



## SUMMARY REPORT

### EU PLATFORM ON FOOD LOSSES AND FOOD WASTE

### JOINT MEETING OF THE CONSUMER FOOD WASTE PREVENTION SUBGROUP AND THE EUROPEAN CONSUMER FOOD WASTE FORUM (ECFWF)

### DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY (SANTE)

*On-site in Brussels/on-line via Webex*

*16 February 2023 – From 09:30 to 15:45*

**Chair:** Anne-Laure Gassin, DG SANTE E1

**Commission:** ESTAT, Joint Research Centre (JRC) (S1, EU Policy Lab: Foresight, Design & Behavioural Insights; D3, Land Resources and Supply Chain Assessments; D1, Forests and Bio-Economy), SANTE E1 (Farm to Fork Strategy)

**Member States represented (20):** AT, BE, BG, DE, DK, EE, ES, FR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LU, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK

**Private sector organisations (14):** BEUC - The European Consumer Organization, BOROUME, CONSORZIO BESTACK, EUCOFEL - European Fruit and Vegetables Trade Association, EURO COOP - European Community of Consumer Co-operatives, FOODSERVICEEUROPE, FOODWIN - Food Waste Innovation Network, HAROKOPIO UNIVERSITY, INDEPENDENT RETAIL EUROPE, IFWC - International Food Waste Coalition, THÜNEN-INSTITUT - Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, TOO GOOD TO GO, WWF EPO - World Wide Fund for Nature European Policy Office, ZERO WASTE SCOTLAND

**Public entities:** Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

**Observers:** NO

**Experts of the ECFWF:** Nora Brüggemann, Collaborating Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production (CSCP) Germany; Thomas Candéal, IFWC; Christophe Diercxsens, Too Good To Go; Ylva Haglund; Jose M. Gil, Technical University of Catalonia (UPC); Ylva Haglund; Gulbanu Kaptan, Leeds University Business School UK; Gyula Kasza, National Food Chain Safety Office in Hungary; Bent Egberg Mikkelsen, University of Copenhagen Denmark; Gudrun Obersteiner, BOKU-University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences Austria; Iva Pires, New University of Lisbon Portugal; Richard Swannell, WRAP; Jenni Vainioranta, Finland's National Food Waste Forum; Erica van Herpen,

Wageningen University the Netherlands; Matteo Vittuari, University of Bologna Italy and Kohei Watanabe, Teikyo University Japan.

## **1. Introduction**

The chair opened the meeting and presented the agenda, which focused on the work of the European Consumer Food Waste Forum (ECWF) pilot project and its results and on-going work, including its main deliverable: the compendium of tools to help reduce consumer food waste. The chair also updated participants on the [European Citizens' panel on food waste](#), organised by the European Commission, and the [23 recommendations](#) put forward by EU citizens to step up efforts to reduce food waste in the EU.

## **2. Update on the work of the European Consumer Food Waste Forum, presentation by JRC ([PDF](#))**

JRC updated participants on the work carried out in the project and expected results. Several experts of the [ECFWF](#) took the floor to present the tasks that they have led as follows:

1. A literature review on drivers for consumer food waste and levers for behavioural change ([report](#)) – task leader Matteo Vittuari, University of Bologna
2. Definition of the scope of the ECFWF and development of the evaluation framework for consumer food waste ([report](#)) – task leader Erica van Herpen, Wageningen University  
Data collection on consumer food waste interventions and evaluation ([report](#)) – task leader Richard Swannell, WRAP
3. Development of a compendium of multi-dimensional, multi-level, evidence-based set of tools that can be applied by players engaged in food waste reduction (such as national governments, local authorities, educational institutions, primary producers, companies, non-governmental organisations and other relevant target groups) ([report](#)) – task leader Thomas Candéal, IFWC

## **3. Overview of the most effective consumer food waste prevention interventions, presentation by Thomas Candéal ([PDF](#))**

Thomas Candéal explained how the data collection on consumer food waste prevention actions was carried out and their evaluation by the ECFWF. Based on around 80 actions collected and evaluated by the Forum, generic types of interventions were identified with a solid evidence base of their potential to reduce food waste. The speaker also highlighted the evidence gaps as an introduction for the discussion with participants on opportunities to further tackle consumer food waste. A table showing the generic types of interventions as well as common target groups and contexts for action was sent to all participants in preparation for the discussion, ahead of the meeting. Participants were divided into four groups to address the evidence gaps from the final deliverable of the project – the compendium of tools, best practices and recommendations to reduce consumer food waste. The gaps and limitations referred to consumer types not targeted, missing drivers and levers for consumer food waste and missing food system stakeholders. The four groups were:

Group 1: Policy and regulatory actions

Group 2: Identifying consumer target groups not yet targeted, but which could be potential hotspots for food waste generation

Group 3: Identifying food system actors who can influence consumers across the food supply chain, but which have not been activated

Group 4: Drivers and levers of food waste behaviour

## **4. Building a compendium of tools to help reduce consumer food waste, presentation by JRC and Thomas Candéal ([PDF](#))**

JRC and Thomas Candéal presented the different dimensions considered in the development of the compendium, which would be multi-dimensional (encompassing interventions and tools to reduce food

waste embedded in a broader context, for example as part of actions aiming to promote adoption of healthy and sustainable diets) and multi-level (involving a collaborative approach between different actors of the food system). Participants were then asked to provide their feedback on the planned work for the compendium and possible ideas about connecting this work with other priority areas (e.g. climate change, biodiversity, purchasing power).

