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Introduction

This deliverable reports the outcomes of the behaviour change analysis that was performed during the pilot implementation trials of the SavingFood project. The pilot trials were set up in 2017 and continued until April 2018, with communities of the SavingFood food redistribution organizations in Greece (Boroume), Hungary (HFA), Belgium (FoodWin) and the United Kingdom (Feedback). During these pilot trials, the SavingFood platform was used for organizing two types of food saving events, being (1) gleaning events to collect leftover crops from farmers’ fields and redistribute it to recipient organisations, and (2) farmers’ market events to redistribute unsold food at the end of the market to recipient organisations. Through the SavingFood platform, coordinators of the food redistribution organizations were able to plan and schedule these events, while citizens (or volunteers) could subscribe and find all the necessary details about it. Through the provided ICT solution, the food redistribution organisations learnt new ways of how to organise their food saving events in a more connected way with volunteers, food donors and recipient organisations.

During the pilot implementation trials, the behaviour change analysis had the purpose to investigate changes in behaviour on the following levels: (i) the degree of participation and volunteer effort in food waste reduction such as during food saving events, (ii) the degree of knowledge about how to save food in a collective way and information gained about the food redistribution process, (iii) the degree of awareness about food waste in general. To reach these objectives, an extensive engagement strategy was set up that included different behaviour change techniques, being motivational videos, a quantification report with statistics about the amount of saved food, ambassador or leadership tactics, awareness raising events, social media pictures, crowdsourcing tips for new donors and charities, and a pledge campaign. The engagement-related behaviour change approach relied on principles of community based social marketing (Lee & Kotler, 2015) and the 7E-framework (Bambust, 2015).

For more information about the outlined strategy, the following documents can be consulted:

- SavingFood Deliverable 2.5: Strategizing SavingFood – Engagement and behaviours V1
- SavingFood Deliverable 2.6: Strategizing SavingFood – Engagement and behaviours V2

A short description of each white paper is provided below:

- **White Paper I – Supporting behavioural change around food waste through awareness raising events:** In this white paper, explanation is provided of how an awareness raising event about food waste can be organised, and how it can lead to behaviour change among citizens. The white paper specifically investigates the change in beliefs and knowledge about food waste with citizens through the participation in the awareness-raising events. Results and lessons learned are reported through a self-assessment survey filled in by volunteers and participants from the events in Greece, Hungary, Belgium and the United Kingdom.
White paper II: Supporting behavioural change around food waste through crowdsourcing, ambassadorship and pledges: In this white paper, explanation is provided of how a crowdsourcing campaign can be organised for collecting tips from citizens about potential (new) food donors and charities as recipients, how ambassador and leadership tactics can be set up, and how a pledge campaign can be organised. Lessons learned are reported through collected logging statistics and interviews with the four food redistribution organisations.

White paper III: Supporting behavioural change around food waste through the SavingFood platform: gleaning and farmer market events: This white paper focuses on the actual usage of the SavingFood platform for organising food saving events. The development process of the platform is explained, in relation to the development of the behaviour change strategy. Results and lessons learned are reported through a user survey with registered users from the platform, as well as through in-depth interviews with coordinators of the SavingFood pilots.
Summary

This white paper discusses three behavioural change interventions of the SavingFood project that targeted citizens who are concerned about the issue of food waste, but who are not yet involved as a volunteer in a food redistribution organisation. The baseline survey organised by SavingFood in the four pilot countries in 2016 demonstrated that an important segment of citizens in the cities were the pilots are currently active are showing an interest to act against food waste, but are not able to participate in food surplus saving events because of several barriers, or are still hesitating to participate. Taking inspiration from the 7E-approach and from community-based social marketing, three behavioural change interventions were deployed that could provide these citizens with a concrete opportunity to act meaningfully and to support the battle against food waste: (i) making a commitment by signing a pledge, (ii) participating in crowdsourcing campaign or (iii) becoming an ambassador for the food redistribution organisation. The interventions were deployed in the final two months of the project from March to April 2018. The coordinators of the pilots who were interviewed about their experience with these three mechanisms have positive impressions from the actions, and confirmed that it are good ways to involve citizens who otherwise would not be engaged into the broader working of their organisation. In this way, the actions can contribute to a greater awareness of citizens (and other actors in the city) about the issue of food surplus redistribution, and to a greater visibility of the food redistribution organisations in the local neighbourhood. The experiences of the pilots teach us that it is important to contextualise these interventions and to embed them within the daily life context and habits of citizens. These not only allow, such as in the case of crowdsourcing, to capitalize on existing social contacts and trust relations between clients and shop owners, but also, such as in the case of ambassador programs, to involve a wide range of the population in a variety of tasks ranging from sharing posts on Facebook to tell school teachers about the existence of the issue of food waste and the food redistribution organisation. The SavingFood pilots will continue to use the designed interventions, will explore new opportunities and will refine them based on the lessons learned presented in this paper.

1. Introduction

Besides offering a platform that allows donors, recipient organisations and citizens to organise concrete food donations and food saving events, the SavingFood project also explored ways to create a broader movement and community around food surplus saving. In order to reach that objective a behavioural change strategy was devised based upon the 7E-model, and insights from Social Marketing and community-based social marketing.

---

The target audience for these interventions were citizens in the countries where SavingFood was active: Hungary, Greece, the United Kingdom and Belgium. In this paper, we focus in particular on the role of 3 interventions: the pledge, the crowdsourcing campaign and the ambassadorship. For each of these interventions, we first briefly discuss the SavingFood rationale for deploying them, secondly, the way the intervention got implemented in each of the pilots and the results obtained, and thirdly, the experience of the coordinator of each of the pilot as well as some reactions from citizens. Each chapter ends with a conclusion where we present the main lessons learned.

In order to obtain these results, logging statistics were retrieved and also in-depth interviews with the coordinators of each of the pilots were organised in the last week of April 2018.

- **HFA and Filab**: Monday 23th April 2018, interview with Balasz Ceh
- **Feedback**: Tuesday 24th April 2018, interview with Dan Wooley
- **FoodWin**: Monday 23th April 2018, interview with Alice Codsi, responsible of FoodWin for the Belgian gleaning pilot
- **Boroume**: Friday 20th April 2018, interview with Dia Chorafa

The first part of the interview focused on the results in terms of numbers of tips received in the crowdsourcing actions or subscriptions to become an ambassador; the second part explored in more detail the concrete experience of the coordinators with the action and tried to identify the opportunities the intervention brought as well as the challenges for the future. Due to time constraints, we could not interview participants in order to understand their point of view. Nonetheless we tried to shed on the light of their experience via the eyes of the coordinator who stood in close contact with the people that signed the pledge, participated in the crowdsourcing exercise or signed up as an ambassador.

