, M. M. et al. (2021): Ultra-Processed Food Consumption and Adult Diabetes Risk: A Systematic Review and Dose-Response Meta-Analysis. In: *Nutrients* 13 (12). DOI: 10.3390/nu13124410.
- 74 Lane, M. M.; Davis, J. A.; Beattie, S.; Gómez-Donoso, C.; Loughman, A.; O'Neil, A. et al. (2021): Ultraprocessed food and chronic noncommunicable diseases: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 43 observational studies. In: *Obesity reviews : an official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity* 22 (3), e13146. DOI: 10.1111/obr.13146.
- 75 Lane, M. M.; Gamage, E.; Travica, N.; Dissanayaka, T.; Ashtree, D. N.; Gauci, S. et al. (2022): Ultra-Processed Food Consumption and Mental Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Observational Studies. In: *Nutrients* 14 (13). DOI: 10.3390/nu14132568.
- 76 Pagliai, G.; Dinu, M.; Madarena, M. P.; Bonaccio, M.; Iacoviello, L.; Sofi, F. (2021): Consumption of ultra-processed foods and health status: a systematic review and meta-analysis. In: *The British journal of nutrition* 125 (3), S. 308–318. DOI: 10.1017/S0007114520002688.
- 77 Wang, M.; Du, X.; Huang, W.; Xu, Y. (2022): Ultra-processed Foods Consumption Increases the Risk of Hypertension in Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. In: *American journal of hypertension* 35 (10), S. 892–901. DOI: 10.1093/ajh/hpac069.
- 78 Cheng S., Zheng Q., Ding G. et al. Mediterranean dietary pattern and the risk of prostate cancer: A meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2019, Vol. 98, 27, p. e16341.
- 79 Narula, N.; Chang, N. H.; Mohammad, D.; Wong, E. C. L.; Ananthakrishnan, A. N.; Chan, S. S. M. et al. (2023): Food Processing and Risk of Inflammatory Bowel Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. In: *Clinical gastroenterology and hepatology : the official clinical practice journal of the American Gastroenterological Association* 21 (10), 2483-2495.e1. DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2023.01.012.
- 80 Monteiro, C. A.; Cannon, G.; Levy, R. B.; Moubarac, J.-C.; Louzada, M. Lc; Rauber, F. et al. (2019): Ultra-processed foods: what they are and how to identify them. In: *Public health nutrition* 22 (5), S. 936–941. DOI: 10.1017/S1368980018003762.
- 81 Chen, Z.; Khandpur, N.; Desjardins, C.; Wang, L.; Monteiro, C. A.; Rossato, Sinara L. et al. (2023): Ultra-Processed Food Consumption and Risk of Type 2 Diabetes: Three Large Prospective U.S. Cohort Studies. In: *Diabetes care* 46 (7), S. 1335–1344. DOI: 10.2337/dc22-1993.
- 82 Scrinis, G.; Monteiro, C. (2022): From ultra-processed foods to ultra-processed dietary patterns. In: *Nature food* 3 (9), S. 671–673. DOI: 10.1038/s43016-022-00599-4.
- 83 Verger, E. O.; Le Port, A.; Borderon, A.; Bourbon, G.; Moursi, M.; Savy, M. et al. (2021): Dietary Diversity Indicators and Their Associations with Dietary Adequacy and Health Outcomes: A Systematic Scoping Review. In: *Advances in nutrition (Bethesda, Md.)* 12 (5), S. 1659–1672. DOI: 10.1093/advances/nmab009.



