



## Review

# Drivers of food waste and their implications for sustainable policy development



Krista L. Thyberg\*, David J. Tonjes

Department of Technology and Society, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3760, USA

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 29 August 2015

Received in revised form 24 October 2015

Accepted 25 November 2015

Available online 11 December 2015

## Keywords:

Food waste

Waste management

Waste prevention

Sustainability

Behavior

Policy

## ABSTRACT

There has been growing interest in establishing food waste prevention and recovery programs throughout the world. The drive to target food waste stems from increasing concerns about resource conservation, food security, food waste's environmental and economic costs, and a general trend in the waste management industry to transition to more sustainable practices. Here the drivers of residential, institutional, and commercial food waste generation in developed countries, particularly in the U.S., are explored. The impacts of food system modernization on food waste generation are examined, including impacts related to food system industrialization, urbanization, globalization, and economic growth. Socio-demographic, cultural, political, and economic drivers of food waste are described with emphasis on how food waste perspectives may vary globally. Specific behaviors and attitudes which result from many of these waste drivers are then discussed. The examination of the range of food wastage drivers are used to provide insight into the best policy approaches to sustainably manage food waste. Food waste prevention policies are placed in context of the waste generating behaviors and attitudes that they address. A review of important background information on food waste is also provided, including definitions of key terms, food waste history, quantities of food waste generated, and the importance of food waste prevention for sustainability, as this information is all critical for effective policy development.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	111
2. Background: food waste definitions, history, and quantities generated .....	111
2.1. Food waste definitions .....	111
2.2. Food waste history .....	111
2.3. Food waste quantification .....	112
3. The importance of food waste prevention .....	112
3.1. Environmental impacts of food production, storage, and transportation .....	112
3.2. Economic losses .....	114
3.3. Food insecurity .....	114
3.4. Environmental impacts of food waste disposal .....	115
4. Drivers of residential, institutional and commercial food waste generation .....	115
4.1. Modernization of food systems .....	115
4.1.1. Industrialization .....	115
4.1.2. Economic growth .....	116
4.1.3. Urbanization .....	116
4.1.4. Globalization .....	116
4.2. Cultural factors .....	117
4.3. Socio-demographic factors .....	117

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [KLThyberg@gmail.com](mailto:KLThyberg@gmail.com) (K.L. Thyberg).

4.4.	Policies driving food waste generation .....	117
5.	Behaviors and attitudes leading to residential, institutional, and commercial food wastage .....	118
5.1.	Institutional and commercial behaviors .....	118
5.2.	Residential behaviors .....	118
6.	Discussion: policies for food waste prevention .....	118
6.1.	Policies to prevent food waste .....	119
6.2.	A multi-faceted policy approach .....	119
6.3.	Selecting the best policy approach .....	121
7.	Conclusion .....	121
	Acknowledgements .....	121
	References .....	121

## 1. Introduction

In the U.S., food waste makes up nearly 15 percent of the disposed municipal waste stream and Americans dispose over 0.6 pounds of food waste per person per day. The amount of food waste disposed has been increasing over time (Thyberg et al., 2015). Globally, it has been estimated that one-third of the edible parts of food produced for human consumption is lost or wasted (Gustavsson et al., 2011). Wasted food is a considerable component of the world's food system challenges. The global population is quickly growing, urbanizing, and becoming wealthier, leading to a diversification of dietary patterns and an increase in demand for land, resources, and greenhouse gas intensive foods, such as meat and dairy. It is estimated that continuing population and consumption growth worldwide will lead to an increase in the global demand for food for at least 40 more years, leading to intensified use of natural resources, especially land, water, and energy (Godfray et al., 2010). These difficulties are exacerbated by the world's changing environmental conditions which cause food production to be unpredictable and increasingly difficult globally (Garnett, 2014).

It is becoming clear that the many negative environmental effects of food systems must be minimized to ensure enough food is available to feed the world's growing population in a sustainable way (Tilman et al., 2001). Shifting toward more sustainable food systems is both essential and urgent, and actions are needed throughout food systems on moderating demand, producing more food, improving governance, and reducing waste (Godfray and Garnett, 2014). By wasting edible food, all of the resources spent growing, producing, processing, and transporting that food are also wasted, resulting in potentially needless environmental impact (Gustavsson et al., 2011). Reduced food waste and proper waste management can also save economic resources, contribute to food security, and minimize negative impacts of food waste on waste management systems.

Interest in food waste prevention and recovery has grown rapidly in the U.S. and abroad, as reflected in federal and state policies (Pearson et al., 2013; Platt et al., 2014). A recent survey indicated that awareness of food waste has begun to grow among U.S. consumers (Neff et al., 2015). However, currently very little food waste is recovered (USEPA, 2014) and prevention initiatives are limited. Prevention programs aim to reduce the amount of food waste generated and recovery programs typically aim to divert food waste from disposal (landfill or incineration) and treat it with biological treatment (composting or anaerobic digestion [AD]) to capture nutrients and/or energy. Food waste prevention has the highest economic, social, and environmental benefit relative to other waste management approaches. The environmental benefits related to prevention are largely explained by avoided food production (Schott and Canovas, 2015). Prevention also enables economic and social priorities to be achieved (e.g., money saved by not purchasing food that is disposed, reallocated excess food to charity).

Effective policies for food waste prevention should address the behaviors and motivations of food waste generation. Some past work has focused on identifying behavioral causes of food waste using surveys and interviews (e.g., Graham-Rowe et al., 2015; Jorissen et al., 2015; Neff et al., 2015; Parizeau et al., 2015). Here the drivers of these behaviors are first explored to provide a broad picture of food waste generation. The impacts of food system modernization on food waste generation are examined, particularly impacts related to food system industrialization, urbanization, globalization, and economic growth. Socio-demographic, cultural, political, and economic drivers of food wastage are reviewed with emphasis on how food waste perspectives may vary globally. Next, specific behaviors which result from many of these waste drivers are discussed. This knowledge of food wastage drivers and behaviors are then used to provide insight into the best policy approaches to sustainably manage food waste. Food waste prevention policies are placed in context of the waste generating behaviors and attitudes that they address. This research can be used to guide the development and implementation of multi-faceted food waste prevention programs which address the three aspects of sustainability (economic, environmental, and social factors).

## 2. Background: food waste definitions, history, and quantities generated

### 2.1. Food waste definitions

Definitions of food waste are not universally agreed upon (Lebersorger and Schneider, 2011), which makes studying and quantifying food waste difficult (Buzby and Hyman, 2012). Different categorizations are generated based on what materials are included, means of production, and management approaches (Gjerris and Gaiani, 2013). Multiple terms have been used interchangeably, such as food loss, food waste, biowaste, and kitchen waste (Schneider, 2013a). Also, often the same terms are used, but with different meanings (Gjerris and Gaiani, 2013). This is exacerbated when reports are translated (Schneider, 2013a). Table 1 provides an overview of previously used definitions; Table 2 provides a complete definition of both food loss and food waste as used in this paper. Here focus is placed on food waste rather than food loss because in the developed world, food waste is generated in higher quantities than food loss. Therefore, the greatest potential for reduction lies with the generators of food waste (retail and consumer sectors) rather than loss (production and processing sectors) (NRDC, 2012; Papargyropoulou et al., 2014; Parfitt et al., 2010).

### 2.2. Food waste history

A history of food waste issues in the U.S. is given in Table 3. Examining the history of food waste provides a foundation for

**Table 1**  
Food waste definitions.

Author	Year	Definition
Kling	1943	Food waste is the destruction or deterioration of food or the use of crops, livestock and livestock products in ways which return relatively little human food value.
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	1981	Food waste is all food products allocated for human consumption that are instead discarded, lost, degraded, or consumed by pests at any stage of the food chain.
FAO	2013	Food waste is food appropriate for human consumption that is discarded (generally at retail and consumption stages).
European Commission	2014	Food waste is food (including inedible parts) lost from the food supply chain, not including food diverted to material uses such as bio-based products, animal feed, or sent for redistribution.
United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	2014	Food waste is uneaten food and food preparation wastes from residences, commercial, and institutional establishments. So, food wastes from homes, grocery stores, restaurants, bars, factory lunchrooms, and company cafeterias are included. Pre-consumer food waste generated during food manufacturing and packaging are excluded.
United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (Buzby et al., 2014)	2014	Food waste is a subset of food loss and occurs when an edible item goes unconsumed. Only food that is still edible at the time of disposal is considered waste.
World Resources Institute (WRI)	2015	Food loss and waste refers to food, as well as associated inedible parts, removed from the food supply chain.

**Table 2**  
Food waste and loss definitions used in this study.

Term	Definition	Drivers	Sectors included	Examples
Food loss	Decrease in edible food mass throughout the part of the supply chain that specifically leads to edible food for human consumption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Infrastructure limitations</li> <li>- Climate and environmental factors</li> <li>- Quality, esthetic, or safety standards</li> </ul>	Production, post-harvest, and processing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Edible crops left in the field</li> <li>- Food that spoils due to poor transportation infrastructure from factory to supermarket</li> <li>- Food that is contaminated during food processing</li> </ul>
Food waste	Food which was originally produced for human consumption but then was discarded or was not consumed by humans. Includes food that spoiled prior to disposal and food that was still edible when thrown away	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decisions made by consumers and businesses</li> <li>- Quality, esthetic, or safety standards</li> </ul>	Retail and consumer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plate waste</li> <li>- Food that spoils due to poor storage in home or restaurant</li> <li>- Restaurant food prepared but discarded due to lack of demand</li> </ul>

understanding how perceptions of food waste have evolved over time and why certain food wasting behaviors occur today.

### 2.3. Food waste quantification

Quantification of the magnitude of food waste is essential for the development of effective, well-planned food waste management policies, and can be used to determine if future food waste recovery and prevention efforts considerably change the residual waste stream (Thyberg et al., 2015). Understanding the extent of food waste may provide an impetus for people to change their attitudes and potentially their behaviors toward food waste. However, definitional issues, the absence of sound quantification methods, and a general lack of imperative or political drive have led to considerable data gaps regarding food waste quantities (Parfitt et al., 2010). A range of diverse methodologies have been used to quantify food waste, all of which have some drawbacks. Some approaches, such as waste characterization sorts and materials flow modeling, attempt to quantify the amount of food waste disposed in municipal solid waste (MSW) (wastes from residential, institutional, and commercial sectors). Other methods (e.g., food diaries, qualitative surveys/interviews, and food supply and nutrition data analyses) focus on overall generated food waste amounts from specific sectors (e.g., households, restaurants) or aim to link disposal amounts with behavioral actions. Some studies focus only on formal wastes and exclude wastes that escape through pathways other than the traditional waste management systems (e.g., waste that goes down the drain, food that is composted at home, food fed to animals). An Australian study estimated that informal food waste disposal represented 20 percent of Australian food waste flows (Reynolds et al.,

2014), which suggests that informal disposal of food waste in the U.S. may be considerable.