### 2. Behavioural change interventions

#### 2.1. The pledge campaign

**2.1.1. Why a pledge campaign for SavingFood?**

The idea behind a pledge campaign is to let people make a small commitment in order to be able to ask later for a greater favour. The reasoning behind this commitment strategy is that when individuals agree to a small request, it often alters their perception about themselves and their attitudes towards the topic. In other words, building upon Darryl Bem, the commitment can cause the generation of a process by which people change their self-perception and gradually see themselves as the type of person who supports a cause and a certain initiative (McKenzie-Mohr, p.47).

In the context of SavingFood, this reasoning was followed, seen the results of our survey in the pilot communities in 2016 (see D2.5: “Strategizing Saving Food: Engagement and Behaviours, v1”) that highlighted that a rather large segment of non-volunteers stated that they are concerned about the issue, but are still hesitating to join or experience barriers to participate in large tasks. Therefore, a pledge campaign was designed which the four food surplus redistribution organisations would propose people to sign it. The pledge was a clear commitment to support the battle against food waste and to become part of a larger group that wanted to stop it. Having signed the pledge, the four food surplus redistribution charities then requested via e-mail within two weeks to effectively sign up for the platform and to look at upcoming food saving events.
2.1.2. Implementation in the pilots

The implementation of the pledge campaign was common to the four pilots with respect to the wording of the pledge as to the process of asking requests.

2.1.2.1. The text of the pledge

In the SavingFood consortium, Feedback had already experience with working with pledges. They highlighted that the pledges should be of a general nature, encompassing all targeted actors of SavingFood. In other words one single pledge was needed that could incorporate a clear commitment that is valid for food donors, citizens and recipient organisations. Three different pledges would only generate confusion for people.

The following text was proposed as pledge:

\[
\text{Saving Food is IN, are you?} \\
\text{Start saving food for you, your planet and mostly for those in need!} \\
\text{By signing our petition, you are:} \\
\begin{itemize}
  \item Joining an expanding global movement promoting the end of food waste \\
  \item Supporting those in need and sharing positive vibes \\
  \item Helping our planet stay green
\end{itemize}
\text{It’s free, it’s quick and it helps you, those around you and those after you!} \\
\text{Even if you don’t have much time, you can be a signpost to something worth signing-up from.}
\]

The chosen message focuses on the commitment of starting to save food instead of starting to save food in the ways the SavingFood platforms offers. Indeed, a food donor, a citizen or a recipient organisation can contribute by means of individual actions to avoid food waste: for example a store making a more efficient inventory of the needs of its customers or a household taking more care of the food quantities it buys in stores by avoiding purchasing bulk promotions. By committing to save food, we thus allow people to connect with ‘quick wins’ they can perform on an individual level. Nonetheless, the pledge already anticipates future steps. On the one hand, it highlights what signing actually means: joining an expanding movement to support those in needs and keep the planet green. On the other hand, the emphasis of being part of a network that transcends the individual act is already anticipated.

2.1.2.2. The pledging process

The pledging process consisted of three steps: signing the pledge, sending new requests based on the pledge commitment and finally follow-up response to these commitments:

1. Announcing and signing the pledge

The pledge could be signed in two ways: either online or either offline by means of a card. We therefore discuss here first the online process, followed by the offline process.

The four food surplus redistribution charities announced the pledge both via social media (mostly Facebook) but also via their digital newsletters or emails. SavingFood Ambassadors (see next section) were contacted to forward the pledge messages online to their network. On the SavingFood platform, the pledge was published in the section of ‘goodies’ and it was available for each organisation in the language of its country: English,
French, Greek and Hungarian. By clicking on «sign» and granting (or not) us permission to publish publicly their details, citizens, donors and charities could make a commitment.

People could not only sign the pledge online, but could also do it offline by means of a postcard. These postcards were mostly disseminated at the awareness-raising events organised by the project partners. On the left side one could read the pledge and on the right side one could sign it. By only having to hand in to a SavingFood collaborator the right side of the post card, the person who committed could take his commitment home as a reminder. The side with the signature and contact details was collected by the pilot coordinator who then manually inserted the data into the online pledge system.

Since studies have demonstrated that making a commitment publicly has a higher impact on the subsequent action than keeping it private⁵, SavingFood also asked permission to the people that signed the pledge to make their commitment public by at least publish their name and country on the platform’s pledge page.

2. Sending requests for further actions

Once a citizen, recipient organisation or a food donor signed the pledge, the coordinators of each of the 4 food redistribution charities used their contact details in order to gradually ask them more requests to build upon the initial commitment.

Within two weeks after having signed the pledge, the food redistribution organisations sent an email to remind people to have signed the pledge and to invite them to start avoiding generating food waste and to join the platform and become member of a concrete food saving community in their neighbourhood. In this way, the email thus moved the focus of commitments from individual actions to take actions as part of the saving food community. If the person effectively signed up as a new volunteer for food saving events on the platform, he/she became part of the platform communication process that supports gleaning and farmers’ markets on the platform. The same applies for a donor or charity in the general food rescue module on the platform. If the person who committed on the pledge does not register as a volunteer, a new reminder was sent after two weeks with this time highlighting results of food saving events in order to reinforce the message that building upon his/her new commitment is necessary and beneficial for those in need and for the planet.

---

Figure 1: SavingFood online pledge – SavingFood Platform

Figure 2: SavingFood Offline Pledge as it was designed and used during the awareness raising events of the project
2.1.3. Results of the pledge campaign

The pledge campaigns were started by the 4 pilots end of February and ran for 2 months. In total, 1068 pledges were signed, divided as follows under the different pilots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot</th>
<th>Total number of pledges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boroume (GR)</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA (HU)</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (UK)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoodWin (BE)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 4 together</td>
<td>690 online + 379 offline (postcard) = 1068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Results of pledge campaign for each pilot

What is striking in this figure is the difference between the number of pledges collected by Boroume and HFA and the number of pledges collected by Feedback and FoodWin. An explanation for this difference emanates from the fact that Feedback, as mentioned above, had already its own pledge. It turned out more difficult as expected to campaign for a «new» pledge that in its core message did not differ that much from the current pledge. A lot of people within the current network of Feedback therefore reacted quite confused when confronted to sign a new pledge and therefore not only did not sign it, but also did not really forward or share the pledge message in their own networks. The importance of this ‘network’ effect for diffusing a pledge message can be actually demonstrated by the case of HFA. Here no pledge existed and in a few weeks more than 350 people signed a commitment.