- 84 Sackey, J.; Zhang, Fang F.; Rogers, B.; Aryeetey, R.; Wanke, C. (2018): Food security and dietary diversity are associated with health related quality of life after 6 months of follow up among people living with HIV in Accra, Ghana. In: *AIDS care* 30 (12), S. 1567–1571. DOI: 10.1080/09540121.2018.1500011.
- 85 Xu, H.; Du, S.; Liu, A.; Zhang, Q.; Ma, G. (2022): Low Dietary Diversity for Recommended Food Groups Increases the Risk of Obesity among Children: Evidence from a Chinese Longitudinal Study. In: *Nutrients* 14 (19). DOI: 10.3390/nu14194068.
- 86 Liu, M.; Liu, C.; Zhang, Z.; Zhou, C.; Li, Q.; He, P. et al. (2021): Quantity and variety of food groups consumption and the risk of diabetes in adults: A prospective cohort study. In: *Clinical nutrition (Edinburgh, Scotland)* 40 (12), S. 5710–5717. DOI: 10.1016/j.clnu.2021.10.003.
- 87 Gholizadeh, F.; Moludi, J.; Lotfi Yagin, N.; Alizadeh, M.; Mostafa Nachvak, S.; Abdollahzad, H. et al. (2018): The relation of Dietary diversity score and food insecurity to metabolic syndrome features and glucose level among pre-diabetes subjects. In: *Primary care diabetes* 12 (4), S. 338–344. DOI: 10.1016/j.pcd.2018.03.003.
- 88 Franceschi, S.; Favero, A.; La Vecchia, C.; Negri, E.; Dal Maso, L.; Salvini, S. et al. (1995): Influence of food groups and food diversity on breast cancer risk in Italy. In: *International journal of cancer* 63 (6), S. 785–789. DOI: 10.1002/ijc.2910630606.
- 89 Di Maso, M.; Turati, F.; Bosetti, C.; Montella, M.; Libra, M.; Negri, E. et al. (2019): Food consumption, meat cooking methods and diet diversity and the risk of bladder cancer. In: *Cancer epidemiology* 63, S. 101595. DOI: 10.1016/j.canep.2019.101595.
- 90 Średnicka-Tober, D.; Barański, M.; Seal, C.; Sanderson, R.; Benbrook, C.; Steinshamn, H. et al. (2016): Composition differences between organic and conventional meat: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis. In: *The British journal of nutrition* 115 (6), S. 994–1011. DOI: 10.1017/S0007114515005073.
- 91 Średnicka-Tober, D.; Barański, M.; Seal, C. J.; Sanderson, R.; Benbrook, C.; Steinshamn, H. et al. (2016): Higher PUFA and n-3 PUFA, conjugated linoleic acid, α -tocopherol and iron, but lower iodine and selenium concentrations in organic milk: a systematic literature review and meta- and redundancy analyses. In: *The British journal of nutrition* 115 (6), S. 1043–1060. DOI: 10.1017/S0007114516000349.
- 92 Baudry, J.; Assmann, K. E.; Touvier, M.; Allès, B.; Seconda, L.; Latino-Martel, P. et al. (2018a): Association of Frequency of Organic Food Consumption With Cancer Risk: Findings From the NutriNet-Santé Prospective Cohort Study. In: *JAMA internal medicine* 178 (12), S. 1597–1606. DOI: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.4357.
- 93 Kesse-Guyot, E.; Rebouillat, P.; Payrastra, L.; Allès, B.; Fezeu, L. K.; Druesne-Pecollo, N. et al. (2020): Prospective association between organic food consumption and the risk of type 2 diabetes: findings from the NutriNet-Santé cohort study. In: *The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity* 17 (1), S. 136. DOI: 10.1186/s12966-020-01038-y.
- 94 Kesse-Guyot, E.; Baudry, J.; Assmann, K. E.; Galan, P.; Hercberg, S.; Lairon, D. (2017): Prospective association between consumption frequency of organic food and body weight change, risk of overweight or obesity: results from the NutriNet-Santé Study. In: *The British journal of nutrition* 117 (2), S. 325–334. DOI: 10.1017/S0007114517000058.
- 95 Baudry, J.; Lelong, H.; Adriouch, S.; Julia, C.; Allès, B.; Hercberg, S. et al. (2018b): Association between organic food consumption and metabolic syndrome: cross-sectional results from the NutriNet-Santé study. In: *European journal of nutrition* 57 (7), S. 2477–2488. DOI: 10.1007/s00394-017-1520-1.
- 96 Kesse-Guyot, E.; Lairon, D.; Allès, B.; Seconda, L.; Rebouillat, P.; Brunin, J. et al. (2022): Key Findings of the French BioNutriNet Project on Organic Food-Based Diets: Description, Determinants, and Relationships to Health and the Environment. In: *Advances in nutrition (Bethesda, Md.)* 13 (1), S. 208–224. DOI: 10.1093/advances/nmab105.
- 97 Schürmann, S.; Kersting, M.; Alexy, U. (2017): Vegetarian diets in children: a systematic review. In: *European journal of nutrition* 56 (5), S. 1797–1817. DOI: 10.1007/s00394-017-1416-0.



