

The project's response to input from BREAD critical friends meeting June 23, 2021

About our framing of responsibility

The ProjectSTEP group challenged us to distinguish between different types of responsibility for food waste. What responsibility do I have as a customer, end user, consumer and guest to help the value chain and stores, etc. reduce their food waste? And what role do companies have in the value chain so that I as a consumer do not overconsume or have to throw away things I do not need. For example, not serving too large portions. Responsibility must be understood depending on the context. There are different types of responsibilities. I have a different type of responsibility than the manufacturers have. Responsibility is not a homogeneous concept or value.

Our response: This is a good and important input that we will take with us in the further work on the paper. This is both a theoretical and a practical question. In practice, we will explore this further in citizens' forums.

About the assumption that RRI and Norwegian food waste governance fit well together

The project's RRI approach, with a focus on participation in innovation processes, fits well with the Norwegian governance approach to food waste. The regulations in the EU are focused on the lower part of the waste hierarchy. It is about avoiding doing things in a wrong way; like sending to landfill or incineration. And the approach is very top down. The statistics come mostly from the bottom, it is not involving too many actors. There are dedicated actors such as SSB in Norway that retrieve statistics; the players in the value chain are not included.

In Norway and Finland, we have taken other steps. We ask if we handle things correctly: Do we make sure the food is eaten instead of thrown away? The food should primarily be used by humans. That is why we distinguish between food for humans, animal feed and industrial by-products. This is more bottom-up work where companies have to provide data themselves, provide a basis for statistics, etc. It requires more resources, but gives more results. The way in which the governance and steering work is arranged can have a great effect on results. The BREAD project's approach fits well with the governance approach in Norway. It is therefore important that we look at what is overlapping here, and perhaps BREAD should consider co-publishing with the Nordic project.

Our response: This is interesting and provides a good starting point for gaining a good understanding of RRI in the food value chains. We will consider further cooperation.

About being aware that power is centralized at the retail level because they have the system integration.

The project should be clear on what we think we can influence and what requires involvement. The big ambitions in the project require that we have the big players involved, and the strongest are in retail. We should find the niches we want to influence. Something requires to hold consumers

accountable, something requires an app, etc. What kind of commitment is suitable for what purposes?

Our response: We are planning a meeting in the project this autumn to take up the discussion further about this important input.

About exploring user-driven innovation in the food sector

In food waste, we want to get consumers to say yes to measures / products that reduce food waste. But the space for opportunities is broader than what the study shows so far; one can make consumers even more responsible. User-driven innovation is much more widespread in IT and health, etc., while so far in food there is a much more instrumental relationship with consumers. This is worth exploring further.

Our response: We agree with this as a useful way forward, e.g. for the post.doc. work.

Experimental approach to citizens' forums?

It was suggested that the project consider a more experimental methodology / approach in citizens' forums instead of discussions in "world cafes". It could provide a good reality orientation for those who participate, and can be a starting point for concrete learning.

Our response: We want to work closely with the research question for work package 2, and build on the RRI theme around responsibility, and thus use these workshops to reflect on responsibility. Setting up an experimental situation could be interesting, but may have to be done in another part of the project (perhaps carried out by AFINO).

Other feedback on plans of Citizens' Forums

We also received a number of specific suggestions that we do not respond to directly, but take with us further:

1. The project can link this to the *Nature in your face* project where we work with food and food waste and climate-friendly menus, with folk high schools and Viken county municipality.
2. The project must take into account that student time is special as analyzed in the behaviour patterns. There is important previous research here.
3. Perhaps the project should consider the following question: What are the biggest obstacles for you as a person when it comes to avoiding food waste? This may be due to a lack of competence in cooking. Maybe the solution lies in education (better food and health subjects, etc.) and information, and not in innovation in the food industry?
4. We received tips on literature on activism and social movements in the field of organization and management, and tips on literature in ethics (including rights perspectives and feminist perspectives) that are relevant to stakeholder involvement.
5. It is important in the workshop that you have enough time for going deeper into the subject.

6. Regarding interviews with table hosts, we were advised to do so, although it is uncertain what resources are available for analyses.

Feedback on Nhat's presentation of topics from the interviews

- There was some very specific feedback that Nhat takes further.