A second observation is that the current number of signed pledges is above the desired objective of 1000 pledges. There are two explanations for this result. First, it should be noted that the pledge campaign until end of April only lasted 2 months and was mainly targeted towards the current audience of the food surplus redistribution organisations. Secondly, especially in the case of Boroume and HFA, we learned that a pledge campaign is a continuous and gradual effort whose results are also related to the expansion of the outreach of the organisation. This means that via social media an organisation can enlarge its online reach, but if the
concrete ‘offline’ action does not follow (for example no one in a certain neighbourhood to actually start a local node of SavingFood or no saving food events organised on a regular bases), it becomes difficult for certain audiences to know/imagine what food surplus saving and in particular food surplus redistribution is all about.

### 2.1.4. Conclusions about the pledge campaign

To conclude we can say that a pledge seems an effective way to allow people to make an initial commitment to start saving food. However, its concrete impact could not be measured given the limited time of the pledge campaign (2 months). It is important for the case of food surplus redistribution, given the focus here on attracting new volunteers/donors/recipient organisations that do not necessarily know the organisation well, to focus the pledge on a step before – on committing to already do individual acts – while keeping a longer-term objective in mind – becoming part of a movement and concretely participate in food saving events or related behaviour beneficial for the food redistribution charity. This has also a practical advantage. Voluntary based organisations need also to grow their presence over areas along with the pledge. If these 2 processes are not happening simultaneously, the pledge as presented here allows you to keep people, in areas where an organisation is not active yet, engaged in other ways of food surplus saving or in actions that might support the set-up of food saving events (see section ambassadors).

### 2.2. Crowdsourcing campaign

#### 2.2.1. Why a crowdsourcing campaign for SavingFood?

The idea of crowdsourcing has also done its introduction in many social innovation initiatives. By means of crowdsourcing, SavingFood wanted to explore the potential of ‘tapping into the wisdom of the crowd’ and realise two objectives.

The first aim was to increase, thanks to tips of citizens, the knowledge of the food redistribution charities about potential food donors in their neighbourhood or farmers in the countryside. Secondly, by employing a crowdsourcing approach, Saving Food wanted to connect the food redistribution charities with more citizens in other ways than the more traditional ways that are currently done (informing and engaging for food saving events). Indeed, the survey in the pilot countries from 2016 (D2.5: “Strategizing Saving Food: Engagement and Behaviours v1.”) indicated that citizens that are concerned about food waste but probably are not able to participate in food saving events were stating that they might be interested in other ways to support the food redistribution organisation and the cause of saving surplus food.

#### 2.2.2. Implementation in the pilots

The design of the crowdsourcing campaign taught us three things. First, it became clear that applying a very open and transparent model in which citizens could drop an icon on a public available map to indicate the place where the potential food donor was situated, was not possibly due to welfare and safety concerns. Secondly, such an approach would also not be a good ground for building trust between the food surplus redistribution charity and the shop, store or farm. Establishing a trustful reliable food donation link requires more work than just contacting and linking. It might be for example necessary to first understand why the

---


food surplus emerged and why the donor is confronted with this situation. In other words, an open approach can become involuntarily a ‘shaming’ tool. Thirdly, especially in the case of gleaning, such an approach would be counterproductive and also dangerous for the crowdsourcer, since it would often require that he/she must check fields or parts of the farm for which he/she actually needs an access permission from the farmer. Conflicts with farmers should be avoided as Feedback’s experience with gleaning informed the project that it is quite difficult to build a trust relationship with farmers.

In order to meet these three challenges, the approach was adapted to food surplus redistribution by choosing for a closed system where citizens could give tips about potential interesting food donors via a Google Form, email or phone. Secondly, it was important that the crowdsourcer had established previous contact with the donor before the information was sent to the food redistribution charity. The food redistribution charity would contact the donor only if the crowdsourcer confirmed that this condition was met.

While HFA and Boroume followed the initial challenge to collect tips about potential food donors, for the pilots that worked on gleaning (Belgium and UK) this was not possible and therefore the focus of the crowdsourcing effort changed to gathering various recipes and tips for food that is closed to its “best if used by day” date in order to avoid potential food waste.

Each pilot organisation distributed the crowdsourcing call from the 2nd week of March 2018 onwards and the campaign was running until the end of the project in April 2018.

2.2.3. Results and experience

2.2.3.1. Hungary

Implementation and results

In Hungary, the crowdsourcing campaign was organised to collect tips about potential farmers that might be interested in supporting gleaning activities, the type of food surplus redistribution that HFA introduced in Hungary thanks to the SavingFood project.

Via the newsletter of HFA, articles in journals, the social media channels of HFA as well as via its ambassadors (see next section) and contacts, it had gathered at the Budapest Wholesale Market (where one of its awareness raising events had taken place, see white paper I), the message to provide tips about potential farms that could be interesting for gleaning opportunities was sent. A special page was also published on the website of HFA. This dissemination strategy often lead to other people, such as the HFA-ambassadors, to pick up the call and provide contacts of people or associations that are interesting for HFA. For example, a famous garden expert in Hungary read the call in a magazine and contacted HFA that he would share the HFA crowdsourcing-call among his community of 400.000 followers.

What concerns the number of tips that led to successful contacts and/or concrete gleaning opportunities, HFA made the remark that it is currently better to speak of ‘leads’ to gleaning opportunities than concrete tips. This is due to the effect of the campaign that is more long term and secondly due to the fact that the gleaning season only starts from June 2018 onwards, so after the end of the SavingFood project. May and June 2018 is the season where strawberries and green peas are growing, which means that only from July a gleaning event can be organised. Moreover, vegetables that will have a bigger return such as tomatoes, zucchini and potatoes will only be available later in the year. For these reasons, HFA expects later this year to have a ‘boom’ in gleaning events organised.
The number of ‘leads’ collected so far indicates that this is not an unrealistic foresight. HFA collected in total the contact details of 150 potential interested organisations to set up a gleaning event. Out of these 150 tips, 30 to 40 can already be considered as concrete leads to gleaning opportunities in the summer of 2018. These contacts made the promise that they would call back HFA once the gleaning opportunity will be concrete from the summer onwards.

The concrete tips cover a diversity of actors spread all over the country and the leads cover big and small farms, although the central organisation of the country and the food sector make Budapest and its Wholesale market a well-connected hub for getting information about potential gleaning places.