Some recent efforts have been made to standardize or improve quantification methods (e.g., WRI, 2015; Thyberg et al., 2015), although estimates are still varied and differ in their definitions and methodologies (WRI, 2015). Table 4 presents some recent published countrywide and global estimates of food loss and waste and illustrates the diversity in scope, scale, and quantification methodologies.

## 3. The importance of food waste prevention

A sound understanding of the importance of studying food waste provides a foundation for developing sustainable policies to address it. In particular, teaching people about the implications of food waste can alter their perceptions and attitudes toward it, potentially yielding behavior changes that can reduce waste. Therefore, the four primary motivations for studying food waste which address environmental, economic, and social issues are reviewed here.

### 3.1. Environmental impacts of food production, storage, and transportation

There is growing recognition that there are substantial environmental burdens associated with the food supply system (production, packaging, distribution, and marketing). Producing food affects the environment to the detriment of humans, animals, plants, and ecosystems generally (Gjerris and Gaiani, 2013). There has been a decadal shift in demand from local and seasonal foods

**Table 3**  
U.S. food waste history timeline.

Period	Food waste activity
Pre-industrial(1750–1850)	- Food waste accounted for the majority of household solid waste -In the U.S., these wastes were often fed to animals, usually pigs, because pigs are effective at turning food and plant wastes back into food (Ackerman, 1997)
1895	- Atwater (1895) conducted a visual survey of residential New York waste bins and noted upper class areas showed a large portion of food purchased but thrown away; waste was less in more moderate neighborhoods
1902	- Atwater (1902) found student clubs wasted 10–14% of nutritive value of food; institutions wasted up to 25%
Early 1900s	- Organized waste collection became common in the U.S.
World War I (1917–1918)	- U.S. government encouraged pig feeding with food waste as a patriotic means to increase food production
World War II (1941–1945)	- Wartime food scarcities increased attention to food waste (Kling, 1943b) - Rationing helped control food panics and discouraged wasting food - U.S. government helped people cope with limited supplies of certain foods (USDA, 1943) and encouraged consumers and handlers of food to save every salvageable bit (Kling, 1943b) - Williamson and Williamson (1942) noted that considerable food loss and waste was taking place; a large portion of food was wasted by the consumer during food preparation and as plate waste - U.S. Food Distribution Administration (1943) estimated that overall U.S. food wastage was 20–30% of all food production - Kling (1943b) estimated that 24% of produced food was lost or wasted - In 1945, the FAO was established and listed food loss reductions as a priority
Post-World War II	- U.S. consumer culture evolved from one of thrift (widespread during wartime), to one of abundance and waste because it was no longer patriotic to conserve food and food became less expensive (Bloom, 2010)
1950s	- Because pigs fed garbage are particularly susceptible to diseases and food systems were becoming industrialized, regulations prohibited use of raw garbage as animal feed (Ackerman, 1997) - USDA began to formally study food waste, generating small, non-representative samples (Adelson et al., 1961, Adelson et al., 1963); they determined household food waste was 7–10% of total calories
1973–1974	- Extensive surveys of household food waste were conducted by the University of Arizona Garbage Project (Rathje and Murphy, 2001); they determined food was 9.7% of total household waste output (by weight) in 1973; in 1974, it was 8.9% (Harrison et al., 1975)
1974	- First World Food Conference (Rome) identified reduction of post-harvest food losses as an element of the solution to global hunger; post-harvest losses were estimated at 15% and a decision was made to reduce this by 50% by 1985 through the Special Action Programme for the Prevention of Food Losses (in 2010, Parfitt et al. noted no progress had been made toward this goal)
1977	- U.S. General Accounting Office issued a report to Congress titled 'Food Waste: An Opportunity to Improve Resource Use' urging the U.S. to examine food loss and waste
1980–1981	- Food waste was the focal point of Garbage Project research; participant surveys and food waste diaries were integrated into research; they found households wasted considerable amounts of food, but survey participants greatly underestimated the amount of waste (Rathje and Murphy, 2001)
1992	- Garbage Project researchers concluded food was a significant portion of household waste (10–15% of all food bought)
1997	- Kantor et al. (1997) published quantitative estimates of food waste across the U.S. food system and concluded 25% of food produced in the U.S. was wasted annually (96 billion pounds)
2010s	- Renewed interest in food waste; calls for waste reduction (Lundqvist et al., 2008) and better management (Lamb and Fountain, 2010) - Increased effort to quantify food waste disposal (see Table 4)

toward imported, non-seasonal fruits and vegetables, increasing transportation and energy use. More food processing also has led to increased energy and material inputs. The increased demand for resource intensive foods, such as meats, makes the environmental impact greater.

Food production and distribution requires large amounts of energy and other resources (Cuellar and Webber, 2010). Key environmental risk areas include water, soil, and air. Food production can contribute to water pollution and eutrophication, particularly due to the seepage of nutrients, such as manure and fertilizers, into the broader environment. Agriculture is the largest human use of water so it is a great consumer of a limited resource (Lundqvist et al., 2008). Agriculture may lead to sediment transport and deposition downstream, as well degradation of aquifers (Trautmann et al., 2015). Food supply chains can also have negative emissions to air, including greenhouse gas emissions from agricultural machines and food transport vehicles (Weber and Matthews, 2008). Direct effects of food supply systems on the land include soil erosion, nutrient depletion (Nellemann et al., 2009), on and off site pollution (Trautmann et al., 2015), deforestation, desertification, and biodiversity loss. A large percentage of the world's land area is in

agriculture; approximately 51 percent of U.S. land is used for growing food (USDA, 2015). Land use changes resulting from agriculture can result in biodiversity loss, natural ecosystem loss, and overall ecological degradation (Pretty et al., 2005).

By wasting edible food, all of the resources that went into growing, producing, processing, and transporting that food are also wasted, resulting in potentially needless environmental impact (Gustavsson et al., 2011). The production of this lost and wasted food globally has been estimated to account for 24 percent of total freshwater resources used in food production, 23 percent of global cropland, and 23 percent of global fertilizer use (Kummu et al., 2012). In the U.S., the production of wasted food requires the expenditure of over 25 percent of the total freshwater used in the U.S., about 300 million barrels of oil (Hall et al., 2009), and represents two percent of annual energy consumption (Cuellar and Webber, 2010). Venkat (2011) estimated that 112.92 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year were emitted from the production, processing, and disposal of avoidable food waste in the U.S.

The impact of food waste on the environment is particularly concerning because population growth and changing consumption

**Table 4**  
Recent estimates of food loss and waste.

Reference	Estimate <sup>a</sup>	Location	Method	Food loss <sup>b</sup>	Food waste <sup>b</sup>
Pekcan et al. (2006)	816.4 g/household/day	Turkey	FAO food supply data, household expenditures and survey		✓ <sup>c</sup>
Lundqvist et al. (2008)	Up to 50% of total production	Global	Food supply and loss data from Smil 2000	✓	✓
WRAP (2009)	8.3 million tonnes/year (22% of purchases)	U.K.	Food diary, composition analysis, and local data		✓ <sup>c</sup>
Hall et al. (2009)	40% of total food supply (1400 calories/person/day)	U.S.	FAO food supply data and human energy expenditure model	✓	✓
DEFRA (2010)	15% of edible food and drink purchases (16% of edible calories)	England	Food purchasing data and WRAP 2009 waste estimates		✓ <sup>c</sup>
Australian Government (2010)	4.06 million tonnes/year (2.67 million tonnes from households and 1.39 million tonnes from commercial/industrial sources)	Australia	State and local waste data	✓	✓
Buzby et al. (2011)	29% of available food supply	U.S.	USDA food supply data and loss factors		✓ <sup>d</sup>
Gustavsson et al. (2011)	33% of total food production	Global	FAO food supply data and loss factors developed by the authors	✓	✓
Koivupuro et al. (2012)	23 kg/person/year	Finland	Food diary		✓
Kummu et al. (2012)	25% of total food production (614 kcal/person/day)	Global	FAO food supply data and loss factors from Gustavsson et al. (2011)	✓	✓
WRAP (2013)	4.2 million tonnes/year	U.K.	Food diary, composition analysis, and local data		✓ <sup>c</sup>
Beretta et al. (2013)	48% of total calories	Switzerland	Mass and energy flow model	✓	✓
USEPA (2014)	34.69 million tons/year	U.S.	Materials flow model		✓ <sup>e</sup>
Oelofse and Nahman (2013)	9.04 million tonnes/year (177 kg/person/year)	South Africa	FAO food supply data and loss factors from Gustavsson et al. (2011)	✓	✓
Buzby et al. (2014)	31% of available food supply (133 billion pounds)	U.S.	USDA food supply data and loss factors		✓ <sup>d</sup>
FUSIONS (2015)	100 million tonnes/year	European Union	National waste statistics and selected research study findings	✓	✓
WasteMinz (2015)	148 kg/household/year	New Zealand	Waste audits		✓ <sup>e</sup>
Reynolds et al. (2015a)	7.3 million tonnes/year (4.1 million tonnes from municipal sources and households and 3.2 million tonnes from industry)	Australia	Estimation approach using data from government and industry reports	✓ <sup>f</sup>	✓ <sup>f</sup>
Thyberg et al. (2015)	0.615 pounds/person/day (35.5 million tons/year)	U.S.	Waste characterization studies		✓ <sup>g</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Estimates as reported in each study. Exact definitions of food loss and waste used may differ from the definitions used here. Some of these differences are noted.

<sup>b</sup> Food loss and waste are defined in Table 2.

<sup>c</sup> Only residential waste included.

<sup>d</sup> Only retail and consumer waste included.

<sup>e</sup> Only household food waste disposed with refuse collected curbside included.

<sup>f</sup> Only food waste disposed in formal solid waste routes included.

<sup>g</sup> Only food waste disposed in the MSW stream included.

patterns will continue worldwide, leading to higher global demand for food and amplified environmental pressures. Thus, it is critical that the impact of food systems on the environment be reduced, yet still produce enough food to feed the world (Tilman et al., 2001). One means of reducing the environmental impact of food systems on the environment is to minimize the amount of food that is produced but is discarded (Godfray et al., 2010).

