
FOOD HUB

HANDBOOK



**KNOWLEDGE-SHARING FOOD HUBS
AGAINST FOOD LOSS & WASTE**

Welcome Message



The Barrio Sin Despilfarro Team

This handbook was developed within a CHARM-EU Capstone project on food loss and waste (FLW) in the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona (MAB), in collaboration with the *Generalitat de Catalunya's Departament d'Agricultura, Ramaderia, Pesca i Alimentació* (DARPA) and a range of system actors, including social entities, wholesale and HORECA representatives, and public educators.

It draws on four complementary perspectives explored in the Capstone project: household practices and education, public communication and campaigns, cultural and technical valorisation of surplus, and food donation and redistribution. The examples and templates are therefore meant to support hubs on any of these topics, as well as their intersections.

It has a dual purpose. First, it offers practical guidance on how to design and facilitate in-person knowledge-sharing food hubs that bring stakeholders together around FLW prevention and food donation. Second, it provides direction for designing an online food hub – a website where the resources, tools and outputs of these physical hubs can be gathered and made accessible in Spanish, Catalan and English, so that knowledge is not lost and can be reused across time and territories.

We gratefully acknowledge all stakeholders who shared their time, experience and critical reflections, which have directly shaped the tools and recommendations that follow.

01 Purpose and Audience

02 Guiding Principles

03 Governance and Roles of the Hub

3.1 Convenor

3.2 Core Partners

3.3 Facilitation and Secretariat

3.4 Online Hub Stewardship

04 The Hub as a Cycle

Example Annual Cycle

05 Stakeholder Mapping and Engagement

5.1 Who Should Be at the Table?

5.2 Stakeholder Mapping

06 Designing a Hub Session

6.1 Before the Session

6.2 During the Session

6.3 After the Session

07 Content and Knowledge Tools

7.1 Case Study Examples

7.2 Practical Tools

08 Documentation, Data and Ethical Considerations

8.1 Documentation

8.2 Data and Ethics

09 Monitoring and Continuous Improvement

9.1 Suggested Indicators

9.2 Learning Loop

10 PART II: Online Food Hub

10.1 Homepage

10.2 “Learn More” button

10.3 Navigation though Tabs

11 Annexes

1. Stakeholder Mapping Template

2. Example Hub Session Designs 1, 2 and 3

01

Purpose and Audience

This guide is intended for staff within the Government of Catalonia's Department of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Food who wish to **convene, host and sustain knowledge-sharing “food hubs”** on FLW across the food system, including prevention, household and community practices, education and communication, valorisation of surplus, and food donation and redistribution.

It can also be used by:

- Municipalities and metropolitan corporations
- Food banks and social entities
- Public food procurement bodies and HORECA actors
- Wholesale markets and retailers
- Civil society organisations and community groups

The goal is to offer a **repeatable process**, not just a one-time event: a way to bring together diverse stakeholders around FLW, share knowledge and tools, and support ongoing collaboration.

This handbook covers both:

- (a) how to design and facilitate in-person knowledge-sharing hubs, and
- (b) how to design and maintain an online food hub that collects their outputs and resources.

In this guide, a **knowledge-sharing food hub** is:

A recurring space (physical and/or digital) where public authorities, businesses, social entities and citizens meet to exchange practical knowledge, align expectations and co-develop solutions on FLW, with a focus on prevention and socially just redistribution.

It is **not**:

- A physical warehouse or logistics hub (though it may discuss them).
- A one-off conference.
- A purely technical training.

Instead, it is a **governance and learning process** that can be repeated each year or cycle, with changing themes and participants.

02

Guiding Principles

The following principles should guide any food hub that DARPA or other actors convene:

1. Prevention first

Prevention should guide decisions across the food system – from production and retail to public catering and households. Donation and other valorisation routes remain important safety nets, but they must not substitute for avoiding surplus and waste wherever possible.