Experience

For HFA, it is clear that experimenting with crowdsourcing allows them to attract actors – first opinion leaders, secondly citizens – into their working that otherwise would not be engaged. Organising a new crowdsourcing campaign and keeping experimenting with the mechanism is certainly an objective after the end of the project.

The crowdsourcing action creates an action opportunity that creates a good optimum between potential and new actors to be involved with. Crowdsourcing allows engaging citizens in other roles towards HFA and can also lead to pick up other roles on the long term, such as becoming a financial endorser or an ambassador.

The implementation of the crowdsourcing campaign definitely allowed HFA to engage broader sections of the Hungarian population and therefore was a concrete learning opportunity for the organisation and its staff. HFA also obtained via this action further experience in overcoming barriers from simply providing a tip to then further work on the lead or make people do more actions to realise a food saving action.

What concerns the experience of citizens with crowdsourcing, the HFA coordinator stated that an action like crowdsourcing is beneficial because people can immediately experience their impact. What is thus important, as was also the case in Greece, is to always thank the crowdsourcer: this simple act makes the crowdsourcer feel that his/her work is respected and meaningful but also makes him/her feel part of a broader network around the concrete food saving operations of HFA.

To what extent do you think that crowdsourcing:

- Allowed citizens to participate in your food saving operations, that otherwise would not have been so much involved or not involved at all? Strongly Agree
- Proved that your saving food operations can grow through the support or the power of a community of people engaged in such a way? Strongly Agree
- Demonstrated that ‘tapping into the wisdom of the crowd’ is beneficial for your saving food organisation? Strongly Agree
- Is a way to also engage citizens (in the long term) in other activities of your organisation (e.g. participating in gleaning and farmer markets)? Agree
- Was a learning experience for the coordinators and other staff members of the food redistribution organisation to engage citizens in the food saving operations? Strongly Agree

Figure 4: HFA’s experience of the crowdsourcing campaign in five statements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact for your organisation, that results in a new donor/charity/farm/farmer market for your network)</th>
<th>This are leads that actually confirmed their interest and to inform HFA when they have surplus later in the year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of new donations or newly organised activities thanks to the provided tip (this indicators goes one step further than the previous one, here you already collaborate with the new contact)</td>
<td>Not yet, but process in place with 30 to 40 tips (see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of social media posts and mails to spread the crowdsourcing campaign</td>
<td>900 people via direct mail (newsletter) and 4 social media posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of views of the social media posts, number of reads of the mails</td>
<td>Not retrievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other possible indicator to track the positive outcomes of your crowdsourcing campaign?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5: HFA’s results of the crowdsourcing campaign in numbers**

### 2.2.3.2. Greece

**Implementation and results**

Boroume focused in their crowdsourcing campaign on getting tips about local shops or canteens that can become a potential food donor. The idea was that a citizen often has a more personal contact with a bakery or a canteen than with the management of a supermarket. This personal contact is a good basis to eventually introduce Boroume to the owner of the shop, bakery or canteen and hence in this way expand the knowledge Boroume has about potential food donors around them.

The message of Boroume for the crowdsourcing campaign alluded to the collective effort of food saving. It underpinned the need to work together in order to be effective and had a request to help the organisation. Special appeal was made to citizens that have a personal contact with a shopkeeper or canteen owner and are feeling sensitive to the issue of food waste and sustainability in general.

The tip could be given to Boroume via a Google Form or via email. Boroume noted a fast response rate after the launch of the call. It was mandatory for the provider of the tip, besides providing the phone number or email of the shopkeeper as a proof of having established prior contact, to provide his/her own phone number or email in order to be able to contact him/her again. Then, Boroume made the first contact with the donor. Finally, the giver of the tip was contacted to tell him/her if the contact was successful or not.

In total, 6 tips were collected and at the end of April 5 out of the 6 tips already led to a confirmation of the donor to get in contact with Boroume. At the end of April, no concrete food was thus saved, but preparations to start saving food were set in motion: the information to the donor was sent, the practical aspects on how and what to donate were worked out and food recipient organisations around the place of the donor were contacted in order to make a fast and efficient match.

The persons that provided the tips were not only volunteers (2), but 3 of the crowdsourcers were entirely new to the organisation and one provider of the tip was someone who had once registered to become a volunteer for Boroume but had never participated in any of its food saving event, so far.
Experience

As HFA, Boroume was very pleased to be able to start a crowdsourcing campaign within the context of the project. It was a concrete learning experience for the organisation and it said it would definitely use the mechanism after the project for targeting the small donors.

The main lessons learned for them were that it is important to target the shops you want to know more about and that you can actually reach. Therefore, they are not sure about the potential for crowdsourcing for supermarkets or markets since the personal link of citizens with the management is of a different nature. Also, small shops are important for the Boroume model as they are often situated close to a food recipient organisation, so it helps to make new and efficient matches between two actors located in each other neighbourhood.

Besides continuing the crowdsourcing action, Boroume is also motivated to explore other topics. One alley they would like to explore is collecting recipes of food close to its ‘best before date’ or pictures of food saving actions by schools. Here again, Boroume pleads for a targeted approach that is in line with its modus operandi. A crowdsourcing action that connects with its current school program or with business canteens should therefore be envisioned.

This brings us to the third main lesson for Boroume: if you target your action very well with respect to donors or topics and you can build upon personal contacts, you are taking opportunity of capitalizing on current trust between the shopkeeper and the crowdsourcer. It is of course important for the food surplus redistribution charity to not endanger this trust relationship, so you need to offer precise and correct information to the potential donor.

Fourthly, for Boroume it is clear that crowdsourcing, given the profile and background of the crowdsourcers, is a good way to involve current volunteers in other ways to the organisation but, more importantly, to involve new people in broader aspects of food saving and food surplus redistribution. It is clearly an
alternative way for citizens to take action and, given sometimes barriers to participate in food saving events, they can do it when they have time in their daily life rituals and in their immediate neighbourhood. It provides thus a new accessible and meaningful opportunity to act for citizens that due to different reasons would be more easily turned down to participate in food saving event. It is however too early to claim, given the short duration of the crowdsourcing campaign, that these 3 new people and the person that once registered as a volunteer will take the step to one day join a concrete food saving event.

Finally, Boroume learned that it is important to make sure that the crowdsourcing call can have a lasting effect on the long term. The 6 responses were provided very fast after the launch of the call (within certain days), so there is a need to plan the communication in such a way that the call can also work over a longer time period. This might be done via a targeted approach (for example: only one city at a time or one neighbourhood) or by having multiple actions after each other instead of one for several weeks as was the case with SavingFood.

