



---

# Hospitality Food Surplus Redistribution Guidelines

Version: 1.0

Date: September 2015

---

**Reducing food waste through social innovation**

FUSIONS EU project is supported by the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme under Grant Agreement no. 311972.



---

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Planning process</b>	<b>5</b>
	2.1 Understanding the landscape	5
	2.2 Prepare your adapted framework	5
	2.3 Pilot phase	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Actors</b>	<b>7</b>
	3.1 Donors	7
	3.2 Recipients	11
	3.3 Coordinators	12
<b>4</b>	<b>Type of products to be redistributed</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Operation models</b>	<b>15</b>
	5.1 Occasional	15
	5.2 Regular	16
<b>6</b>	<b>Distribution models</b>	<b>18</b>
	6.1 Delivery chain	18
	6.2 Temperature chain	19
<b>7</b>	<b>Partnerships</b>	<b>21</b>
	7.1 Identification of actors	21
	7.2 Preparation	22
	7.3 Partner matching and launching	23
	7.4 Relationship management	23
<b>8</b>	<b>Logistics process</b>	<b>24</b>
	8.1 Separating	24
	8.2 Packaging/labelling	24
	8.3 Shipping	24
	8.4 Storing	24
	8.5 Delivery	25
	8.6 Logistics of material and devices	25
<b>9</b>	<b>Information management</b>	<b>26</b>
	9.1 Donor and recipient info database	26
	9.2 Logistics monitoring	26
<b>10</b>	<b>Date/time limits of consumption</b>	<b>28</b>
	10.1 Best before and use by dates	28
	10.2 Setting and indication of dates	28
<b>11</b>	<b>Legal issues</b>	<b>29</b>
	11.1 Food law	29
	11.2 Tax	30
	11.3 Contracts	30
<b>12</b>	<b>Financing</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Quality assurance</b>	<b>34</b>
	13.1 Main risks	34

---

	13.2 Main elements of quality assurance	34
<b>14</b>	<b>Communication</b>	<b>36</b>
	14.1 Target groups and messages	36
	14.2 Communication tools and channels	37
	14.3 Branding	37
<b>15</b>	<b>Closing remarks</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>Vocabulary</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>17</b>	<b>Additional sources of information</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>18</b>	<b>Annex I. – Logo plans</b>	<b>41</b>

---

# 1 Introduction

The Hospitality Food Surplus Redistribution Guidelines were prepared within the framework of FUSIONS (Food Use for Social Innovation by Optimising Waste Prevention Strategies) project, funded by the FP7 program of the European Union. In the Guidelines we have included all the knowledge we have learned from already existing initiatives within and outside the EU and during the implementation of a pilot project in Hungary.

The primary goal of the document is to help the creation and roll-out of similar activities all across Europe. We strongly believe that the launch of such an activity requires a coordinator organisation and the Guidelines were prepared primarily from the point-of-view for these coordinators. Although some parts of the Guidelines are relevant for donor and recipient organisations also, due to the variety of potential alternatives, we recommend that focused and targeted information material are prepared for the relevant participants during the implementation of that various processes.

---

## 2 Planning process

In order to launch a successful and long-term sustainable network of activities we recommend carrying out a proper planning process. The main elements of the planning process are set out below,

### 2.1 Understanding the landscape

To understand the landscape we recommend the following activities,

- Read the Guidelines and locate the unclear points/topics
- Consult with experts from different domains
  - Relevant HORECA (Hotel/Restaurant/Café) segments (companies, umbrella organisations, consultants)
  - Food safety and other legal & tax issues (food chain safety authority, legal experts, tax consultants)
  - Recipient organisations (social) domain (NGOs, NGO networks, local municipalities)
- Look at existing initiatives, best practices
  - In your country (food banks and others)
  - In other countries (see some links to existing best practice organisations in Chapter 17.)

### 2.2 Prepare your adapted framework

- Set your strategy and action plan,
  - Identify main target donor and recipient segment(s) – look for “quick wins” in order to get a good reference for future roll-out
  - Identify geographic target(s) – be focused and select a pilot location as close as possible to your location to have the best understanding of pilot results (and potential problems if any)
  - Create an action plan including a detailed pilot plan
  - Plan your action team and budget, involving volunteers and potential in-kind fundraising
  - Analyse risks and plan mitigation actions. (Risk Assessment)

### 2.3 Pilot phase

We strongly recommend starting with one of a few pilot actions involving a limited number of donors and recipient organisations in order to limit risks and be able to adjust your process through your own learning.

---

Pilots should be in line with your strategy and preferably involve donors and recipients willing to be part of a strong cooperation with the coordinator, in order to receive sufficient feedback for adaptation.

Based on the result of the pilot(s) plan and execute the roll-out activities. For the roll-out create all necessary templates, tools and checklists for all participants.

---

# 3 Actors

The main actors of the process are the donors (suppliers), the recipients (where we mean the recipient organisations who distribute the food to the final recipients/ food users (the people in need) and the coordinators.

## 3.1 Donors

Here we list and describe the different donor segments (different segments of the hospitality sector) including pros and cons from the redistribution perspective.