2. Mission-driven intermediaries at the centre

Social enterprises, food banks, schools, NGOs, community projects and other mission-driven actors are key intermediaries. Hubs should recognise their hybrid missions (environmental, social, educational, economic) and constraints.

3. Collaborative governance

No single actor can “fix” FLW. Hubs should help clarify shared and distinct responsibilities, strengthen trust and accountability, and enable joint decisions rather than merely transmitting top-down instructions.

4. Operational realism

Design discussions and proposals around real constraints: storage capacity, staff, time, quality of food and services (including donations), regulations, and funding.

5. Data for learning, not just control

Encourage simple, meaningful data practices that help actors understand where FLW occurs and what works, without over-burdening those with the least capacity.

6. Equity and inclusion

Avoid shifting costs or risks onto smaller social entities, schools, community projects or individual volunteers. Hubs should amplify marginal voices, not only the best-resourced actors.

03

Roles and Governance of the Hub

3.1 Convenor

(DARPA or equivalent public authority)

Main responsibilities:

- Frame the overall objectives of the hub.
- Ensure neutrality, continuity and follow-up.
- Provide basic resources (venue, facilitation budget, communication)..

3.2 Core Partners

Examples:

- Food banks and social (redistribution) entities
- Social enterprises working on awareness-raising and valorisation
- Primary sector, wholesale markets, distributors, and retailers
- Schools and education networks
- Municipal / metropolitan food policy bodies
- HORECA and catering associations
- Community kitchens and neighbourhood projects
- Campaign and communication units working on FLW

Responsibilities:

- Co-design themes and agendas.
- Help recruit participants from their networks.
- Co-host sessions and share case studies.

3.3 Facilitation and Secretariat

This can be internal (DARPA staff) or external (consultancy, NGO):

- Design the detailed process for each hub session.
- Manage invitations, logistics and documentation.
- Ensure balanced participation and inclusive discussion.

TIP: Create a small “hub steering group” (6–8 people) from the convenor + core partners. Meet briefly 2–3 times per year to set priorities and review progress.

3.4 Online Hub Stewardship

In addition to convening in-person sessions, DARPA is responsible for stewarding the **online food hub** that accompanies this process. While the physical hubs create space for dialogue and co-creation, the online hub ensures that their outputs remain accessible over time.

Key tasks for the digital steward are to:

- **Maintain** the structure and basic content of the online hub in line with this handbook and DARPA's web standards.
- **Upload** and **organise** materials after each hub session (summaries, tools, case studies, relevant policy updates), using simple categories and tags agreed with partners.
- Ensure that content **respects confidentiality and data protection requirements**, and that sensitive information is anonymised where necessary.
- **Coordinate** with core partners who provide case studies and tools, and support them in preparing materials that can be shared publicly.
- **Monitor** basic usage and feedback to inform periodic improvements to the hub.

In practice, these tasks can be carried out by a small secretariat or coordinating team within DARPA, working closely with the facilitation team and core partners.

Part II of this handbook delves further into the details of what can be expected on the online food hub.



04

The Hub as a Cycle

The food hub should remain relevant and long-lasting rather than a one-off event. To ensure this, they should be held in (yearly) **cycles**, not isolated meetings.

Example Annual Cycle

- **Step 1 – Priority setting (Q1)**
 - Steering group reviews current FLW issues, policy changes (e.g. Law 1/2025), and opportunities.
 - Decide on 1-2 focus themes (e.g. “donation from wholesale & retail”, “FLW in HORECA and events”).
- **Step 2 – Thematic hub sessions (Q2-Q3)**
 - Organise 1-3 sessions on the chosen theme(s).
 - Each combines short inputs with facilitated multi-stakeholder discussion.
- **Step 3 – Follow-up actions (Q3-Q4)**
 - From each session, identify 1-3 feasible follow-up actions (e.g. a pilot project, a working group on donation guidelines, a shared template).
 - Assign leads and timelines.
- **Step 4 – Reflection and planning (Q4)**
 - Hold a short reflection meeting.
 - Review what was achieved and what needs to change in the next cycle.