With respect to the experience of citizens, Boroume has of course no sight on citizens that tried to provide a tip, but for some reason did not manage to complete the Google Form or ultimately did not participate. For those that participated, the coordinator pointed towards two important lessons. First, Boroume highlighted that citizens like to be thanked for their effort but more importantly, informed about the status of the contact. Citizens feel very valuable if you tell them that the contact was established but seem also to be ready to offer their support if any problem has been occurred in convincing the potential donor to join the battle against food waste.

A second important lesson relates to the potential of citizens to become more aware of the work and importance of Boroume thanks to crowdsourcing. Boroume stated that what concerns the four people that now got in contact with Boroume, it is clear that they became aware of the general idea and philosophy behind the organisation and the process of providing tips. It is however too early to state that they became aware of the whole process behind the matchmaking and eventually the saving food events themselves. This observation is thus in line with the lesson mentioned above that it is too early to state a certain direct relationship in the future between participating in a crowdsourcing action and eventually increasing the engagement of citizens with Boroume via a concrete volunteering role at gleaning or farmers’ market events. Nonetheless, the ambassador program can be a good mechanism to reinforce and further intensify the relationship and hence play the role of an intermediary step between initial engagement and volunteering.

To what extent do you believe that crowdsourcing:

- Allowed citizens to participate in your food saving operations, that otherwise would not have been so much involved or not involved at all? **Strongly Agree**
- Proved that your saving food operations can grow through the support or the power of a community of people engaged in such a way? **Strongly Agree**
- Demonstrated that ‘tapping into the wisdom of the crowd’ is beneficial for your saving food organisation? **Strongly Agree**
- Is a way to also engage citizens (in the long term) in other activities of your organisation (e.g. participating in gleaning and farmer markets)? **Agree**
- Was a learning experience for the coordinators and other staff members of the food redistribution organisation to engage citizens in the food saving operations? **Strongly Agree**

*Figure 7: Boroume’s experience of the crowdsourcing campaign in 5 statements*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Indicator</strong></th>
<th><strong>Number</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of tips gathered during the crowdsourcing campaign</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of successful tips (successful = a new contact for your organisation, that results in a new donor/charity/farm/farmer market for your network)</td>
<td>The 1 tip that was not succesful was due to the fact that the citizen had not make prior contact with the donor before providing the tip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new donations or newly organised activities thanks to the provided tip (this indicators goes one step further than the previous one, here you already collaborate with the new contact)</td>
<td>5 Confirmed interest and preparations are being made, but no donation made yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of social media posts and mails to spread the crowdsourcing campaign</td>
<td>1150 person reached to dissiminate call via their mail/facebook &lt;br&gt; 1 reminder was sent beginning of April &lt;br&gt; 1 newsitem on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of views of the social media posts, number of reads of the mails</td>
<td>9650 views organic reach Social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other possible indicator to track the positive outcomes of your crowdsourcing campaign?</td>
<td>The response was quite immediate after call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8: Boroume’s results of the crowdsourcing campaign in numbers*

### 2.2.3.3. UK and Belgium

**Implementation, results and experience**

In the UK and Belgium, the pilot coordinators experienced difficulties with implementing this recipe track and create a positive vibe around it. The crowdsourcing campaign was therefore put on hold and effort was reoriented towards the ambassador programme in the UK (see next section). It seems that citizens mainly associate sharing recipes with cooking pages than with a food surplus redistribution. Secondly, recipes were provided in different forms (in terms of explanation or description of the recipes by citizens as well as in terms of ingredients) so that it becomes difficult to assemble concrete recipes without needing to do a lot of redaction work which would lead Feedback too far away from its core role: advocating against food waste and organising gleaning events.

### 2.2.4. Conclusion

The experience of HFA and Boroume showed that a crowdsourcing campaign can be a good tool for food redistribution charities to expand their network of donors and to reach out to citizens and actors that would otherwise not so get involved in saving surplus food. It has therefore, based on the provided result, a clear potential to change the awareness of citizens about the existing of a food redistribution charity and to make them act concretely and meaningfully while before they would not be triggered to call Boroume or HFA. The fact that both HFA and Boroume have the intention to the deploy such a mechanism is the future is a good outcome of the project and opens new ways for explorations in the future. Nonetheless, we would like to conclude with 3 observations for the future of HFA and Boroume and other food surplus redistribution organisations that are tempted to launch such a campaign.

The crowdsourcing campaign taught us first that the mechanism seems to be the most fruitful for the general food rescue model between a shop and a charity. In the case of collecting tips for gleaning or
farmers’ markets, the results are more diverse between the UK and Hungary. While the former one can’t actually risk organising a crowdsourcing due to safety reasons of the crowdsourcer, Hungary tried to work around the issue by looking for ‘leads’ to potential farms and farmers’ markets. Secondly, the general food rescue model has the advantage that it can target citizens in their daily life context in their search for small shops, canteens and other potential food donors in their neighbourhood and that it can build upon existing social contact between the crowdsourcer and the donor. This is essential since an important fact for a donation to happen via a food redistribution organisation is a trustful relationship between the food redistribution organisation and the donor. In the case of crowdsourcing for farmers this trustful relation between an ordinary citizen and a farmer is less frequently present. Boroume is taken this lesson that crowdsourcing for food redistribution organisations should capitalize on existing relations now further by exploring how crowdsourcing can help for their children program at schools.

The second important lesson from the project is that crowdsourcing is an interesting tool that besides being adapted to a specific case and target audience, also helps a food redistribution organisation to expand its own network within citizens and neighbourhoods beyond the mere fact of food surplus saving as such. Although there is no hard evidence from the project’s experience, one can suppose that these new encountered citizens might gradually become more involved with the food redistribution charity. It is therefore, important that the food redistribution charity does not consider the crowdsourcing campaign as an isolated event but tries to see this intervention within a broader scope to expand its network of volunteers. As was testified by Boroume, although the crowdsourcers (especially the new contacts) are since their participation better aware of Boroume and its works, there is still a way to go to make them more aware about the whole process of matchmaking and food surplus collection and redistribution.

Thirdly, it is important to highlight that the food redistribution charities active in the SavingFood project have already build up a certain activity the past years. One important challenge to organise such a crowdsourcing action is of course to have enough capacity to follow it up. This concerns the monitoring of the campaign and the crowdsourcers as contacting potential new donors. Therefore, planning this capacity in terms of personal/volunteer involvement is a crucial component of the roll-out of a crowdsourcing campaign. An ambassador program that becomes mature can eventually be a solution for these capacity issues.