### 3.2. Economic losses

The large economic impact of throwing food away affects all the individuals and organizations involved in the food supply chain. Understanding the economic costs of wastage may encourage behavioral changes to prevent waste, as saving money has been documented as a driving factor in food waste prevention behaviors (Graham-Rowe et al., 2014; Quested et al., 2013; WasteMinz, 2014). Table 5 provides recent estimates of the financial cost of wasted and lost food.

### 3.3. Food insecurity

Food security, the availability of and access to sufficient and healthy foods and good nutrition, is imperative for the

wellbeing of individuals and nations (Soussana, 2014). Although there appears to be sufficient food available to feed the world's population, nearly 11 percent of the global population is food insecure (FAO, 2015). In the U.S., nearly 15 percent of households were food insecure some time in 2012 (Coleman-Jensen et al., 2013). Due to this high prevalence of food insecurity, food wastage has an important ethical dimension (Gjerris and Gaiani, 2013). If food resources were managed better and wastes were minimized, resources could be used to help feed the hungry, such as by diverting excess food through charitable donations. A theoretical estimate by Reynolds et al. (2015b) found that if all avoidable food waste in Australia were rescued by charity, it could feed 921 thousand people for a year.

Furthermore, food loss and waste amplify the environmental impact of food production along the entire supply chain by requiring more production than is needed based on market demand. Therefore, reducing food waste, while maintaining current production levels, could help meet global food needs. Essentially, food waste avoidance in one region could lead to a higher availability of food elsewhere (Gentil et al., 2011). If less food were wasted, fewer resources would be required to produce food that is not consumed, and these agricultural lands and resources could be liberated for other uses, such as growing food for the world's hungry (Stuart, 2009).



**Table 5**  
Economic costs of food waste and loss.

Country	Year	Estimate <sup>a</sup>	Sectors included	Reference
New Zealand	2015	\$589 million/year	Avoidable household waste	WasteMinz (2015)
Australia	2015	\$5.8 billion/year	All sectors	Food Wise (2015)
Global	2013	\$750 billion/year	All sectors (seafood excluded)	FAO (2013)
U.K.	2012	\$18.3 billion/year, \$689/household/year	Household	WRAP (2013)
U.S.	2011	\$197.7 billion/year, \$643.3/person/year	Avoidable distribution, retail and consumer waste	Venkat (2011)
U.S.	2010	\$161.6 billion/year, 1249 calories/person/day	Avoidable retail and consumer food waste	Buzby et al. (2014)
Canada	2010	\$21.1 billion/year	All sectors	Gooch et al. (2010)
U.S.	2008	\$165.6 billion/year, \$390/person/year	Avoidable retail and consumer food waste	Buzby and Hyman (2012)

<sup>a</sup> Estimates given in currencies other than U.S. dollars were converted to U.S. dollars.

Reducing food waste will improve future food availability in the context of global population growth and increasing resource scarcity (Buzby et al., 2014; Godfray et al., 2010; Pearson et al., 2013). The United Nations estimate that the world population will reach 9.3 billion by 2050 (United Nations, 2013) and this growth will require an increase in food production by about 70 percent (FAO, 2009). To produce enough food to sustain this high population, pressure will be increased on agricultural land and other limited resources. It is necessary to develop ways to provide more food with fewer inputs so that the world's food system can deliver better nutritional outcomes at a smaller environmental cost (Garnett, 2014). Reducing food waste across the entire food chain will be a key part of any strategy to sustainably and equitably feed the world's growing population (Foresight, 2011).

#### 3.4. Environmental impacts of food waste disposal

Food waste may have negative environmental impacts at the end of its life depending on how it is managed. In landfills, food waste converts to methane, a greenhouse gas with a global warming potential 25 times greater than carbon dioxide on a 100-year time scale (IPCC, 2007). Although one quarter of U.S. landfills capture methane to create energy, fugitive emissions and landfills without collection systems cause landfills to be the third largest source of anthropogenic methane in the U.S. (USEPA, 2011). Food waste tends to degrade faster than other landfilled organic materials, has a high methane yield, and does not contribute to considerable biogenic sequestration in landfills (Levis and Barlaz, 2011); therefore, reducing the amount of food waste landfilled should be a priority. Treatment of food waste with waste-to-energy incineration (WTE) is not considered to be energetically favorable due to the high moisture content of food waste (which results in a lower heating value than other materials). Additionally, WTE is unable to capture valuable nutrients within food waste and various environmental pollution problems may arise from inefficient air pollution control measures. As a result, methods other than WTE for the handling of food waste are preferred (Pham et al., 2015).

Food waste can generate benefits (e.g., energy, compost) if managed through composting or anaerobic digestion (AD) or in landfills with efficient gas collection systems. Management of food waste through informal routes, such as donating it to charity or feeding it to pets, may also provide environmental benefit (Reynolds et al., 2014, 2015b). Reducing and diverting food waste from disposal may be a means to increase stagnant recycling rates and improve the overall environmental performance of waste management systems.

#### 4. Drivers of residential, institutional and commercial food waste generation

There are many drivers of food waste generation from residential, institutional, and commercial sectors, although detailed information on the exact causes is limited (Lebersorger and

Schneider, 2011). In the developed world, particularly the U.S., increases in the volume, availability, accessibility (Rozin, 2005), affordability, and caloric density of food have led to increased over-consumption and waste (Blair and Sobal, 2006). There tends to be little understanding regarding what food is, where it comes from, and what its production entails (Stuart, 2009). Culture and personal choice affect decisions regarding what is too good to throw away and these perceptions can change over time. Specific socio-demographic characteristics have also been associated with increased food wastage. Striking differences in attitudes toward food and food waste have been documented both within and across nations (Stuart, 2009). Therefore, food waste generation is a function of cultural, personal, political, geographic, and economic forces that influence behavior in specific ways (Pearson et al., 2013) and it may differ from person to person, year to year, or from society to society.

##### 4.1. Modernization of food systems

Modernization in food supply chains is associated with industrialization, economic growth, urbanization, and globalization. It is manifested through dietary transitions and affects the amount and type of food that is wasted (Table 6). Countries move through nutritional transitions and food supply changes at different rates, often directly related to cultural and economic factors (Hawkes, 2006; Drewnowski, 1999). Those cultures which place emphasis on food as a finite, valuable resource that is to be cherished are likely to modernize at slower rates and ultimately have differing wastage patterns (Stuart, 2009).

###### 4.1.1. Industrialization

Industrialization of food systems, which results in a transition of food production and preparation from the home to factory and from handcraft to purchasing (Strasser, 1999), affects the foods that people consume, the types and quantities of food waste, and contributes to increased physical distancing of people from food production and preparation. In areas with industrialized food systems with large amounts of food processing, people often purchase pre-made foods, or canned and frozen vegetables. As a result, pea pods and corn husks, for example, become industrial wastes, while packaging becomes more common in household waste. In industrialized food systems, consumers often purchase pre-cut meats, such as chicken legs, so there are no other components of the chicken to be disposed as waste at the consumer level; the other parts of the chicken are utilized or disposed by industry during the chicken processing.

Increased frequency of eating at restaurants and consumption of takeout food (commercially prepared but consumed at home) (Sobal, 1999) has been observed in the developed world. This is partly due to the dramatic rise of two-earner households, leading to little available time for food selection and preparation. As food preparation and consumption is increasingly accomplished in restaurants, some shifts in food waste from homes to the

**Table 6**  
Modernization's effects on food systems.

Factor	Description	Effects on food systems
Industrialization	Transition from food production and preparation at home to large-scale operations and factories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increases distancing of people from food production and preparation</li> <li>- Increases food preparation outside the home</li> <li>- May reduce food costs</li> <li>- Contributes to abundance and variety of food</li> </ul>
Economic growth	Increase in disposable income	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increases diet diversification, particularly a transition away from traditional foods</li> <li>- May cause reductions in disposable income spent on food</li> </ul>
Urbanization	Population shift from rural to urban areas which requires the extension of food supply systems to feed urban populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increases diet diversification</li> <li>- Increases distancing of people from food production</li> </ul>
Globalization	Shift from local to global food sources; transition of dietary patterns away from traditional ways toward global trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increases diet diversification away from local foods</li> <li>- Increases distancing of people from food production</li> </ul>

commercial sector may occur. It is estimated that almost half the U.S. food budget is spent eating away from home; USDA estimated that in 2012, \$672 billion was spent for food prepared in the home and \$630 billion was spent on food outside of the home. This is a dramatic change from the early twentieth century where almost all food expenditures were spent on food prepared within the home; in 1929, \$15.3 billion was spent on food in the home and \$3.5 billion was spent on food from outside (USDA, 2013). Adults tend to be less likely to waste food that they prepared themselves or that a loved one prepared. In cultures based on handwork, handmade things are valuable as they embody many hours of labor. People who have not created or prepared something themselves, or watched a loved one do so, value labor less than those who have, and therefore, are more likely to throw it away (Strasser, 1999). As food preparation and consumption is increasingly done in restaurants, factories, or supermarkets, there is likely to be shifts in the types and quantities of food waste generated by residences, industry, and commercial establishments.

#### 4.1.2. Economic growth

Higher incomes have generally been associated with the consumption of a more varied diet (Drewnowski, 1999; Pingali and Khwaja, 2004). Growth in household incomes is associated with a decline in starchy food staples and a diversification of diet toward more meats, dairy, fish, and poultry (Fischler, 1999; Parfitt et al., 2010), per Bennett's Law (food share of starchy staples decreases as income increases) (Bennett, 1941). This worldwide trend with increases in consumption of protein and energy rich foods, and convenience foods, and decreases in rice consumption, has been documented. Particularly, Asian diets are shifting toward more Western foods (Pingali and Khwaja, 2004). Western diets, with vulnerable, shorter shelf-life foods, are associated with greater food waste and a greater drain on environmental resources (Lundqvist et al., 2008). Rathje and Murphy (2001) point out that diet diversification may lead to more food waste, and the more repetitive the diet, the less food wasted. Thus, census tracts with mostly Mexican-American families had less food waste because the ingredients for Mexican food are consistent, making it easy to incorporate leftovers into new meals and staple ingredients are used in almost every meal. In restaurants, larger menus lead to more waste because there are additional ingredients to manage.