This pattern can be adapted to different scales (metropolitan, regional, sector-specific). Each cycle of in-person hub meetings generates outputs (case studies, tools, summary notes) that should be uploaded and organised in the online food hub. Over time, this creates a shared, searchable repository of knowledge in Spanish, Catalan and English.

05 Stakeholder Mapping and Engagement

5.1 Who Should Be at the Table?

Aim for a **balanced mix** of:

- Public authorities (regional, municipal, metropolitan)
- Social entities and NGOs (food banks, social kitchens, community groups)
- Businesses (wholesale markets, retailers, HORECA, catering, primary production where possible)
- Knowledge actors (universities, research centres, professional associations)
- Citizen voices (consumer groups, neighbourhood associations)

5.2 Stakeholder Mapping Template

Annex A provides a template to identify and characterise the key stakeholders who should be involved in a knowledge-sharing food hub on FLW in the MAB and beyond. Subsequently, this can also be used during the hub sessions themselves.

For each potential actor, ask:

- What is their **role** in FLW (generator, intermediary, recipient, regulator, funder)?
- What is their **level of influence** on decisions?
- How directly are they **affected** by FLW or related policies?
- What is their **capacity** to act (staff, resources, time)?

Use this to:

- Ensure smaller organisations and diverse territories are not systematically left out.
- Identify which actors need special support (e.g. travel reimbursement, language support, flexible timing).

This section gives a **checklist** for a typical 2–3 hour hub meeting. For concrete examples of full session outlines, including three household-focused topics, see **Annex B**. These can be adapted and reused by DARPA staff and partners when planning future hub meetings.

6.1 Before the Session

1. Define a clear objective

Example:

- “Map current barriers and promising practices in food donation between HORECA and social entities in the MAB.”
- “Co-create a first draft of a practical guide for surplus donation at wholesale level.”

2. Select 1–3 guiding questions

Examples:

- “If you could change one thing tomorrow in how surplus moves, what would it be?”
- “Where do you see responsibility being fairly shared, and where is it being shifted?”
- “What types of support (guides, tools, infrastructure) would make the biggest difference in your daily work?”

3. Choose the format

For a 2–3 hour session:

- Welcome and framing (10–15 min)
- Short context input (legal/policy, data, 10–15 min)
- Small-group discussions (60–75 min) with 6–8 people per table
- Plenary synthesis (30–40 min)
- Agreement on key follow-up points (10–15 min)

4. Sort logistics

- Accessible venue (or hybrid set-up).
- Clear language: offer Spanish and Catalan; avoid technical jargon.
- Food and timing that respects municipal, HORECA and NGO schedules.
- Decide on note-taking and consent (will quotes be anonymised? Can photos be taken?).

6.2 During the Session

- Briefly restate purpose and ground rules (respect, listening, timekeeping).
- Use simple visual aids (flipcharts, sticky notes, digital boards).
- Ensure that different stakeholder groups sit together, not all NGOs at one table, all policymakers at another.
- If possible, have a co-facilitator dedicated to monitoring who speaks and encouraging quieter voices.

6.3 After the Session

- Within 2-3 weeks, send a **one-page summary** to participants:
 - Key points raised
 - Any emerging agreements or tensions
 - Concrete next steps and who is responsible

07

Content and Knowledge Tools

A hub works best when participants **bring and co-create concrete tools**, not only discuss problems.

7.1 Case Study Examples

Provide a simple template that asks:

- Who is involved?
- What problem were they addressing?
- What did they try (process, tools, partnerships)?
- What worked and what did not?
- What can others learn from this?

In **Annex B** at the end of this handbook, you can find case study session outline examples on FLW reduction on household level:

- **Session 1:** “Cooking for One, Feeding Many: Household Practices and Social Norms”
- **Session 2:** “Labels, Dates, and Safety: What Do Consumers Really Need to Know?”
- **Session 3:** “Community-Level Interventions: From Household Habits to Neighbourhood Practices”

7.2 Practical Tools

Examples of what can be shared, improved and standardised through the hub:

- Donation quality guidelines (for donors)
- Simple templates for prevention plans
- Sample donation agreements (roles, responsibilities, liability)
- Basic spreadsheets or dashboards for tracking surplus and donations
- The hub should not aim to “own” these tools, but to circulate and refine them across actors.