- 98 Sanders, TA. Growth and development of British vegan children. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1988, Vol. 48, (3 Suppl), pp. 822-5.
- 99 Avgerinos, K. I.; Spyrou, N.; Mantzoros, C. S.; Dalamaga, M. (2019): Obesity and cancer risk: Emerging biological mechanisms and perspectives. In: *Metabolism: clinical and experimental* 92, S. 121–135. DOI: 10.1016/j.metabol.2018.11.001.
- 100 Powell-Wiley, T. M.; Poirier, P.; Burke, L. E.; Després, Jean-Pierre; Gordon-Larsen, Penny; Lavie, Carl J. et al. (2021): Obesity and Cardiovascular Disease: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. In: *Circulation* 143 (21), e984-e1010. DOI: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000973.
- 101 Avila, C.; Holloway, A. C.; Hahn, M. K.; Morrison, K. M.; Restivo, Maria; Anglin, Rebecca; Taylor, Valerie H. (2015): An Overview of Links Between Obesity and Mental Health. In: *Current obesity reports* 4 (3), S. 303–310. DOI: 10.1007/s13679-015-0164-9.
- 102 WHO (2022): European regional obesity report 2022. Copenhagen: World Health Organization.
- 103 Dignard, C.; Leibler, J. H. (2019): Recent Research on Occupational Animal Exposures and Health Risks: A Narrative Review. In: *Current environmental health reports* 6 (4), S. 236–246. DOI: 10.1007/s40572-019-00253-5.
- 104 Ghafari, M.; Cheraghi, Z.; Doosti-Irani, A. (2017): Occupational risk factors among Iranian farmworkers: a review of the available evidence. In: *Epidemiology and health* 39, e2017027. DOI: 10.4178/epih.e2017027.
- 105 Rojas-Rueda, D.; Morales-Zamora, E.; Alsufyani, W. A.; Herbst, C. H.; AlBalawi, Salem M.; Alsukait, Reem; Alomran, Mashael (2021): Environmental Risk Factors and Health: An Umbrella Review of Meta-Analyses. In: *International journal of environmental research and public health* 18 (2). DOI: 10.3390/ijerph18020704.
- 106 Nguyen, T.; Bertin, M.; Bodin, J.; Fouquet, N.; Bonvallot, N.; Roquelaure, Y. (2018): Multiple Exposures and Coexposures to Occupational Hazards Among Agricultural Workers: A Systematic Review of Observational Studies. In: *Safety and health at work* 9 (3), S. 239–248. DOI: 10.1016/j.shaw.2018.04.002.
- 107 Palascha A., Fardet A., Rock E., O'Sullivan A., & Elliott P. (2023): Food system-related health impacts (PLANEAT - Internal report 4).
- 108 Edwards, P.; Roberts, I. (2009): Population adiposity and climate change. In: *International journal of epidemiology* 38 (4), S. 1137–1140. DOI: 10.1093/ije/dyp172.
- 109 EAT-Lancet Commission. Food Planet Health. Healthy Diets from Sustainable Food Systems. *Summary Report of the EAT-Lancet Commission.* 2020.
- 110 WOAH (World Organization for Animal Health). (2022). Terrestrial Animal Health Code. Paris, France. Retrieved from: <https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/standards/codes-and-manuals/terrestrial-code-online-access/?id=169&L=1&htmlfile=glossaire.htm>
- 111 Fardet, A.; Rock, E. (2020). How to protect both health and food system sustainability? A holistic 'global health'-based approach via the 3V rule proposal. *Public Health Nutrition*, 23(16), 3028-3044. doi:10.1017/S136898002000227X
- 112 Zira, S., Rööös, E., Ivarsson, E., Hoffmann, R., Rydhmer, L. (2020). Social life cycle assessment of Swedish organic and conventional pork production. *Int. Journal of Life Cycle Assessment* 25, 1957-1974
- 113 Langfield, T., Clarke, K., Marty, L. et al. (2023) Socioeconomic position and the influence of food portion size on daily energy intake in adult females: two randomized controlled trials. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 20, 53. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-023-01453-x>
- 114 Scientific Advisory Board on Agricultural Policy, Food and Consumer Health Protection at the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (2020): Promoting sustainability in food consumption – Developing an integrated food policy and creating fair food environments. Executive summary and synthesis report, Berlin