**BEUC** highlighted that the compendium should address spill-over effects of other policy actions. For example, encouraging households to cook more food from scratch could result in increased amounts of food waste (e.g. inedible parts of fruit and vegetables), while policy measures such as “pay as you throw” would disadvantage these households and incentivise them to purchase more processed products instead. **EUFIC** explained that “pay as you throw” schemes could be implemented in different ways, giving the example of Flanders, where it is mandatory to sort biowaste separately, which is then collected at a fixed price. Other schemes mentioned by speakers involve paying for the total volume of waste (**IFWC**) or the number of garbage bags collected (**WRAP**). **WRAP** highlighted that introducing new obligations regarding separate collection of biowaste presents an opportunity to disseminate messages about food waste prevention, an action that should be considered by all municipalities.

In terms of food waste prevention actions requiring coordinated efforts, participants mentioned voluntary agreements and a dedicated food waste law (**Norway**), addressing the drivers that lead consumers to waste ‘imperfect’ food as well as the impact of voluntary/private quality standards on food waste generation (**DE**). The **Commission** informed participants of a [call for proposals](#) under Horizon Europe for projects aiming to better understand the impact of marketing standards on food waste generation and provide recommendations/solutions on how to prevent and reduce such possible impacts (call closed on 12/04/2023).

## **5. Disseminating the results of the European Consumer Food Waste Forum, presentation by JRC and Thomas Candéal ([PDF](#))**

JRC and Thomas Candéal presented the planned activities to disseminate the final results of the project as well as the structure of the compendium. Participants were asked to provide feedback on the compendium and to propose ways in which the Platform could support its dissemination.

**EUFIC** underpinned the importance of considering different target audiences in all communication activities. For example, municipalities and waste management facilities (**WRAP, IE**); educators; large multinational food services that would have a better capacity to implement the compendium rather than smaller restaurants, while SMEs in the food services and hospitality sector could benefit from targeted advice on how to reduce food waste in their own kitchens (**WRAP**). At the same time, **DK** warned that overly differentiating target groups could lead to missing important actors.

Several **ECFWF experts** highlighted the importance of monitoring the impacts of actions and communicating about results achieved: the food waste prevention calculator further developed by ECFWF could be a good tool to translate food waste data into impacts (economic, environmental). However, it would be important not to give the impression that the solutions proposed by the Forum can lead to pre-defined impacts.

**Zero Waste Scotland** suggested that Platform members could put in place communication activities to ensure the successful dissemination of the report for national audiences, which were hard to reach from the EU level.

**EUFIC** inquired about ways of monitoring progress of national food waste prevention programmes. **Thomas Candeal** highlighted that national programmes were just one element that could be targeted in the monitoring of the impacts of the Forum's work. **WRAP** referred to approach followed by the Champions 12.3 network in monitoring global progress made towards the SDG 12.3 targets in their annual reports and suggested that a similar approach could be considered for monitoring the impacts of the compendium. The **Commission** commented that, as regards national food waste prevention programmes, specific indicators would need to be set to track their progress.

## **6. Preventing consumer food waste: the contribution of consumer segmentation studies and importance of tailoring behavioural interventions, presentation by JRC ([PDF](#))**

**JRC** provided an overview of their work on audience segmentation, presenting the pros and cons of using such an approach, as well as the techniques for targeting and tailoring food waste prevention actions. Ahead of the meeting, participants received a scientific paper by the JRC on the role of segmenting consumers and tailoring behavioural interventions to reduce consumer food waste.

Participants were asked for their feedback on ways to improve the format of the document in order to make it a useful tool for practitioners (both private and public organisations) that implement such interventions. JRC also ran a live survey via SLIDO, where participants were asked to provide information about their experience with segmentation and/or targeting/tailoring interventions, benefits and challenges for such methods as well as examples of scientific papers from the food waste literature and/or real-life food waste reduction interventions that they might be aware of.

Overall, 45 experts participated in the survey, but not all responded to all questions. Participants' replies indicated that most respondents had little or no knowledge of segmentation techniques and method of targeting or tailoring interventions to reduce consumer food waste, while 30% of respondents indicated to have a lot of knowledge on these topics. In terms of benefits of using such approaches, respondents indicated the increased effectiveness and efficiency of food waste prevention interventions, a potentially higher reach, better addressing the needs of consumers, better focused interventions, better understanding the drivers of food waste as well as distinguishing between different types of actors. In terms of challenges in implementing such approaches, respondents referred to impacts on the costs of interventions (related to research), required knowledge and time resources, as well as data availability. Regarding specific segments that should be targeted, respondents mentioned children (or "young" people), families as well as single households, food service providers, young adults, households in general, actors with a high motivation to change their habits and vulnerable categories.

JRC shared their functional mailbox address ([JRC-FOODWASTE-FORUM@ec.europa.eu](mailto:JRC-FOODWASTE-FORUM@ec.europa.eu)) and encouraged participants to share relevant reports/papers that should be considered when preparing the audience segmentation report. The final report was published in July 2023 and can be found [here](#).

## **7. Conclusions and wrap up**

**JRC** explained that the next steps of the ECFWF would be to finalise the compendium. The Commission announced that the EU citizens' recommendations would be published shortly and would be discussed with the Platform.