08 Documentation, Data and Ethical Considerations

8.1 Documentation

- Decide in advance how discussions will be documented:
 - Named statements vs anonymised comments
 - Internal notes vs public summaries
- Aim for **light but systematic** documentation:
 - Key insights per question
 - Short list of action points with responsible actors

8.2 Data and Ethics

- If you collect structured data (e.g. survey responses, quotes used in reports), ensure:
 - Consent is obtained and clearly recorded.
 - Sensitive information about vulnerable groups is protected.
 - Data are used to support learning, not to single out or penalise specific organisations.
- Be transparent about:
 - Who will see the notes and summaries.
 - How long data will be stored and by whom.

09

Monitoring and Continuous Improvement

To keep the hub relevant and sustainable, DARPA should monitor **both process and outcomes**.

9.1 Suggested Indicators

- Number and diversity of participants per session (by sector, geography).
- Participant feedback on perceived usefulness (short exit survey).
- Number of concrete follow-up actions initiated (e.g. pilots, working groups).
- Evidence of changes in practice or policy linked to hub discussions (even if small).

9.2 Learning Loop

After each cycle:

- Hold a short internal debrief with convenor, facilitation and core partners.
- Ask:
 - What worked well?
 - What did not work, and why?
 - Which themes or formats should we change next time?

Update the **agenda, stakeholder mix and tools** for the next cycle accordingly.



First Knowledge-Sharing Food Hub Focus Group Prototype Testing

PART II

10 Online Food Hub

Introduction

The following section serves as a guide for creating of the online food hub associated to the “Barrio sin Despilfarro” project. It aims to guide designers, content editors, and institutional stakeholders in developing a **clear, consistent, and accessible digital platform** for the knowledge-sharing food hub events.

The sections below follow the order in which users encounter them when scrolling from top to bottom.

10.1 Homepage

The homepage is a key element of the website, as it forms the first impression of the user. It should include the following elements, in order to convey credibility and professionalism:

- **Project identification:** The title of project is clearly visible, along with the project's purpose and the logo of the organising body (Generalitat de Catalunya).
- **Contextual Framing:** Gives a context to the food waste issue globally, in the EU, nationally, and then regionally. Visuals, graphs and numbers are used to catch the attention at first glance.
- **Project positioning:** The home page also briefly presents Barrio sin Despilfarro as a community-based, multi-actor solution to food waste prevention in the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona.



10.2 “Learn More” Button

The homepage should also display a **“Learn More” Button**.

By clicking on this button (at the lower end on the home page), the user is taken to more extensive information on the project, the knowledge-sharing hub, and its rationale. Under the **“Learn more”**, it is advised to have **“Why this Hub”** section, including an explanation of what the hubs are, what their aim is and why they are relevant amongst the pre-existing actions against food waste.

It is important to have explicit referencing of:

- **Catalan and national laws on food waste prevention**
- **Relevant national legislation**
- **The Zero Waste Plan**
- **Sustainable Development Goal 12.3**

The screenshot shows a website for 'BARRIO SIN DESPILFARRO'. The top navigation bar includes 'Home', 'Events & outcomes', 'Stakeholders', 'FAQs', 'Join us', a 'Search...' field, and a magnifying glass icon. The main content features a large pie chart titled '129 kg food waste per inhabitant in the EU'. The chart is divided into several segments: 'Households' (68 kg), 'Retail and other distribution of food' (10 kg), 'Primary production' (12 kg), 'Restaurants and food services' (15 kg), and 'Manufacture of food products and beverages' (23 kg). Below the chart, a note states: 'Due to rounding, the sum of the values for the categories does not match the total. Source: Eurostat (2021), most recent data available (2020)'. The Generalitat de Catalunya logo is at the bottom left. On the right, a section titled 'The issue of food waste...' discusses the impact of food waste and includes a bulleted list of facts. A 'Learn More' button is located at the bottom right of the main content area.