115 Franco, S., Barbanera, M., Moscetti, R. *et al.* Overnutrition is a significant component of food waste and has a large environmental impact. *Sci Rep* 12, 8166 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-11813-5>




FOOD IMPACT MAP

Diets with low intake of vegetables, fruit, whole grains, legumes, nuts, and seeds and high in red and processed meat and highly processed food intake are dominant in Europe. As a result, low-quality diets are a major factor in health and social burdens as well as environmental degradation.

DID YOU KNOW? In the EU ~30 % of children aged 7-9 are overweight or obese.

Prevalence of overweight and obesity in children aged 7-9 years (%).



Source: WHO (2022)



Overweight and obesity in early life affects a child's physical and mental health, educational attainment, and quality of life now and in the future.



In particular, high consumption of refined grains and highly processed foods, notably those high in added fats, salt, and/or sugars such as soft drinks, salty snacks, sweets, and fast foods, increases the likelihood of overweight and obesity.



Eat a variety of whole grains; around 3-6 servings per day*. Limit refined grains like white bread and rice.
*1 serving for adult diet: e.g., 40-60 g bread/60-80 g dried pasta or rice




Eat a variety of seasonal vegetables and fruits per day, at least 5 servings*. French fries are not part of it.
*1 serving for an adult diet: 125 g



Limit the consumption of industrial foods with ingredients not use at home, and/or high in added fat, sugars, and/or salt, like fast foods, salty snacks, biscuits, etc. You should not eat more than 25 g of added sugar (like from sweets) and 2/3 of a teaspoon of salt*
*for one adult per day



WATER
Drink water instead of sugar-sweetened beverages and choose tap water if it is safe, instead of bottled water. Drink 1,5-2L water per day! *for an adult diet.



Consume max. 2 servings of milk and dairy products daily, e.g., 200 g milk or yoghurt and 60 g cheese per day*
*for an adult diet



Limit red meat and processed meat like beef and cold cuts to 0-3 servings per week*
*1 serving for an adult diet: 100-125g



Eat 3 servings of various legumes per week* such as peas, beans, and lentils as plant-based alternatives to animal sourced protein
*1 serving for an adult diet: 70 g raw / 125 g cooked)



Eat a handful of nuts per day, notably at snacking times



Choose healthy plant-based oils (such as olive and rapeseed oil) for cooking and seasoning. Limit fats of animal origin such as butter

HOW TO ACHIEVE A HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE DIET

Changing our diets to include healthy, high-quality foods and towards more plant-based is an effective way to protect our planet and improve our health. Here are some tips on how you can change your diet for the better!



Base your diet around a variety of vegetables, fruit, legumes, nuts, whole grains and roots



Reduce foods high in added sugars, fats and/or salt and/or ingredients not found at home



Avoid eating more than needed



Reduce food waste



Choose organic products to reduce pesticide use



Limit consumption of foods grown in tropical regions (coffee, tea, tropical fruit, etc.)



Buy seafood from sustainably managed stocks and increase intake of seaweed and bivalves




Choose meat from extensive grazing systems that help preserve biodiversity





FOOD IMPACT MAP

Diets are a major driver of environmental impacts, including climate change, resource depletion, and biodiversity loss, in Europe and beyond. They are linked to social and health impacts. Combating malnutrition, overweight and obesity, and insufficient food security and equity for all citizens are problems faced by all EU countries.