As incomes rise, people may be able to waste food because food expenditures are not considerable portions of their income. In wealthy countries, such as the U.S., food is relatively inexpensive compared to other expenses (e.g., housing) and people can afford to waste food (Pearson et al., 2013). The FAO suggest that the careless attitude of consumers who can afford to waste food is

a large contributor to household food wastage (Gustavsson et al., 2011). The proportion of U.S. household income spent on food has steadily declined as people have gotten wealthier, food prices have decreased, and the cost of other necessary items have increased. The USDA determined that in 1929, Americans spent 19.3 percent of their disposable personal income on food; the percentage steady declined and in 2012, it was 6.1 percent. In poorer countries, however, expenditures on food are still high. For example, in Pakistan 47.7 percent of disposable income was spent on food in 2012; in Cameroon, it was 45.9 percent (USDA, 2013).

#### 4.1.3. Urbanization

Urbanization requires extensions of food supply systems (Parfitt et al., 2010). It leads to diet diversification and a disconnection from food sources which ultimately may increase food waste. Urbanization has increased substantially in the U.S.; in 1790, five percent of Americans lived in urban areas, by 1890 it was 35 percent, and in 2010, it was 81 percent (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Urbanization is expected to continue increasing globally. Concentrated, population dense urban food systems are different from those of dispersed, low density rural systems (Solomons and Gross, 1995). There are far fewer farms and farmers in urbanized areas, so fewer people interact directly with agricultural processes or live near places where food is produced, hindering knowledge about food origins. This promotes disconnections from food (Parfitt et al., 2010), so that people have no sense of what their food is made of or how it was produced (Fischler, 1999). Since food sources are not local, there are more opportunities to market diverse foods, different from those grown locally. Lebersorger and Schneider (2011) found residual waste from urban Austrian households contained significantly more food waste than rural areas.

#### 4.1.4. Globalization

Food systems have changed due to the shift from local to regional to global foods in terms of quantity, type, cost, variety, and desirability (Hawkes, 2006). Globalization means the linkage and integration of previously local, national and regional phenomena into organizational arrangements at a global scale (Sobal, 1999). Food supply globalization was made possible by social and technological changes occurring after food supply industrialization (Robertson, 1990). New dietary patterns reflect global patterns and may differ significantly from traditional food practices, particularly because non-local foods are available for consumption and there is an overall increase in the range and quantities of available foods (Pingali and Khwaja, 2004). Globalization has been associated with the consumption of fewer locally produced plant foods and more imported and processed foods, particularly animal

products (Pingali and Khwaja, 2004; Sobal, 1999). Food now travels long distances (Pretty et al., 2005), and to more supermarkets in place of small, local markets, and so consumers purchase more non-local foods. Changes in diets spurred by globalization affect the type of food that is disposed; people also may be more likely to waste food as they do not have a deep connection and understanding of it.

#### 4.2. Cultural factors

Culture plays a fundamental role in shaping food, eating, and nutrition (Rozin, 2005; Sobal, 1998), as well as waste generation. The amount of food a society wastes is dependent on cultural habits and attitudes. People from different cultures regard different foods and food parts as edible, and throw different parts away (Strasser, 1999). Pollan (2007) points out that some cultures, particularly the U.S. and Australia, have weak food traditions of their own, meaning there are few longstanding rules and rituals about what to eat and when to eat it, and there are weak connections between the production and preparation of food and its consumption. Bloom (2010) has argued that the U.S. has an unhealthy relationship with food, and overall, the U.S. food culture places little value on food, leading to waste. Other societies have a strong appreciation for food, including production and preparation. Countries such as France have deep food cultures which are deeply embedded in culture and which have been developed over long periods of time (Gatley et al., 2014). French attitudes toward food tend to emphasize moderation and quality, rather than abundance and quantity as in the U.S. (Rozin, 2005). Countries with deep food cultures tend to be more resistant to change (or at least change slower) primarily due to strong values surrounding what foods can be grown during certain seasons and how foods are prepared. Many cuisines depend on the longevity of traditional recipes and cooking techniques (Conveney et al., 2012). Deep food cultures may be less affected by changes brought on by modernization of the food supply system.

Furthermore, there are cultural differences in daily food practices which may affect wastage. For instance, there may be cross-national differences in shopping patterns in terms of the amount of food purchased in a single trip, the number of days between shopping trips, and the amount of food stored in the household (Neff et al., 2015). Household shopping practices, particularly the size of the store where groceries are purchased and the frequency of shopping, have been shown to affect wastage (Jorissen et al., 2015). In developing countries, consumers generally buy smaller amounts of food each time they shop (compared to developed countries), often just enough for meals that day (Pearson et al., 2013), which may reduce waste. Extant educational campaigns may also cause differing waste patterns. Mena et al. (2011) found that Spanish retail food managers did not see food wastage as a major problem, but managers in the U.K. placed waste on a higher agenda. This is possibly due to recent campaigns in the U.K. emphasizing food waste as a problem.

#### 4.3. Socio-demographic factors

Surveys of attitudes and behaviors have shown some correlations between food wasting behaviors and certain socio-demographic characteristics (Pearson et al., 2013), although there is no clear consensus regarding which socio-demographic factors relate to more waste. Understanding demographic patterns can lead to a better understanding of how wastage patterns may change as demographics change (e.g., aging populations). Age has been shown to affect food waste generation, with young people wasting more than older people (Cox and Downing, 2007; Hamilton et al., 2005; Quested and Johnson, 2009; WasteMinz, 2014). In Australia, food waste fell sharply as age increased; among 18–24 year olds,

38 percent of respondents wasted more than \$30 (Australian) on fresh food over two weeks, compared to seven percent of people aged 70 and up (Hamilton et al., 2005). In the U.K., people over age 65 wasted considerably less food than the rest of the population (approximately 25 percent less when household size was controlled for). These older participants felt that wasting food was wrong, which may be based on the fact that many people of this age group experienced austerity and food rationing during World War II, establishing attitudes against wastefulness (Quested et al., 2013). It is unknown if current young people will waste less as their knowledge, attitudes, and lifestyle change as they age (Pearson et al., 2013).

Family composition and household size significantly affect food waste generation. Households with children waste more than households without children (Cox and Downing, 2007; Hamilton et al., 2005; Parizeau et al., 2015; WasteMinz, 2014). One common cause for food waste in Swedish households was that children often did not want to finish their food. Larger households waste less per capita than smaller households (Baker et al., 2009; Parizeau et al., 2015; WasteMinz, 2015; Williams et al., 2012), especially those where people live alone (WasteMinz, 2014). Koivupuro et al. (2012) found no significant difference in waste per capita based on household size, but people that lived alone generated the most waste per capita. In particular, women that lived alone generated the most food waste per capita. Jorissen et al. (2015) also found that single person households wasted the most per capita.

Food is wasted across all levels of income (Pearson et al., 2013). Lower food waste has been found in low-income compared to high-income households (Cox and Downing, 2007; WasteMinz, 2014) and food waste has also been shown to increase with household income (Baker et al., 2009). However, others found little or no correlation between income and food wastage (Koivupuro et al., 2012; Van Garde and Woodburn, 1987; Wenlock et al., 1980).

#### 4.4. Policies driving food waste generation

There are policies which contribute to food waste by mandating food disposal under certain conditions or by preventing its redistribution elsewhere. These policies aim to achieve some overall benefit (food safety or enhanced nutrition), but they may also lead to increased food wastage. Furthermore, litigation concerns may discourage the reuse or redistribution of edible food. As a result, there is tension between the need for food safety and nutrition and the desire to reduce food waste (Watson and Meah, 2012).

A policy which may lead to food wastage is the 2010 Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act which required USDA to update nutrition standards of the National School Lunch and Breakfast Program. The revised standard emphasized nutritional quality improvements for student meals. This policy has been criticized for leading to substantially more food waste because students dislike the new meals and are throwing away fruits and vegetables that they are required to take (Jalonick, 2014). At one elementary school after the implementation of the policy 45 percent of served food and beverages were discarded by students (Byker et al., 2014). However, Cohen et al. (2014) evaluated plate waste at several schools before and after the standards were implemented, and found substantial amounts of food waste both before and after. Shwartz et al. (2015) found that the standard reduced plate waste in middle schools; so, it is unclear whether the standard causes increased food wastage. In 2014 a bill was proposed to ease the requirements of the meal standards, particularly regarding the amount of whole grains required in meals (Jalonick, 2014).

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration sets federal calls for food safety, which are promulgated at the state and local levels as well. Food safety inspections or food labeling requirements mandate the disposal of food that is not allowed to be sold or consumed, such as



food that is improperly labeled or inadequately stored. The USDA and the European Union (EU) have recognized that food safety policies contribute to waste, but consider human health protection the primary concern. Still, both have vowed to reduce food waste. The USDA is working to streamline donation procedures for wholesome misbranded or non-standard food that is fit for human consumption to redistribution agencies, and has spearheaded several food waste reduction initiatives, such as through tax incentives for donors and liability protection. These efforts include the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act, U.S. Federal Food Donation Act of 2008, and Internal Revenue Code 170(e)(3).

## 5. Behaviors and attitudes leading to residential, institutional, and commercial food wastage

Food wastage is not the result of a single behavior, but combinations of multiple behaviors (Quested et al., 2013). Cultural, political, economic, geographic, and socio-demographic drivers described in Section 4 may cause the behaviors, but so can personal preference, values, and attitudes. There is no clear consensus on attitudes toward food waste, although food waste awareness has been shown to reduce waste (Parizeau et al., 2015). Some work has found a lack of concern and awareness regarding food waste (Buzby et al., 2011; Pearson et al., 2013) and a perception that food waste prevention is not a priority (Graham-Rowe et al., 2014). Neff et al. (2015), however, found widespread awareness of food waste among American consumers. Here specific residential, institutional, and commercial food wastage behaviors are described.

### 5.1. Institutional and commercial behaviors

At the retail and institutional levels, food is generally wasted due to choices regarding quantities of available food and visual qualities of food. Specific causes include (1) un-purchased specialty holiday food; (2) damaged packaging; (3) damaged or inadequately prepared items; (4) overstocking or over-preparation of food; (5) routine kitchen preparation waste; and (6) out-grading/quality control (Buzby and Hyman, 2012). Appearance quality standards cause retailers, particularly supermarkets, to out grade foods due to rigorous quality standards concerning weight, shape, and appearance (Gustavsson et al., 2011). Many grocers take pride in beautiful food displays with uniform, flawless food, which require the culling of even slightly imperfect items. Overstocking also is an issue because retailers would rather put more stock out than run out of items and restaurants prefer to have a wide array of available menu options (Stuart, 2009). Inaccurate forecasting of food needs also is a contributor to wastage (Mena et al., 2011). Although these factors may all contribute to food waste, the magnitude of wastage has been shown to vary across commodity types. Buzby et al. (2015) found that in U.S. supermarkets, the percentage of fresh produce delivered to U.S. supermarkets that was not sold for any reason ranged from 2.2 (sweet corn) to 62.9 (turnip greens) percent; the range for fruits was smaller, ranging from 4.1 (bananas) to 43.1 (papaya) percent. These differences may be attributed to packaging differences, susceptibility to damage, and the public's knowledge and familiarity with certain foods.