Finally, we should stress that thanking your crowdsourcer is an essential part of the action and it should be worked out well. As the case of Boroume shows, crowdsourcers are really interested into the outcome of their help and want to provide further assistance if they can in case the contact with a donor did not work out well. Also, HFA testified the importance of not neglecting your tip providers.

2.3. Ambassadorship

2.3.1. Why an ambassador program for SavingFood?

The ambassador program builds upon the notion of promoting social diffusion of the idea of the food surplus charity being active in the local neighbourhood. It builds upon the work of personal influence in the spread of certain opinions and ideas in society. By creating a certain group of volunteers that would be the ‘human proof’ that the movement is alive and active, SavingFood wanted on one hand to create a visibility effect so that the interest of other citizens in a neighbourhood network would get triggered and they would start

---

looking for information about what it all means. On the other hand, the ambassador program as a tool of social diffusion was conceived to be more than just a mere advertising instrument. It provided also a concrete opportunity for citizens to perform certain tasks that were essential for the food surplus redistribution. In particular, besides being a new platform for current volunteers of the food redistribution organisation that want to help their organisation in other ways, the ambassador program was also designed as an accessible opportunity for non-volunteering citizens that are concerned about food waste but are not participating in food saving events, yet. For these citizens, the program had to make it possible to act in a small but meaningful way and on their own pace. In this way, as with crowdsourcing, picking up the ambassadorship could be a first step in order to become one day a volunteer for food saving events organised via the SavingFood platform.

As with the crowdsourcing campaign, the pilots had to work out the concrete implementation of the ambassador program based on the principles outline above and in accordance with their needs and in their specific context.

2.3.2. Implementation in the pilots

2.3.2.1. Hungary

Implementation and results

The Ambassador program of Hungary was launched via the existing online social networks and newsletters/direct mails of HFA. In this way, a central management could be organised for the organisation of the communication in order to have a better coordination and monitoring of the work of the ambassadors.

Ambassadors in the Hungarian case were having different tasks with respect to disseminating communication and finding donors/charities/volunteers:

- Disseminating general messages via social media or newsletters within their own network;
- Disseminating the pledge call in their network by resharing it in their own networks (online and social);
- Providing tips about donors/charities;
- Looking for potential volunteers for food saving events.

Since the Ambassador program was launched for the whole country, these more general supportive tasks were more suited to request from people who lived remotely from the HFA headquarters than asking for supporting tasks in the administration of HFA or at the food surplus storage place of the foodbank (which volunteers are already doing right now).

In total, about 1000 people occasionally shared messages online that were launched as part of the ambassador program (these messages were labelled as part of an ambassador program) and 100 to 150 people registered to become regular ambassadors and promoting the pledge within their network.
Experience

Since there was no direct contact between HFA and the ambassadors, it is difficult to grasp any dynamics from the side of the ambassadors with respect to their experience of the program. Nonetheless, the coordinator of HFA made the statement that they saw different age groups disseminating messages. Social media is more present with younger people, but older people have another online network that sometimes is also of a more diverse character than young people due to the work of adults or their involvement in local communities. As such, although their online activity can be seen as less intense (with respect to sharing), their actions can be more impactful. Secondly, it is also interesting for an ambassador program that focuses on online disseminating that older people in Hungary are more and more using social media. This means that there is a potential present in the country to reach a broader and older audience in the near future.

What concerns HFA itself, they consider the ambassador program as an opportunity to involve citizens in important parts of their operations – in particular the communication parts – in which they would otherwise not be involved. As such, the ambassador program was a way to let these citizens get a closer and meaningful relation with HFA. Secondly, the program clearly increased the online visibility of HFA in Hungary as messages got shared on social media and in online communities. It is also via their sharing and dissemination activities that the crowdsourcing of tips of potential gleaning opportunities got spread and let to some concrete results (see section above).

Finally, HFA stated that implementing an ambassador program was useful and that it will certainly look for ways in the future to continue and expand the program.
To what extent do you believe that the ambassador program:
- allowed citizens to participate in your food saving operations, that otherwise would not have been involved so much? **Strongly Agree**
- Allows my food redistribution organisation to be more visible and recognizable in the food saving community? **Strongly Agree**
- allows my food redistribution organisation to engage people who are local influencers towards friends and family for joining the activities of our organisation? **Strongly Agree**
- was a learning experience for the coordinators and other staff members of my food redistribution organisation to recruit new citizens in the food saving operations? **Strongly Agree**

**Figure 10: HFA’s experience of the ambassador program in 5 statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of registered citizens for the ambassador program</td>
<td>1000 occasional 100-150 regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of requests for more information about the ambassador program</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of enrolled ambassadors in a training session</td>
<td>n/a (since online information on what to do as an ambassador)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of social media posts and mails to spread the ambassador program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of views of the social media posts, number of reads of the mails</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other possible indicator to track the positive outcomes of the ambassador program?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11: HFA’s results of the ambassador program in numbers**

2.3.2.2. **Greece**

*Implementation and results*

Boroume launched a call via its social media and its newsletter. A separate page was created on the website of Boroume to inform citizens about the ambassadorship. As with the crowdsourcing campaign, the message was addressed to citizens that are feeling concerned about food waste and was designed in such a way that it highlighted that their involvement is needed to effectively tackle food waste and that Boroume could use their help and effort.

Citizens that were interested to become an ambassador could register via a Google Form. After having completed their contact data, they could select the task they would like to perform from a list:
• Contribution to disseminating information material about food waste in general and Boroume in particular;
• Sharing SavingFood video’s and Boroume video’s;
• Encourage friends and relatives to save food from social and corporate events they attend;
• Provide tips to Boroume about potential charity organisations in their neighbourhood;
• Inform friends and relatives about the gleaning program;
• Set up a gleaning group and adopt a farmers’ market action in their neighbourhood;
• Support Boroume at school by telling teachers of their children about the existence of Boroume.

Once the form was completed, Boroume sent dedicated pdf’s that contained more information about the action with first assignments and concrete how-to-do tips. A task all ambassadors had to do was to share the links of the motivational video’s that were sent along with the pdf’s. Also, a follow-up mail was sent after two days to inform them about a training session in Athens in May where more details about the Ambassador program would be presented.