~8% of the EU population is unable to afford a meal with meat, fish or a vegetarian equivalent every second day. They experience food insecurity.

Looking more closely, the percentages range from ~5% in Sweden and Ireland to >10% in Germany, Spain, Greece and Hungary.

Food insecurity = Inadequate access to food because of physical, social, and financial constraints



- ### Health impacts of food insecurity
- Increased risk for chronic diseases
 - Increased risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes
 - Insufficient intake of nutrients
 - Increased risk for adverse mental health impacts

HOW TO ACHIEVE A HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE DIET

Far-reaching action is needed to shift consumer diets to greater reliance on plant-based foods and less consumption of animal-based foods and highly processed foods. Here are key recommendations that policymakers can take to advance the movement toward more healthy and sustainable diets.



Embrace and support the integration of plant-based diets

Foods sourced from animals, especially red meat, have relatively high environmental footprints per serving compared to other food groups. Dietary patterns rich in fruit, vegetables, whole grains, legumes, nuts, and seeds are more consistently associated with reduced risks of morbidity and mortality from chronic diseases and working within planetary boundaries.



Shaping appropriate, sustainable food environments for consumers

Consumers are confronted with food environments that make more sustainable shopping and eating more difficult. Such as a lack of healthy, sustainable foods and meals, portion sizes that are too large, insufficient information, and high exposure to advertising for ultra-processed foods and beverages.



Create financial access to healthy and sustainable foods

Often, unhealthy foods such as ultra-processed foods are less expensive than healthy foods. Implementing fiscal policies, such as taxing products that have a greater impact on human health and the environment, and targeting food subsidies and incentives to legumes, fruits, and vegetables, is important to increase the affordability of sustainable and healthy foods.






FOOD IMPACT MAP

Consumers are confronted with food environments that make more sustainable shopping and eating more difficult. Such as a lack of healthy, sustainable foods and meals, portion sizes that are too large, insufficient information, and high exposure to advertising for highly processed foods and beverages.



GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BY FOODS CONSUMED IN EUROPE




Source: EU specific carbon footprints calculated within the Plan'eat project

DID YOU KNOW?

High consumption of ultra-processed foods (UPFs) can increase the risks for all-cause mortality and several chronic diseases

PREVALENCE OF OBESITY AMONG ADULTS VS. HOUSEHOLD AVAILABILITY OF UPFS IN NINETEEN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES (1991-2008)



Source: Monteiro et al. (2018)

WHAT ARE UPFS?

These are industrial food products derived from foods or parts of foods and being added with cosmetic purified ingredients not used at home to modify colour, flavour, texture and/or taste (e.g., additives, aromas). This also includes industrial processing, such as extrusion, puffing, etc., which destructure food matrices.



This include mainly carbonated soft drinks; sweet or savoury packaged snacks (e.g., chips); packaged breads and buns; margarines and other spreads; breakfast 'cereals'; 'instant' soups and noodles; poultry and fish 'nuggets' and 'sticks'; many (but not all) meat and dairy analogues; biscuits, cakes, candies, desserts, sausages, cold cuts, etc.

HOW TO SUPPORT ACHIEVING HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE DIETS

A sustainable approach to food retail and service is more important than ever to make food environments less impactful for people and the planet. Here are some recommendations on how you, as a food professional, can build and promote more healthy and sustainable practices.



Lead the way and inspire to sustainable food consumption.



Emphasize plant-based and high-quality foods, including unrefined, minimally processed foods, healthy fats and protein.



Develop and use less ultra-processed foods and more minimally-processed foods.



Choose meat from extensive grazing systems that help preserve biodiversity.



Explore new foods and put diversity on the plate.



Sourcing seafood from sustainably managed stocks.



Limit consumption of foods grown in tropical regions (e.g., coffee, tea, tropical fruit) to reduce water use and impact on biodiversity.



Reduce food waste, especially food with a high environmental impact (e.g. meat, dairy, fish, tropical products, etc.).