In food service, plate waste is a significant contributor to food waste (NRDC, 2012), and results from large portion sizes and undesired accompaniments. Portion sizes are increasing inside and outside the home in the developed world (Wansink and Payne, 2009; Wansink and van Ittersum, 2007; Wansink and Wansink, 2010). Portion sizes began to rise in the 1970s, and then increased sharply in the 1980s and continued to climb in the 1990s. Portion increases have been seen in supermarkets, where the number of items in larger sizes has increased tenfold between 1970 and 2000.

The average sizes of certain foods, such as bagels and muffins, have increased significantly over the past 20 years. These large portions encourage both waste and obesity (Young and Nestle, 2002). Kallbekken and Saelen (2013) found that reducing the physical size of plates in hotels reduced food waste by 19.5 percent.

### 5.2. Residential behaviors

Consumer behavioral choices cause food wastage at the household level through the interaction of aspects of food's journey into and through the home: planning, shopping, storage, preparation and consumption (Quested et al., 2013). Poor planning at the shopping stage leads to over-provisioning and impulse or bulk purchases (Koivupuro et al., 2012), which are significant contributors to food waste (Pearson et al., 2013). Food is commonly purchased without much thought as to how it will be used (Gustavsson et al., 2011) which can contribute to wastage.

In the home, wastes may be generated due to preparing too much food (Koivupuro et al., 2012) or preparing food inadequately. People may lack the skills to prepare food well, or to reuse leftovers. In the U.K., 40 percent of household food waste was due to the preparation and serving of more food than could be consumed (Quested and Johnson, 2009). Over-provisioning is both intentional and unintentional, as cooks may find it difficult to estimate how much to cook, but they also would rather prepare too much food than not enough (Pearson et al., 2013). Portion sizes in the home, as measured in the sizes of bowls, glasses, and dinner plates, and serving sizes as presented in cookbooks, have been increasing. The serving size of some entrees increased by as much as 42 percent in the 2006 *Joy of Cooking* cookbook from recipes in the first (1931) edition (Wansink and Payne, 2009).

Food spoilage due to improper or suboptimal storage, poor visibility in refrigerators, and partially used ingredients, leads to wastage (NRDC, 2012). A survey of U.K. households found 47 percent more fresh food was wasted compared to frozen foods because fresh food spoils faster (Martindale, 2014). Another U.K. study found that more than half of food waste occurs because food was not used in time (Quested and Johnson, 2009), possibly due to confusion over "use by", "sell by", "enjoy by", and "best by" date labeling (Quested and Johnson, 2009; Van Garde and Woodburn, 1987). In the U.S., there are no federal standards on the presentation and meaning of date labels on food. State rules vary in coverage and what the dates mean which leads to consumer confusion (Kosa et al., 2007), and often results in safe, edible food being thrown away. This confusion and general misconceptions about food safety and high sensitivities to food safety are contributors to food waste (Pearson et al., 2013).

## 6. Discussion: policies for food waste prevention

This paper demonstrated that food waste is a complex, interdisciplinary, and international issue which can have profound effects for global sustainability. Table 4 illustrates that large quantities of food is currently wasted, and food waste disposal has been shown to increase with time (Thyberg et al., 2015). Examination of the diverse range of food wastage drivers and behaviors provides insight into the best ways to achieve successful food waste prevention, which possibly can reverse the trend of increased food wastage. Currently in the U.S. there is no widespread or visible political or social momentum to prevent food waste (Buzby et al., 2014). Little research has directly addressed factors that motivate, enable or inhibit food waste prevention behaviors (Graham-Rowe et al., 2014). Here prevention policies are placed in the context of generation behaviors and attitudes; this context is valuable as we

**Table 7**  
Mechanisms to prevent food waste based on waste generating behaviors and attitudes.

Factor	Description	Mechanisms to prevent waste
Over preparation/large portion sizes/undesired food	Excess food that is prepared but that is not consumed (includes plate waste)	1. Public/employee education regarding proper food preparation, portion sizes, and on importance of ordering flexibility to ensure people like the food they are served 2. Food redistribution policies for edible retail and commercial food (e.g., to a food bank)
Inadequate food preparation/lack of food preparation skill	Food that is prepared incorrectly (such as by burning) or poorly (such as food that does not taste good) which results in wasting; food that is wasted due to an inability to reuse excess food or incorporate left-overs into a new meal	Public/employee education regarding proper food preparation and reuse
Defects in food or food packaging	Food that is disposed due to imperfect qualities of the food (such as bruising) or damaged food packaging (includes out-grading)	1. Logistic improvements (e.g., improved transportation that reduces food damage; improved food packaging) 2. Food redistribution/donation policies for edible retail and commercial food (e.g., to a food bank)
Over stocking	Excess food that is purchased but not consumed/sold (either at consumer or retail levels)	1. Public/employee education regarding food purchasing and planning 2. Logistic improvements (e.g., stock management improvement for retailers)
Spoilage/food not used in time/confusion over date labels/high sensitivity to food safety	Food that is allowed to spoil before it can be consumed/sold or food that is believed to be inadequate for consumption based on personal preferences, date labels, or conceptions about food safety	1. Public/employee education regarding food storage, food safety, and food planning 2. Improved, easily understandable food labeling systems 3. Logistic improvements (e.g., stock management improvement for retailers, improved product packaging)
Routine kitchen preparation wastes	Non-edible food components that are disposed of as part of routine kitchen preparation (e.g., apple cores)	These wastes are hard to reduce completely; therefore, they are best targeted with policy options for MSW systems, such as food waste diversion policies (to AD or composting)
Lack of awareness or concern about food waste	Lack of awareness or concern about wasting food	Education regarding the issue of food waste, quantities generated, and why it is an environmental, economic, and social concern

move forward with developing policies to sustainably manage food waste in the U.S. and abroad.

### 6.1. Policies to prevent food waste

Waste prevention requires changes in people's behavior, both collectively (e.g., companies) and individually (BioIntelligence Service, 2011; Wilson, 1996). Sections 4 and 5 demonstrate that there are an array of attitudes, preferences, values, and behaviors toward food which contribute to the propensity to waste food at residential, institutional, and commercial sectors; these factors may differ from person to person. National circumstances and cultural norms have also been linked to food wastage (BioIntelligence Service, 2011), so wastage patterns may differ from region to region and country to country. This indicates that effective approaches to food waste prevention may also differ (Buzby et al., 2011). Table 7 describes prevention mechanisms which were developed based on behavioral and attitudinal factors that drive wastage from residential, institutional, and commercial sectors in developed countries.

### 6.2. A multi-faceted policy approach

Policies for food waste prevention should target the circumstances and actions that lead to food wastage and should be informed by motivations for waste production. Graham-Rowe et al. (2015) found that at the household level, survey participants were more likely to intend to reduce fruit and vegetable food wastage if they felt favorable about waste reduction, that others would approve of these behaviors, and confident in their ability to reduce waste. So, policy approaches should be multi-faceted and address attitudes and logistical aspects of waste prevention. There are a range of policy options to support food waste prevention (UNEP, 2014) (Table 8). It is necessary to address multiple prevention mechanisms simultaneously because prevention is not created

by one, but by many behaviors (Cox et al., 2010). Furthermore, by using multiple policy approaches, different parts of the population will be targeted, thus providing greater opportunities to engage more people (Quested et al., 2013). This is necessary because different populations will respond differently to prevention initiatives. For instance, Rispo et al. (2015) found that economically and socially deprived communities, particularly those in high-rise, high-density housing, will require exceptional efforts and additional resources to drive behavior changes to prevent food waste.

It can be concluded that a package of prevention policies are necessary to prevent food waste; they should encompass three key aspects: Values, Skills, and Logistics. The first aspect, Values, involves addressing values and perceptions which drive behavior. These values are grounded in the motivations for food waste prevention described in Section 3. Values policy options should address identified concerns regarding food wastage, which include: (1) food waste is a waste of resources (money and edible food); (2) wasting food is wrong (WasteMinz, 2014) and yields feelings of guilt (Graham-Rowe et al., 2014); and (3) food waste negatively impacts the environment (Doron, 2013). An example of a Values policy is an educational campaign which teaches people about the importance of environmental and social altruism, and how preventing food waste can provide benefits (Wilson, 1996). Another is one which emphasizes the economic impact of food wastage (Table 5); the concept of saving money has been found to be a powerful motivator to food waste prevention (Graham-Rowe et al., 2014; Quested et al., 2013; WasteMinz, 2014). A means to support Value-driven behavior change is to provide the public with knowledge on food waste generation quantities. Miliute-Plepiene and Plepys (2015) found that improved awareness about food waste quantities spurred by the introduction of a food waste sorting program played an important role in food waste prevention in a Swedish municipality.