The citizens that signed up as an ambassador had a diverse background. Most people came from Athens and Thessaloniki and some even were living in places where Boroume is not active yet. These people will be especially targeted the coming months as they are a good base for setting-up a Boroume/SavingFood program or hub in these places. As with the survey, also more women signed up than men. Regarding the age, there is no information as this was not requested with the registration.

Figure 12: Call for Ambassadors disseminated by Boroume on Facebook
Experience

For the Boroume coordinator, setting up the ambassador program clearly has an added value for the organisation. It allowed to involve citizens with the work of Boroume, especially citizens that otherwise would not have been involved. An ambassador program is thus clearly a new way to explore and make connections with citizens. The fact that within a few days after the launch already 27 people signed up also showed that it appeals to citizens. The launch of the program is thus certainly also a fruitful way to be more visible and can lead to a good spread of the idea of Boroume and food surplus redistribution in a neighbourhood. Although it is difficult to make a hard claim for the coordinator, she suspects that the ambassador program attracted potential local influencers in a neighbourhood.

The SavingFood program also allowed to expand the current initiatives Boroume had deployed on a minor scale under the label ‘Boroume in the neighbourhood’. Compared to this initiative, that worked very local, the SavingFood Ambassador program was taken as an opportunity to expand the tasks an ambassador/citizen can do and to define this from his point of view and from concrete opportunities he/she has to act in her/his daily life.

With respect to the experience of citizens, Boroume stated that the procedure was well communicated because there were hardly any requests for explanations. The clear message might also be a reason for the success of the initiative given its 27 subscribers after just a few days. Nonetheless, as mentioned above, a training session will be organised shortly in Athens to explain further the ambassador roles and tasks.

Secondly, the driver for citizens seems to be the opportunity to become, in a via accessible way, part of a larger community that tackles a major issue in Greek cities. It is thus not so much the environmental dimension that is the main driver, but the social dimension of food surplus redistribution.

One of the major contributions according to Boroume is that the ambassador program can make citizens aware that even by doing one simple step, such as sharing a message on Facebook, they make a difference for Boroume. Although citizens could do such actions before, the ambassador program also had the advantage to provide a broader structure for the citizens. Now, they can do these small steps in a more organised way and it makes them feel clearly already a part of the movement while before they were associated ‘being part’ rather exclusively with picking up food at gleaning or farmers’ market events.

To what extent do you believe that the ambassador program:

- Allowed citizens to participate in your food saving operations, that otherwise would not have been involved so much? **Strongly Agree**
- Allowed my food redistribution organisation to be more visible and recognizable in the food saving community? **Strongly Agree**
- Allowed my food redistribution organisation to engage people who are local influencers towards friends and family for joining the activities of our organisation? **Agree**
- Was a learning experience for the coordinators and other staff members of my food redistribution organisation to recruit new citizens in the food saving operations? **Strongly Agree**

*Figure 13: Boroume’s experience of the ambassador program in 5 statements*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of registered citizens for the ambassador program</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also a hotel in Athens, where the staff would be trained to become an ambassador, is on board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of requests for more information about the ambassador program</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of enrolled ambassadors in a training session</td>
<td>One-on one training so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session is planned in May in Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of social media posts and mails to spread the ambassador program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email base of volunteers to further promote it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email send to partners such donors, food companies, retail (hotel was recruited via this mechanism)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of views of the social media posts, number of reads of the mails</td>
<td>7000 organic reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other possible indicator to track the positive outcomes of the ambassador program?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Boroume’s results of the ambassador program in numbers

2.3.2.3. United Kingdom

Implementation and results

The ambassador program was trialled in the West-England Gleaning region, in particular in the city of Bristol. Students at the local universities and high schools were in particularly targeted. This target group was selected because the ambassador program consisted of creating a community of young and like-minded people that could support SavingFood and, in particular after the project, Feedback. Students can be considered as a good target group as they share a common space – the university – and age and SavingFood could be for young people a way to discuss common concerns with like-minded people in a clear setting.

In practice students had to:

- Raise awareness in the university about the issue of food waste and what a university can do to prevent food waste;
- Create a group of volunteers in their peer group and perform a small but meaningful action to raise awareness and reduce food waste, by for example organising a debate evening with local food waste initiatives or by creating a Facebook group about the topic in which students could share tips and recipes and share the motivational videos of the project;
- Try to form a group of volunteers for food saving events;
- Inform local supermarkets about SavingFood and Feedback.

The students that registered as an ambassador received documentation to support them with these 4 tasks.

In order to recruit students, Feedback attended the local Freshness fair which is an orientation session for new students at the university and besides this presence, Feedback organised 2 events at the university. Flyers and leaflets were also distributed on campus and one pub session was organised where students could meet Feedback people.

The ambassador program was launched in March and was also repeated in Manchester at the same time as the awareness-raising event organised by Feedback.
In total 6 students registered immediately to become an ambassador while 12 students signed up the request for more information. As so far, no training session has been organised, people did not attend such a session yet. Nonetheless, Feedback is currently looking for an opportunity to organise a training session in Bristol to explain more what an ambassador can do and help support the currently enrolled students.

The majority of these contacts obtained via the ambassador efforts were new to Feedback.

Experience

For Feedback, setting up the ambassador program, even in trial mode, had a positive impact for the organisation. For Feedback the ambassador program was according to the coordinator one of the most effective actions they did in SavingFood. It would have been better to have started this earlier in the project, for example in line with the awareness-raising events. The connection with the platform not only lead to a delay of such an important initiative but it also frames such a program in a way that other interesting aspects are concealed or not explored.

Feedback believed that thanks to this initiative they can attract other people than those that sign up for a gleaning event and that it allowed them to give these students a greater and deeper involvement with food saving than would not have been the case without such a program. Important of course is that the program is well targeted to a group and to a region, as was the case in Bristol.

Secondly, as mentioned above, the majority of the students that registered as an ambassador or signed up for more information, were new to Feedback. The ambassador program thus allowed to create more visibility among students in Bristol. In practice the ambassador program allowed Feedback to reach out to students that are sensitive for sustainability issues and are active in groups working on such issues. It is therefore an interesting lesson for Feedback to not create again a new SavingFood group, but rather to connect with the existing initiatives where these students are involved in.

The experience with the ambassador program is certainly going to be extended. Currently Feedback is looking to set-up an ambassador program in Kensington in Sussex. Compared to Bristol, where the action will be continued, the focus will now be on elderly and retired people. As was also the case with Hungary, elderly people are interesting as they, compared to young people and students, have another kind of network that is often, due to life history and work experience, more rooted or connected to organisations that matter in a certain region or field.