This section also explains the online food hub: it is the digital companion to the in-person knowledge-sharing hubs. While physical hubs create space for dialogue, trust-building and co-creation, the online hub ensures that the resources, tools and insights generated do not disappear after each meeting.

The text should clearly explain that food waste prevention efforts are currently fragmented across sectors, with many initiatives operating in isolation despite existing expertise and innovation. The hub responds to this challenge by creating a structured space for dialogue, coordination, and collective learning.

Navigation through Tabs

The homepage should guide the reader to other relevant information, through thematic tabs:

- **Discover Good Practices:** Links to documented practices and related Generalitat-led initiatives on food waste prevention.
- **Events & Outcomes:** Summaries and outputs from previous hub events, including key insights and conclusions.
- **Stakeholders:** Overview of participating actors and sectors involved in the project.
- **Join the Network:** Contact information and mechanisms to enrol for participation in next events.
- **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ):** Clear answers to common questions to reduce barriers to participation and understanding.

Core pages and key resources should be available in Catalan, Spanish and English to ensure accessibility to a wider array of stakeholders.

BARRIO SIN DESPILFARRO

Home Events & outcomes Stakeholders FAQs Join us Search...

Past events & outcomes

BARRIO SIN DESPILFARRO

Home Events & outcomes Stakeholders FAQs Join us Search...

Get to know the involved stakeholders

Barrio sin Despilfarro is a community-based, multi-actor project aiming at developing real solutions in the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona. The project consists of a wide network of actors from the food chain:

es im-perfect mercabarna

espioladors

JOIN US

FUNDACIÓ BANC DELS ALIMENTS

Generalitat de Catalunya

Annex 1. Stakeholder Mapping Template —

Purpose:

Use this sheet to identify and characterise the key stakeholders who should be involved in a knowledge-sharing food hub on food loss and waste in the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona and beyond.

Instructions:

- Be specific: name the organisation (and, if known, the person or unit).
- Focus on stakeholders who generate, manage, regulate, redistribute or are affected by food surplus and waste.
- Use a simple scale for some columns (e.g. Low/Medium/High, or 1-3).

For each stakeholder, fill in one row. You can group actors by the following characteristics:

- Sector / type (Public, Social, Business, HORECA, Primary, Citizen, Knowledge)
- Main role in FLW (generator, intermediary, regulator, funder, recipient, advocate)
- Influence on decisions (L/M/H)
- How affected by FLW or FLW policy?
- Capacity to act (staff, resources, time)
- Current relationship with DARPA / hub convenor
- Desired level of engagement (Core partner, Regular participant, Occasional invitee, Inform/Consult)
- Notes / specific needs (language, timing, access, support)

Other characteristics can be added if deemed necessary.

Stakeholder Map

Stakeholder name / organisation	Sector / type	Main role in FLW	Influence on decisions	How affected by FLW or FLW policy?	Capacity to act	Current relationship with DARPA / hub convenor	Desired level of engagement	Notes / specific needs
1	2	3	4	5	6			

Annex 2. Example Hub Session Designs

Session 1: “Cooking for One, Feeding Many: Household Practices and Social Norms”

Session length (content only): 120 minutes

(Be mindful to allocate enough time for a walk-in, break, and informal closing or networking space outside this block.)

1.1 Objectives

- Understand how everyday cooking and eating habits create or prevent household food waste.
- Surface how social norms (hospitality, portions, family expectations, time pressure) influence over-cooking and leftovers.
- Identify promising practices and community-based ideas that can be supported by DARPA and municipalities.

1.2 Suggested participants

- Families, single households, caregivers.
- Representatives from NGOs/social entities working with households (youth, elderly, low-income families).
- Chefs (including canteens, community kitchens, small HORECA).
- Municipal staff (social services, community centres, local food policy).
- Representatives from consumer organisations or neighbourhood associations.
- DARPA staff involved in FLW / food policy.