**Table 8**  
Potential food waste prevention policies.

Prevention policy	Description	Category
Education to promote the importance of food waste prevention in terms of environmental, social, and economic impacts	Education campaigns addressing the issue of food waste, quantities generated, and why it is important to prevent food waste. These programs can focus on moral issues of wasting food and the potential to save money by preventing food waste. The campaigns may be done through various media outlets, including mailings, face-to-face training, email, and social media.	Values
Education to promote behavior changes	Education campaigns focused on behavior changes can target a variety of audiences and focus on various aspects of food waste prevention. These aspects include proper food preparation, portion sizes, food reuse, ordering flexibility in restaurants, food purchasing, food storage, food safety, and meal planning. The campaigns may be done through various media outlets, including mailings, face-to-face training, email, and social media.	Skills
Encourage food redistribution/donation policies (for edible retail and commercial food)	Policies can encourage the redistribution of edible food for human consumption. Recovery policies may include tax incentives for donors, limited liability regulations for donors, programs to facilitate the connection between donors and the needy, or may facilitate logistics of collection and transport.	Logistics
Promote food redistribution to animal feed	Policies can facilitate diversion of wasted food from retail and consumer sectors to animal feed, such as foods that were refused due to packaging errors or blemishes. Programs may facilitate the connection between donors and the needy, provide tax incentives to donors, or may facilitate logistics of collection and transport. Furthermore, at the household level, education can encourage people to feed excess food to pets instead of disposing it.	Logistics
Incentivize food waste prevention	Policies can be enacted to incentivize prevention, such as rewarding companies that are able to significantly prevent food waste. Incentives can be financial, such as tax credits for those that prevent waste, or mandated higher costs for waste disposal (which should encourage reduction).	Logistics
Increase research and development	Policies to support research and development can contribute to innovations which may reduce food wastage. These include improved packaging that extends shelf life, improvements in food storage, or better tracking systems for stock management. Policies may include funding for research organizations or tax incentives.	Logistics
Improve food packaging	Policies can encourage reconfiguration of product packaging to prevent waste, such as packaging to extend shelf life or protect products. Policies may include financial incentives to businesses using preferred packaging.	Logistics
Improve food date labeling	Policies to eliminate ambiguous food labeling include well-defined, clear, scientifically-sound date labeling systems for food.	Logistics
Change waste collection system design	Policies to change the design of municipal waste collection systems can help prevent food waste. These include volume based systems for trash or reduced number of days that trash is collected.	Logistics
Change treatment of collected wastes	Policies can reduce food waste by stipulating how it is to be treated. An example is legislation to ban landfilling of organics. Fiscal incentives, such as taxes, fees, or subsidies, can also dictate treatment methods.	Logistics
Mandate targets for prevention	Policies to mandate reporting of food waste statistics and achievement of specific prevention goals can encourage prevention.	Logistics

The next policy component, Skills, enables people to change their behaviors, such as by providing training on how to prevent food waste. Stefan et al. (2013) found that providing consumers with practical tools to improve their food planning and shopping routines could reduce waste. Graham-Rowe et al. (2014) also determined that people should be trained in food management skills to empower them to reduce waste. Neff et al. (2015) found that concern for foodborne illness was the most common reason for discarding food by American consumers. Providing education training and skills to help people better understand food safety may be essential for waste prevention. At the retail level, Mena et al. (2011) found that a cause of food wastage was improper employee procedures for stocking, stock rotation, and other tasks. Better employee training could address this skill-deficit.

The final aspect of a policy package is Logistics which facilitates food waste prevention and minimizes inconvenience, both of which have been identified as key aspects of successful food waste prevention programs (Graham-Rowe et al., 2014). There are various logistical improvements which may prevent waste. At the retail level, a major cause of food wastage is poor forecasting regarding food needs. Improving forecasting practices and

using up-to-date data mining models are examples of logistical improvements which can reduce forecast error and ultimately wastage (Mena et al., 2011). Other logistical based policies include those which provide incentives to businesses to use preferred product packaging or those which support research and development focused on improved packaging. Williams et al. (2012) determined that 20–25 percent of household food waste was due to packaging factors. So, improved food packaging can significantly prevent food waste. Packaging may be used to increase product protection, facilitate temperature control, or prevent damage during distribution (Verghese et al., 2015). Logistical improvements at the institutional level, particularly schools, which have been identified include enabling the storage of intact food for later use, modification of policies which encourage waste (e.g., mandating students take certain foods), and changes to daily operations (e.g., increasing time students have to eat) (Blondin et al., 2015). A final policy option targeting logistics are those that facilitate the redistribution of excess food to the needy. Logistical barriers to donation may be substantial (Schneider, 2013b), but they may be overcome to some degree with strong coordination efforts.

### 6.3. Selecting the best policy approach

There are regulatory, social, and political obstacles to enacting food waste prevention policies. Thyberg and Tonjes (2015) outlined many of these challenges, including poor public participation, lack of efficient indicators to monitor performance, and uncertainty regarding policy outcomes. There is no one-size-fits-all solution to food waste; policy measures to address it should be custom tailored for each individual situation, integrate community needs, and involve a package of several measures addressing Values, Skills and Logistics. Holistic approaches which integrate education, financial aspects, and logistical improvements across food and waste systems are ideal.

It is unclear which combination of mechanisms to prevent food waste is most effective because evaluations of food waste prevention policies are scarce. Due to the inherent difficulty in studying and implementing waste prevention, there has been little quantitative work assessing its environmental impacts (Gentil et al., 2011). Moreover, it is difficult to demonstrate a consistent, direct link between specific policy mechanisms and measured waste prevention results (Cox et al., 2010). Further complicating food waste prevention is the fact that many food waste prevention initiatives are still in their early stages, so comprehensive data are not yet available (BioIntelligence Service, 2011). Rather than struggle with the lack of existing data and concrete conclusions regarding the best policy means to prevent food waste, it is suggested that new, well-planned intervention campaigns be initiated, but with mandates for proper monitoring and evaluation. These data can serve as critical resources for designing future waste prevention programs and improving existing programs (Thyberg and Tonjes, 2015). Prevention initiatives targeting food loss (losses at production, post-harvest, and processing stages of the food supply chain) should parallel food waste prevention campaigns to address the issue from multiple angles.

Food waste prevention policies can substantially reduce the amount of food waste disposed, making it an effective alternative to collection and treatment of wastes economically, socially, and environmentally. However, even with rigorous prevention programs, food waste from residential, institutional, and commercial sectors will never be eliminated because some food waste is unavoidable (e.g., peels) (Schott et al., 2013), and redistribution of edible food to feed humans may be unfeasible due to food perishability and high transport or distribution costs (Buzby et al., 2014). Food also may not meet safety or quality requirements under food safety regulations (Salhofer et al., 2008). Furthermore, prevention activities may not broadly appeal to consumers and they may be costly (Buzby et al., 2011). Estimates of the proportion of food waste that is avoidable differ considerably across studies; estimates for the proportion of avoidable food waste are: 34 percent avoidable in Sweden (Schott et al., 2013); 47 percent avoidable and 18 percent partially avoidable in Germany (Kranert et al., 2012); 60 percent avoidable in the U.K. (WRAP, 2013); and 54 percent avoidable and 12 percent partially avoidable in New Zealand (WasteMinz, 2015). More studies documenting the proportion of disposed food waste that is avoidable would be beneficial, especially in the U.S. where data are lacking. Nevertheless, once prevention policies are enacted, recovery programs to encourage the capture of energy and nutrients from food waste should be pursued.

## 7. Conclusion

Increasingly citizens, scientists, businesses, institutions, and policy makers are realizing that the current food system is unsustainable and changes are required if the world will be able to

support a population of over nine billion by 2050. Reducing food waste will become an increasingly important strategy to help feed this growing human population (Godfray et al., 2010). However, food waste prevention has not yet become mainstream in the U.S. or abroad. Wastage of food is a widespread phenomenon globally and it is likely that food waste generation will continue growing if not curbed by prevention policies. Waste prevention in general has frequently been ignored in waste management, as signaled by states that define waste goals in terms of recycling or diversion, rather than using indicators that capture prevention success. Understanding the implications of food waste and adjusting attitudes and behaviors toward food in order to prevent it should be an urgent priority. This paper deepened the understanding of food waste and highlighted that it is a complex issue involving numerous diverse actors across the globalized food chain. Policies to prevent food waste should address the range of behaviors and motivations for wastage. They should be multi-faceted so that they target people's values, provide them with skills to prevent waste, and facilitate logistical improvements to encourage prevention. Food wastage is an issue that demands attention, research, and action, particularly regarding ways to prevent food waste generation.

### Acknowledgements

Krista L. Thyberg was supported by the Town of Brookhaven under a Professional Services Agreement; David J. Tonjes received some support from the Town similarly. Although the Town of Brookhaven supported this research, it does not necessarily reflect the view of the Town and no official endorsement should be inferred.

### References

- Ackerman, F., 1997. *Why do We Recycle?* Island Press, Washington, DC, USA.
- Adelson, S.F., Asp, E., Noble, L., 1961. Household records of foods used and discarded. *J. Am. Diet. Assoc.* 39, 578.
- Adelson, S.F., Delaney, I., Miller, C., Noble, I.T., 1963. Discard of edible food in households. *J. Home Econ.* 55, 633.
- Atwater, W.O., 1895. *Methods and Results of Investigation on the Chemistry and Economy of Food.* USDA, Washington, DC, USA.
- Atwater, W.O., 1902. *Principles of nutrition and nutritive value of food.* USDA Farm. Bull. 142, 46.
- Australian Government, 2010. *National Waste Report 2010.* Australian Government Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, Canberra, Australia.
- Baker, D., Fear, J., Denniss, R., 2009. *What a Waste: An Analysis of Household Expenditure on Food.* The Australia Institute, Canberra, Australia.
- Bennett, M.K., 1941. *Wheat Studies of the Food Research Institute.* Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA.
- Beretta, C., Stoessel, F., Baier, U., Hellweg, S., 2013. Quantifying food losses and the potential for reduction in Switzerland. *Waste Manag.* 33 (3), 764–773.
- BioIntelligence Service, 2011. *European Commission DG ENV Guidelines on the Preparation of Food Waste Prevention Programmes.* European Union, Paris, France.
- Blair, D., Sobal, J., 2006. *Luxus consumption: wasting food resources through overeating.* *Agric. Hum. Values* 23, 63–74.
- Blondin, S.A., Djang, H.C., Metayer, N., Anzaman-Frasca, S., Economos, C.D., 2015. 'It's just so much waste.' A qualitative investigation of food waste in a universal free School Breakfast Program. *Public Health Nutr.* 18 (9), 1565–1577.
- Bloom, J., 2010. *American Wasteland.* Da Capo Press, Cambridge, MA, USA.
- Buzby, J.C., Hyman, J., Stewart, H., Wells, H.F., 2011. The value of retail- and consumer-level fruit and vegetable losses in the United States. *J. Consum. Affairs* 45 (3), 492–515.
- Buzby, J.C., Hyman, J., 2012. Total and per capita value of food loss in the United States. *Food Policy* 37 (5), 561–570.
- Buzby, J.C., Wells, H.F., Hyman, J., 2014. *The Estimated Amount, Value and Calories of Postharvest Food Losses at the Retail and Consumer Levels in the United States.* USDA Economic Research Service, Washington, DC, USA.
- Buzby, J.C., Bentley, J.T., Padera, B., Ammon, C., Campuzano, J., 2015. *Estimated fresh produce shrink and food loss in U.S. supermarkets.* *Agriculture* 5 (3), 626–648.
- Byker, C.J., Farris, A.R., Marcenelle, M., Davis, G.C., Serrano, E.L., 2014. Food waste in a school nutrition program after implementation of new lunch program guidelines. *J. Nutr. Educ. Behav.* 46 (5), 406–411.
- Cohen, J.F.W., Richardson, S., Parker, E., Catalano, P.J., Rimm, E.B., 2014. Impact of the new US Department of agriculture school meal standards on food selection, consumption, and waste. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 46 (4), 388–394.