With respect to the experience of young people, Feedback told us that the Bristol experience so far taught them that even students need a lot of face-to-face contact in order to move forward with the program. This is certainly a point to work on. The reason why students signed up as an ambassador was, besides the concern over the issue, a desire to meet likeminded people in a new unfamiliar context. This is an important aspect when targeting your ambassador program to young people: the issue is an important factor, but determinant in concretely taking action is providing a space where likeminded young people can meet each other and work-out an action.

To what extent do you believe that the ambassador program:
- Allowed citizens to participate in your food saving operations, that otherwise would not have been involved so much? **Agree**
- Allowed my food redistribution organisation to be more visible and recognizable in the food saving community? **Agree**
Allowed my food redistribution organisation to engage people who are local influencers towards friends and family for joining the activities of our organisation? **Strongly Agree**

Was a learning experience for the coordinators and other staff members of my food redistribution organisation to recruit new citizens in the food saving operations? **Strongly Agree**

**Figure 15: Feedback’s experience of the ambassador program in 5 statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of registered citizens for the ambassador program</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of requests for more information about the ambassador program</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of enrolled ambassadors in a training session</td>
<td>0 (but session is planned in Bristol in the near future to support the created group of ambassadors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of social media posts and mails to spread the ambassador program</td>
<td>Difficult to tell as we mainly used leaflets and flyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of views of the social media posts, number of reads of the mails</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other possible indicator to track the positive outcomes of the ambassador program?</td>
<td>New program set-up in Kensington with elderly based upon the good experience in Bristol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16: Feedback’s results of the ambassador program in numbers**

2.3.3. Conclusion

The ambassador program was implemented in all three pilots. As with the crowdsourcing campaign, all participating pilots were in the end enthusiastic about the experience and have ambitions to continue this kind of engagement strategy after the project. Notwithstanding the modest out roll, it becomes clear that, like crowdsourcing, an ambassador program can be good intervention to on the one hand expand the network of the food redistribution charity in neighbourhoods or groups beyond the aspect of volunteering for food saving events and on the other hand to increase in such a way its visibility in a local community.

The ambassador program is a very flexible approach as it allows, within the framework of its two objectives, that each food redistribution charity can adapt its deployment in line with its own particular needs. As such each pilot adopted its own strategy – students in the case of Feedback, sharing communication in the case of HFA and a variety of tasks in the case of Boroume. Nonetheless, to start an ambassador program, SavingFood recommends starting very focused, especially when a food redistribution organisation does not possess a lot of staff or volunteers to monitor and manage it. As the 3 pilots indicate, response can be very fast, and it is important to build upon this response in a very concrete and immediate way. This means that deploying an ambassador program means also that the action is well prepared and sustained over a long period of time: on the one hand a food redistribution charity needs to provide training and secondly ambassadors, in contrast with crowdsourcing, are not expecting to do an action once, but to perform a more continuous activity.

As with crowdsourcing, follow up on your audience is important. Here the focus is not only on thanking your ambassadors for their effort, but the value of a registration can also lie in potential actions of the food redistribution organisation. As in the case of Boroume, it might be that people register as an ambassador but are not living in areas where the food redistribution organisation is active. In that case, an ambassador
campaign can focus on helping these people to create a first hub or community that creates awareness about the issue before starting one day food saving events.

Thirdly, it is also remarkable that an ambassador program can be targeted at different age groups. While crowdsourcing can attract a technical savvy audience, an ambassador program has, as Feedback’s future plans show, and HFA experience learns, a potential to encompass all ages. This is an advantage as the observations of HFA and Feedback tell us that elderly people have the advantage of often having a more diverse network due to their life cycle and work experience.

Finally, we should observe that it would be a mistake to separate a crowdsourcing and ambassador action from each other. Just as with crowdsourcing, the ambassador program should not be seen in isolation, but part of a broader strategy of interventions as we did in SavingFood and as a first step to getting new citizens later involved in other saving surplus food actions. Moreover, in practice, HFA and Boroume also redirected some aspects of crowdsourcing to the ambassador program.

3. CONCLUSIONS

This paper discussed three behavioural change interventions that were designed within the SavingFood project and deployed into three of its pilots: Feedback in the UK, HFA in Hungary and Boroume in Greece. Their deployment was inspired by the insights from the 7E-strategy that stated that behavioural change is the results of a catalysator effect brought about by different interventions that each focus on a certain domain that influences behaviour – knowledge, beliefs, motivations, habits, and opportunities to act.

The pledge, the crowdsourcing campaign and the ambassador program had the common objective to reach out to citizens that are concerned about SavingFood but are not participating in food surplus saving events yet. Although all three are of a different nature, they all provided opportunities for these concerned citizens to act and contribute hence in meaningful ways to the cause of saving surplus food. Due to belated implementation of the platform and the initial connection that was made between these interventions and the technical solution, the pilots only implemented these interventions in the two final months of the project, meaning that we could only report on their initial success and we cannot make statements about their lasting impacts. Nonetheless, we highlighted after each discussion of these interventions some important lessons for future work since all pilots were after this first trial convinced about the benefit of these three actions for their operations and for expanding their network.

The pledge strived to make citizens to commit themselves to start saving food on an individual scale. Consequent small requests to build upon to this commitment should support the process of change in self-perception of people that they can actually be a food surplus saver and sign up to the platform. In total the project reached its objective of having 1000 pledges and pilots are currently busy with sending the follow-up request to foster behavioural change towards registering to the platform. The crowdsourcing campaign learned that it should best be used in a context where personal relations exist between the crowdsourcer and the donor. Finally, the ambassador program turned out to be a very flexible tool that allows to target all ages groups and let them perform, depending on the tasks provided, simple tasks. This is especially interesting when working with elderly people as they often have, due to their life experience, a more diverse network of actors that can help with developing saving surplus food actions in new neighbourhoods. Finally, the crowdsourcing and the ambassador program highlighted that these interventions should be designed in such a way that they are perfectly embedded in the daily life context of citizen. If a citizen goes every day to a certain shop, he does not have to change his/her habits to help SavingFood. If the crowdsourcing action is
well designed, it builds upon this daily ritual to provide the concerned citizen with an opportunity to act
when he/she has his daily chat with the shop or canteen owner.

Perhaps the main final lesson for the project was that we tied these 3 interventions in our behavioural
change strategy towards the platform in line with the initial outline of the DOA. A looser connection would
have allowed the pilots to create a group of enthusiast citizens that were already doing little actions before
ultimately joining the platform.