1.3 Expected outputs

- List of key household practices and norms that drive waste.
- Examples of promising low-waste practices (e.g. batch cooking, shared meals, portioning, leftover culture).
- 2-3 ideas for interventions (community programmes, campaigns, tools) that DARPA/municipalities could support.

1.4 Agenda (120 minutes)

0-10 min	<p>Welcome & context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator introduces objective and agenda. • Quick recap of why household practices matter for prevention-first strategies.
10-25 min	<p>Individual reflection & share</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: <i>“Think of a recent week. When did you end up throwing food away at home? What was it, and why?”</i> • Facilitator notes key examples on a visible board. • Examples harvested in plenary to show variety (single households, families, carers, etc.).
25-55 min	<p>Small-group discussion 1: Practices and norms</p> <p>Participants split into mixed groups.</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>“In your experience, what everyday practices lead to most food waste at home?”</i> 2. <i>“Which social norms or expectations (e.g. ‘better too much than too little’, ‘proper meal’, hospitality) drive over-buying or over-cooking?”</i> 3. <i>“Where do you see people already improvising low-waste solutions?”</i> <p>Groups write key points on flipchart:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Column A: wasteful practices/norms; • Column B: existing low-waste practices.
55-70 min	<p>Plenary harvest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each group presents 2-3 key points from each column. • Facilitator clusters into themes (e.g. portion size, planning, leftovers, social pressure, time constraints).

70-100 min	<p>Small-group discussion 2: Ideas for change Same groups or reshuffled.</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>If you wanted to change one household practice you identified, what would you target first?</i> 2. <i>What kind of support (information, tools, community activities, incentives) would help people actually change that practice?</i> 3. <i>What could DARPA, municipalities, NGOs or chefs realistically do together to support this?</i> <p>Groups produce one “idea card” per practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target practice/norm • Who is involved • What happens • What support is needed • Potential barriers
100-120 min	<p>Plenary synthesis & next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each group presents their idea card. • Facilitator identifies 2-3 intervention ideas (e.g. “cooking for one” community workshops, shared meal clubs) and notes which actors could lead or support. • Capture on a single “opportunities” sheet to feed into hub follow-up.

Session 2: “Labels, Dates, and Safety: What Do Consumers Really Need to Know?”

Session length (content only): 120 minutes

(Be mindful to allocate enough time for a walk-in, break, and informal closing or networking space outside this block.)

2.1 Objectives

- Clarify how “best before” and “use by” dates are currently understood and applied in practice.
- Identify misunderstandings that lead to avoidable household waste.
- Co-develop simple, realistic messages and tools that could support safer, lower-waste decisions at home.

2.2 Suggested participants

- Food safety and public health officials.
- Retail representatives (quality/labelling, CSR).
- Consumer organisations and NGOs.
- Social entities working with food aid (who see what gets discarded).
- Chefs / HORECA (especially those doing take-away or ready-to-eat).
- DARPA staff involved in food safety and FLW.

2.3 Expected outputs

- List of common misconceptions and risky practices around date labels.
- Core messages that stakeholders agree are both safe and practical.
- 3-4 ideas for communication channels and formats (e.g. on-pack, signage, social media, workshops).

2.4 Agenda (120 minutes)

0-10 min	Welcome & context <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Facilitator introduces objective and agenda.• Short input from food safety / regulatory expert on what “use by” and “best before” legally mean.
10-25 min	Individual reflection & share <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Question: <i>“From your perspective, what is one typical confusion or risky behaviour you see related to date labels?”</i>• Facilitator notes key examples on a visible board.
25-55 min	Small-group discussion 1: Mapping misunderstandings Participants split into mixed groups. Prompts: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>“When and why do people throw away food that is still safe?”</i>2. <i>“When might people actually take too much risk (e.g. keeping food too long)?”</i>3. <i>“How do current labels, packaging and retail practices contribute to confusion?”</i> Groups write key points on flipchart: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Column A: leads to avoidable waste;• Column B: could be unsafe.
55-70 min	Plenary harvest <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each group presents 2-3 items from each column.• Facilitator clusters themes (e.g. misunderstanding of “best before”, smell/visual check myths, risk with high-risk foods, confusion with freezing).