- Coleman-Jensen, A., Nord, M., Singh, A., 2013. Household Food Security in the United States in 2012. In: USDA Economic Research Report (ERR 155), Retrieved from: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err155.aspx> (accessed 29.08.15).
- Conveney, J., Begley, A., Gallegos, D., 2012. 'Savoir Faire': are cooking skills a new mortality? *Austr. J. Adult Learn.* 52 (3), 617–642.
- Cox, J., Downing, P., 2007. Food Behaviour Consumer Research: Quantitative Phase. WRAP, Banbury, UK.
- Cox, J., Giorgi, S., Sharp, V., Strange, K., Wilson, D.C., Blakey, N., 2010. Household waste prevention – a review of evidence. *Waste Manag. Res.* 28 (3), 193–219.
- Cuellar, A.D., Webber, M.E., 2010. Wasted food, wasted energy: the embedded energy in food waste in the United States. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 44 (16), 6464–6469.
- DEFRA (Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs), 2010. Household Food and Drink Wastes Linked to Food and Drink Purchases, Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/household-food-and-drink-waste-and-purchases> (accessed 29.08.15).
- Doron, N., 2013. Waste Not, Want Not: How Fairness Concerns can Shift Attitudes to Food Waste. Fabian Society, London, UK.
- Drewnowski, A., 1999. Chapter 10: fat and sugar in the global diet. In: Grew, R. (Ed.), *Food in Global History*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, USA.
- European Commission, 2014. Food Waste, Retrieved from: [http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food\\_waste/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food_waste/index_en.htm) (accessed 29.08.15).
- FAO, 1981. Food Loss Prevention in Perishable Crops. Agricultural Service Bulletin 43, Rome, Italy.
- FAO, 2009. Feeding the World, Eradicating Hunger. World Summit on Food Security, Rome, Italy.
- FAO, 2013. Food Wastage Footprint: Impacts on Natural Resources. FAO, Rome, Italy.
- FAO, 2015. State of Food Insecurity in the World 2015. FAO, Rome, Italy.
- Fischler, C., 1999. Chapter 11: the 'mad cow' crisis: a global perspective. In: Grew, R. (Ed.), *Food in Global History*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, USA.
- Food Wise, 2015. Facts on Food Waste, Retrieved from: <http://www.foodwise.com.au/foodwaste/food-waste-fast-facts/> (accessed 23.10.15).
- Foresight, 2011. The Future of Food and Farming: Final Project Report. The Government Office for Science, London, UK.
- FUSIONS, 2015. FUSIONS Food Waste Data Set for EU-28, Retrieved from: <http://www.eu-fusions.org/index.php/publications/261-establishing-reliable-data-on-food-waste-and-harmonising-quantification-methods> (accessed 23.10.15).
- Garnett, T., 2014. Three perspectives on sustainable food security: efficiency, demand restraint, food system transformation. What role for life cycle assessment? *J. Clean. Prod.* 73 (15), 10–18.
- Gatley, A., Caraher, M., Lang, T., 2014. A qualitative, cross cultural examination of attitudes and behaviour in relation to cooking habits in France and Britain. *Appetite* 75 (1), 71–81.
- Gentil, E.C., Gallo, D., Christensen, T.H., 2011. Environmental evaluation of municipal waste prevention. *Waste Manag.* 31 (12), 2371–2379.
- Gjerris, M., Gaiani, S., 2013. Household food waste in Nordic countries: estimations and ethical implications. *Nordic J. Appl. Ethics* 7 (1), 6–23.
- Godfray, H.C.J., Beddington, J.R., Crute, I.R., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J.F., Pretty, J., Robinson, S., Thomas, S.M., Toulmin, C., 2010. Food security: the challenge of feeding 9 billion people. *Science* 327 (5967), 812–818.
- Godfray, H.C.J., Garnett, T., 2014. Food security and sustainable intensification. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* 369 (1639).
- Gooch, M., Felfe, A., Marenick, N., 2010. Food Waste in Canada. Value Chain Management Centre, Oakville, ON, Canada.
- Graham-Rowe, E., Jessop, D.C., Sparks, P., 2014. Identifying motivations and barriers to minimising household food waste. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 84, 15–23.
- Graham-Rowe, E., Jessop, D.C., Sparks, P., 2015. Predicting household food waste reduction using an extended theory of planned behavior. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 101 (2015), 194–202.
- Gustavsson, J., Cederberg, C., Sonesson, U., Otterdijk, R., Meybeck, A., 2011. *Global Food Losses and Food Waste*. Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, Italy.
- Hall, K.D., Guo, J., Dore, M., Chow, C.C., 2009. The progressive increase of food waste in America and its environmental impact. *PLoS ONE* 4 (11).
- Hamilton, C., Denniss, R., Baker, D., 2005. Wasteful Consumption in Australia. The Australia Institute, Canberra, Australia.
- Harrison, G.G., Rathje, W., Hughes, W., 1975. Food waste behavior in an urban population. *J. Nutr. Educ.* 7 (1), 13–16.
- Hawkes, C., 2006. Uneven dietary development: linking the policies and processes of globalization with the nutrition transition, obesity, and diet-related chronic diseases. *Global. Health* 2 (1), 4.
- IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), 2007. *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*. In: Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- Jalonick, M.C., 2014. GOP Supports Break from Healthy School Meal Standards. Huffington Post, Retrieved from: [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/12/08/gop-healthy-school-lunch-waiver\\_n.6290516.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/12/08/gop-healthy-school-lunch-waiver_n.6290516.html) (accessed 28.08.15).
- Jorissen, J.C., Priefer, C., Brautigam, K., 2015. Food waste generation at household level: results of a survey among employees of two European Research Centers in Italy and Germany. *Sustainability* 7 (3), 2695–2715.
- Kallbekken, S., Saalen, H., 2013. 'Nudging' hotel guests to reduce food waste as a win-win environmental measure. *Econ. Lett.* 119 (3), 325–327.
- Kantor, L.S., Lipton, K., Manchester, A., Oliveira, V., 1997. Estimating and addressing America's food losses. *Food Rev.* 20, 2–12.
- Kling, W., 1943a. A nutritional guide to wartime use of agricultural resources. *J. Farm Econ.* 25, 683–691.
- Kling, W., 1943b. Food waste in distribution and use. *J. Farm Econ.* 25, 848–859.
- Koivupuro, H.K., Hartikainen, H., Silvennoinen, K., Katajajuuri, J.M., Heikintalo, N., Reinikainen, A., Jalakanen, L., 2012. Influence of socio-demographical, behavioural and attitudinal factors on the amount of avoidable food waste generated in Finnish households. *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* 36 (2), 183–191.
- Kosa, K.M., Cates, S.C., Karns, S., Godwin, S.L., Chambers, D., 2007. Consumer knowledge and use of open dates: results of a web-based survey. *J. Food Prot.* 70 (5), 1213–1219.
- Kranert, M., Hafner, G., Barabosz, J., Schneider, F., Lebersorger, S., Scherhauser, S., Schuller, H., Leverenz, D., 2012. Determination of Discarded Food and Proposals for a Minimization of Food Wastage in Germany. University Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany.
- Kummu, M., de Moel, H., Porkka, M., Siebert, S., Varis, O., Ward, P.J., 2012. Lost food, wasted resources: global food supply chain losses and their impacts on freshwater, cropland, and fertiliser use. *Sci. Total Environ.* 438, 477–489.
- Lamb, G., Fountain, L., 2010. An Investigation into Food Waste Management, Retrieved from: [http://www.actiondechets.fr/upload/medias/group\\_b.report\\_compressed.pdf](http://www.actiondechets.fr/upload/medias/group_b.report_compressed.pdf) (accessed 28.07.15).
- Lebersorger, S., Schneider, F., 2011. Discussion on the methodology for determining food waste in household waste composition studies. *Waste Manag.* 31 (9/10), 1924–1933.
- Levis, J.W., Barlaz, M.A., 2011. Is biodegradability a desirable attribute for discarded solid waste? Perspectives from a national landfill greenhouse gas inventory model. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 45 (13), 5470–5476.
- Lundqvist, J., de Fraiture, C., Molden, D., 2008. Saving Water: From Field to Fork—curbing Losses and Wastage in the Food Chain. SIWI Policy Brief, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Martindale, W., 2014. Using consumer surveys to determine food sustainability. *Br. Food J.* 116 (7), 1194–1204.
- Mena, C., Adenso-Diaz, B., Yurt, O., 2011. The causes of food waste in the supplier–retailer interface: evidence from the UK and Spain. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 55 (6), 648–658.
- Miliute-Plepiene, J., Plepys, A., 2015. Does food sorting prevents and improves sorting of household waste? A case in Sweden. *J. Clean. Prod.* 101 (2015), 182–192.
- Neff, R.A., Spiker, M.L., Truant, P.L., 2015. Wasted food: U.S. consumers reported awareness, attitudes and behaviors. *PLoS ONE* 10 (6).
- Nellemann, C., MacDevette, M., Manders, T., Eickhout, B., Svihus, B., Prins, A.G., Kaltenborn, B.P., 2009. *The Environmental Food Crisis – The Environment's Role in Averting Future Food Crises*. UNEP, Norway.
- NRDC (Natural Resources Defense Council), 2012. Wasted: How American is Losing up to 40 Percent of its Food from Farm to Fork to Landfill. NRDC Issue Paper August 2012, IP 12-06-B, Washington, DC, USA.
- Oelofse, S.H.H., Nahman, A., 2013. Estimating the magnitude of food waste generated in South Africa. *Waste Manag. Res.* 31 (1), 80–86.
- Papargyropoulou, E., Lozano, R., Steinberger, J.K., Wright, N., bin Ujang, Z., 2014. The food waste hierarchy as a framework for the management of food surplus and food waste. *J. Clean. Prod.* 76 (1), 106–115.
- Parfitt, J., Barthel, M., Macnaughton, S., 2010. Food waste within food supply chains: quantification and potential for change to 2050. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* 365 (1554), 3065–3081.
- Parizeau, K., von Massow, M., Martin, R., 2015. Household-level dynamics of food waste production and related beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours in Guelph, Ontario. *Waste Manag.* 35 (2015), 207–217.
- Pearson, D., Minehan, M., Wakefield-Rann, R., 2013. Food waste in Australian households: why does it occur? *Austr. Pacif. J. Reg. Food Stud.* 3, 118–132.
- Pekcan, G., Koksall, H., Kuckerdonmez, O., Ozel, H., 2006. *Household Food Wastage in Turkey*. FAO, Rome, Italy.
- Pham, T.P.T., Kaushik, R., Parshetti, G.K., Mahmood, R., Balasubramanian, R., 2015. Food waste-to-energy conversion technologies: current status and future directions. *Waste Manag.* 38 (2015), 399–408.
- Pingali, P., Khwaja, Y., 2004. Globalisation of Indian Diets and the Transformation of the Food Supply Systems. In: ESA Working Paper No. 04-05, Retrieved from: <http://www.eldis.org/vfile/upload/1/document/0708/doc15357.pdf> (accessed 28.08.15).
- Platt, B., Goldstein, N., Coker, C., Brown, S., 2014. *State of Composting in the U.S. Institute for Local Self Reliance*, Washington, DC, USA.
- Pollan, M., 2007. *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*. Penguin, London, England.
- Pretty, J.N., Ball, A.S., Lang, T., Morison, J.I.L., 2005. Farm costs and food miles: an assessment of the full cost of the UK weekly food basket. *Food Policy* 30 (1), 1–19.
- Quested, T., Johnson, H., 2009. *Household Food and Drink Waste in the UK*. WRAP, Banbury, UK.
- Quested, T.E., Marsh, E., Stunell, D., Parry, A.D., 2013. Spaghetti soup: the complex world of food waste behaviours. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 79, 43–51.
- Rathje, W., Murphy, C., 2001. *Rubbish!: The Archaeology of Garbage*. University of Arizona Press, Phoenix, AZ, USA.
- Reynolds, C.J., Mavrakis, V., Davison, S., Høj, S.B., Vlaholias, E., Sharp, A., Thompson, K., Ward, P., Coveney, J., Piantadosi, J., Boland, J., Dawson, D., 2014. Estimating informal household food waste in developed countries: the case of Australia. *Waste Manag. Res.* 32 (12), 1254–1258.
- Reynolds, C.J., Geschke, A., Piantadosi, J., Boland, J., 2015a. Estimating industry and municipal solid waste data at high resolution using economic accounts: an