70-100 min	<p>Small-group discussion 2: Messages and tools Same groups or reshuffled.</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"If you had to design three short messages to reduce waste without compromising safety, what would they be?"</i> 2. <i>"Where should people see these messages (labels, signage, social media, community spaces, cooking shows)?"</i> 3. <i>"What role can each sector here realistically play in disseminating them?"</i> <p>Groups draft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 key messages (in everyday language). • 2-3 communication channels for each message. • Note any risks from safety perspective.
100-120 min	<p>Plenary synthesis & next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each group presents their messages. • Facilitator identifies 3-5 messages that most stakeholders can endorse. • Capture final messages and potential pilots for communication campaigns.

Session 3: “Community-Level Interventions: From Household Habits to Neighbourhood Practices”

Session length (content only): 120 minutes

(Be mindful to allocate enough time for a walk-in, break, and informal closing or networking space outside this block.)

3.1 Objectives

- Explore how household-level waste is influenced by community and neighbourhood contexts.
- Share experiences from community fridges, shared kitchens, local campaigns, etc.
- Identify 2-3 promising community-level interventions that could be scaled or supported across the MAB / Catalonia.

3.2 Suggested participants

- Municipal environment and social services departments.
- NGOs managing community fridges, shared kitchens, neighbourhood food projects.
- Representatives from neighbourhood associations and community centres.
- Food banks / social entities.
- DARPA staff responsible for regional programmes and grants.

3.3 Expected outputs

- Map of existing community-level FLW initiatives (even small or informal).
- Identification of key enablers and barriers at neighbourhood level.
- 2-3 concrete ideas for interventions or support mechanisms (calls, training, toolkits, small grants).

3.4 Agenda (120 minutes)

0-10 min	<p>Welcome & context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator introduces objective and agenda. • Set the scene: shift from “individual behaviour” to “neighbourhood practices”.
10-25 min	<p>Individual reflection & share</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: “<i>Do you know of any FLW community initiatives that connect households?</i>” • Facilitator notes key examples on a visible board.
25-55 min	<p>Small-group discussion 1: Enablers and barriers</p> <p>Participants split into mixed groups (ideally each group has at least one person engaged in a community initiative).</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>What makes these initiatives possible in practice (space, volunteers, municipal support, local champions, etc.)?</i> 2. <i>What main barriers do they face (funding, bureaucracy, burnout, regulation, stigma, location)?</i> 3. <i>How do they affect household-level habits and attitudes towards waste?</i> <p>Groups write key points on flipchart:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Columns: Enablers / Barriers / Effects on household habits.
55-70 min	<p>Plenary harvest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each group presents one strong enabler and one strong barrier and their respective effects. • Facilitator clusters themes (e.g. small spaces, stable funding, municipal flexibility).

70-100 min	<p>Small-group discussion 2: Designing support and scaling Same groups or reshuffled.</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>If DARPA and municipalities wanted to support more of these initiatives, what are the most useful forms of support? (e.g. micro-grants, spaces, legal guidance, visibility, training)</i> 2. <i>What should they avoid doing (over-regulation, heavy reporting)?</i> 3. <i>Design one community-level intervention that you would start or strengthen in the next 12–18 months.</i> <p>Groups prepare a mini-pilot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name / idea in one sentence. • Target neighbourhood / group. • What changes (practices/attitudes). • Support needed and from whom.
100-120 min	<p>Quick pitch, plenary synthesis & next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each group has 2 minutes to pitch their mini-concept. • Participants vote on the ideas they find most promising or feasible. • Facilitator notes top-rated ideas as candidates for future calls or support schemes