- input–output approach with Australian case study. *J. Mater. Cycles Waste Manag.*, 1–10.
- Reynolds, C.J., Piantadosi, J., Boland, J., 2015b. Rescuing food from the organics waste stream to feed the food insecure: an economic and environmental assessment of Australian food rescue operations using environmentally extended waste input–output analysis. *Sustainability* 7 (4), 4707–4726.
- Rispo, A., Williams, I.D., Shaw, P.J., 2015. Source segregation and food waste prevention activities in high-density households in a deprived urban area. *Waste Manag.* 44, 15–27.
- Robertson, R., 1990. Mapping the global condition: globalization as a central concept. *Theory Culture Soc.* 7 (2/3), 15–30.
- Rozin, P., 2005. The meaning of food in our lives: a cross-cultural perspective on eating and well-being. *J. Nutr. Educ. Behav.* 37 (2), S107–S112.
- Salhofer, S., Obersteiner, G., Schneider, F., Lebersorger, S., 2008. Potentials for the prevention of municipal solid waste. *Waste Manag.* 28 (2), 245–259.
- Schneider, F., 2013a. Review of food waste prevention on an international level. *Waste Resour. Manag.* 166 (4), 187–203.
- Schneider, F., 2013b. The evolution of food donation with respect to waste prevention. *Waste Manag.* 33 (3), 755–763.
- Schott, A.B.S., Vukicevic, S., Bohn, I., Andersson, T., 2013. Potentials for food waste minimization and effects on potential biogas production through anaerobic digestion. *Waste Manag. Res.* 31 (8), 811–819.
- Schott, A.B.S., Canovas, A., 2015. Current practice, challenges and potential methodological improvements in environmental evaluations of food waste prevention – a discussion paper. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 101, 132–142.
- Shwartz, M.B., Henderson, K.E., Read, M., Danna, N., Ickovics, J.R., 2015. New school meal regulations increase fruit consumption and do not increase total plate waste. *Child. Obes.*
- Sobal, J., 1998. Cultural comparison research designs in food, eating, and nutrition. *Food Qual. Preference* 9 (6), 385–392.
- Sobal, J., 1999. Chapter 9: food system globalization, eating transformations, and nutrition transitions. In: Grew, R (Ed.), *Food in Global History*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, USA.
- Solomons, N.W., Gross, R., 1995. Urban nutrition in developing countries. *Nutr. Rev.* 53 (4), 90–95.
- Soussana, J.F., 2014. Research priorities for sustainable agri-food systems and life cycle assessment. *J. Clean. Prod.* 73, 19–23.
- Stefan, V., van Herpen, E., Tudoran, A.A., Lahteenmaki, L., 2013. Avoiding food waste by Romanian consumers: the importance of planning and shopping routines. *Food Qual. Preference* 28 (1), 375–381.
- Strasser, S., 1999. *Waste and Want: A Social History of Trash*. Metropolitan Books, New York, NY, USA.
- Stuart, T., 2009. *Waste: Uncovering the Global Food Scandal*. W.W. Norton & Company, New York, NY, USA.
- Thyberg, K.L., Tonjes, D.J., 2015. A management framework for municipal solid waste systems and its application to food waste prevention. *Systems* 3 (3), 133–151.
- Thyberg, K.L., Tonjes, D.J., Gurevitch, J., 2015. Quantification of food waste disposal in the United States: a meta-analysis. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*
- Tilman, D., Fargione, J., Wolff, B., D'Antonio, C., Dobson, A., Howarth, R., Schindler, D., Schlesinger, W.H., Simberloff, D., Swackhamer, D., 2001. Forecasting agriculturally driven global environmental change. *Science* 292 (5515), 281–284.
- Trautmann, N.M., Porter, K.S., Wagenet, R.J., 2015. *Modern Agriculture: Its Effects on the Environment*. Cornell Cooperative Extension, Pesticide Safety Education Program, Ithaca, NY, USA.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2012. Growth in Urban Population Outpaces Rest of Nation. In: *Census Bureau Reports*, Retrieved from: <http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/2010.census/cb12-50.html> (accessed 28.08.15).
- UNEP (United Nations Environmental Programme), 2014. *Prevention and reduction of food and drink waste in businesses and households – Guidance for governments, local authorities, businesses and other organizations*, Version 1.0.
- United Nations, 2013. *World Population Prospects: The 2012 Revision*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, New York, NY, USA.
- USDA (United States Department of Agriculture), 1943. *National Wartime Nutrition Guide*. USDA, Washington, DC, USA.
- USDA, 2013. ERS Food Expenditure Series – Tables 1 (Food Expenditures by families and individuals as a share of disposable personal money income) and 8 (Food and Alcoholic beverages: Total expenditures). USDA Economic Research Service <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-expenditures.aspx>.
- USDA, 2015. Land Use, Value and Tenure, Retrieved from: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/farm-economy/land-use,-land-value-tenure.aspx> (accessed 28.08.15).
- USEPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency), 2011. *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990–2009*. USEPA, Washington, DC, USA.
- USEPA, 2014. *MSW in the United States: 2012 Facts and Figures*. USEPA, Washington, DC, USA.
- U.S. Food Distribution Administration, 1943. *Facts on Food Waste*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Library, Washington, DC.
- Van Garde, S.J., Woodburn, M.J., 1987. Food discard practices of householders. *J. Am. Diet. Assoc.* 87 (3), 322–329.
- Venkat, K., 2011. The climate change and economic impacts of food waste in the United States. *Int. J. Food Syst. Dyn.* 2 (4), 431–446.
- Verghese, Lewis, K.H., Lockrey, S., Williams, H., 2015. Packaging's role in minimizing food loss and waste across the supply chain. *Packag. Technol. Sci.* 28, 603–620.
- Wansink, B., Payne, C.R., 2009. The joy of cooking too much: 70 years of calorie increases in classic recipes. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 150 (4), 291.
- Wansink, B., van Ittersum, K., 2007. Portion size me: downsizing our consumption norms. *J. Am. Diet. Assoc.* 107 (7), 1103–1106.
- Wansink, B., Wansink, C.S., 2010. The largest last supper: depictions of food portions and plate size increased over the millennium. *Int. J. Obes.* 34 (5), 943–944.
- WasteMinz, 2015. *New Zealand Food Waste Audits*. WasteMinz, Auckland, New Zealand, Available from: <http://www.wasteminz.org.nz/sector-groups/behaviour-change/national-food-waste-prevention-project/> (accessed 23.10.15).
- WasteMinz, 2014. *National Food Waste Prevention Study*. WasteMinz, Auckland, New Zealand, Available from: <http://www.wasteminz.org.nz/sector-groups/behaviour-change/national-food-waste-prevention-project/> (accessed 23.10.15).
- Watson, M., Meah, A., 2012. Food, waste and safety: negotiating conflicting social anxieties into the practices of domestic provisioning. *Sociol. Rev.* 60 (S2), 102–120.
- Weber, C.L., Matthews, H.S., 2008. Food-miles and the relative climate impacts of food choices in the United States. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 42 (10), 3508–3513.
- Wenlock, R., Buss, D., Derry, B., Dixon, E., 1980. Household food wastage in Britain. *Br. J. Nutr.* 43 (1), 53–70.
- Williams, H., Wikstrom, F., Otterbring, T., Lofgren, M., Gustavsson, A., 2012. Reasons for household food waste with special attention to packaging. *J. Clean. Prod.* 24, 141–148.
- Williamson, L., Williamson, P., 1942. What we eat. *Agric. Appl. Econ. Assoc.* 24, 698–703.
- Wilson, D.C., 1996. Stick or carrot? The use of policy measures to move waste management up the hierarchy. *Waste Manag. Res.* 14 (14), 385–398.
- WRAP (Waste and Resources Action Programme), 2009. *Household food and drink waste in the UK – 2007 estimates*. WRAP, Banbury, UK.
- WRAP, 2013. *Household Food and Drink Waste in the United Kingdom 2012*. WRAP, Banbury, UK.
- WRI, 2015. *FLW Protocol Accounting and Reporting Standard (FLW Standard) Draft (March 20, 2015)*, Retrieved from: <http://www.wri.org/our-work/project/food-loss-waste-protocol/publications> (accessed 23.10.15).
- Young, L., Nestle, M., 2002. The contribution of expanding portion sizes to the US obesity epidemic. *Am. J. Public Health* 92 (2), 246–249.