### 3.1.1 Á la carte restaurants

Main common characteristics:

- mostly preparing meals by order (freshly made or food prepared PCEA (pre-cooked in an estimated amount) and reheated just in the amount of the actual order)
- many of them offering daily menus (PCEA)
- usually open from lunch till dinner time

Main strengths and challenges from the redistribution perspective	
Strengths	Challenges
- Easy decision making (the owner is often even there in person) - Regular donation possibility	- Smaller quantities with high variety (e.g. total 10 portions offered from 5 different type of meals) - Surplus mostly available late in the evenings

“Better potential” characteristics (providing better chance for success):

- larger restaurants (>100 seats)
- restaurants offering daily menus
- higher quality places (higher surplus potential at the raw material side)
- restaurants also offering event locations and/or event catering services (weddings, parties, etc.)
- places with high-risk external conditions (e.g. open air restaurants, restaurants in beaches, ski-areas, etc.)
- donors with a recipient in a close vicinity (easier to reach a positive Return on Investment on logistics)

### 3.1.2 Individual self service restaurants

Examples:

- Canteens situated in office buildings
- Self-service restaurants in shopping centres and busy public places

Main common characteristics:

- Offering limited variety of meals in larger quantities
- Higher ratio of pre-prepared food compared to freshly made
- Opening hours adapted to environment (e.g. office canteens mostly operate only during lunchtime)

Main strengths and challenges from the redistribution perspective	
Strengths	Challenges
- Higher average quantity - Better cooling infrastructure (e.g. shocker)	- If food is being served in ambient conditions, further use might be difficult

“Better potential” characteristics:

- “Lunch only” places offer easier “hot-hot” distribution option (shipping early in the afternoon)
- where the location owner (company, real-estate operator) is open for Corporate Social Responsibility and is willing to add surplus redistribution obligation in the service contract with the restaurant

### 3.1.3 Hotels

Main common characteristics:

- Offering usually buffet and a la carte serving of food as well
- Bigger hotels also do event catering activities

Main strengths and challenges from the redistribution perspective	
Strengths	Challenges
- Own kitchen, bigger hotels with large infrastructure, often with blast chiller(s) - Agreement with hotel chains may result in cooperation with more/many hotels at the same time	- Buffet type of services have strong limitations for redistribution because of safety risks of food displayed for self-service

“Better potential” characteristics:

- Places using blast chilling process in the preparations of meals
- Places with larger number of rooms and/or bigger conference room facilities

### 3.1.4 Event caterers

Main common characteristics:

- Non-regular activities (highest peak season before Christmas, lower peak seasons during spring and autumn)
- Mostly buffet type serving

Main strengths and challenges from the redistribution perspective	
Strengths	Challenges

- Caterers always over plan quantities "to be on the safe side" from the customers point of view	- High variation of location and donated volumes - Takeover at evening events is very late
--	---

"Better potential" characteristics:

- Bigger events (over 200 participants)
- Outdoor events (higher weather risk)
- Caterers using cook-chill process (with reheating on-site)
- Events with clients having CSR as a high priority

### 3.1.5 Public kitchens

Examples:

- schools,
- hospitals

Main common characteristics:

- Cooking for large number of people
- Service locally or by use of satellite kitchens
- Schools with very simple menus including high quantities
- Hospitals with very complicated menus (because of dietary reasons)

Main strengths and challenges from the redistribution perspective	
Strengths	Challenges
- Exact planning of quantities by the public kitchen is very hard because of the large quantities, surplus is not easily avoidable - Takeover times are usually feasible (early afternoon or evening)	- Surplus from satellites is already reheated once so only the hot-hot chain can work as second reheating is not allowed

"Better potential" characteristics:

- Larger number of portions kitchens
- Kitchens with local serving as well (not only cooking for satellites)
- Companies operating several kitchens

### 3.1.6 Hot deliverers

Main common characteristics:

- Service providers offering home delivery services only (no sit-in service option)
- Meals are delivered based on a la carte orders
- Delivery usually by motorbikes or cars

Main strengths and challenges from the redistribution perspective	
Strengths	Challenges
- Own delivery service (can be used/agreed for surplus redistribution as well)	- Limited amount of surplus

"Better potential" characteristics:

- Larger service providers
- Companies offering larger selection in the menus

### 3.1.7 Cold deliverers

Main common characteristics:

- Kitchens using Cook Chill technology and delivering food in packaged/portioned way, using cold chain
- Kitchens usually take orders latest by the end of the day before, delivery is organised in the morning
- Typical consumers are office workers and single households

Main strengths and challenges from the redistribution perspective	
Strengths	Challenges
- Cook Chill process gives larger timeframe for delivery - Products are already packaged, no need for serving kitchen	- The larger timeframe also provides better flexibility for the service provider, therefore limited surplus quantities can be expected

“Better potential” characteristics:

- Service providers with larger client base

### 3.1.8 Supermarkets/hypermarkets

Main common characteristics:

- Some supermarkets are also offering (take away) meals, grills, etc.

Main strengths and challenges from the redistribution perspective	
Strengths	Challenges
- Where a cooperation for redistribution already exists for other food products in the supermarket, the add-on of meals to the redistribution list is an easier option	- Usually small quantities, - Different logistics requirement from the usual donation stream

“Better potential” characteristics:

- Places where other donors are at the same location as well (e.g. a food court in the shopping centre), several donors can increase the ROI of the redistribution activities

### 3.1.9 Cafés/pâtisseries

Main common characteristics:

- Cafés and pâtisseries are from a redistribution point-of-view à la carte restaurants, with the difference of serving only food requiring refrigeration

Main strengths and challenges from the redistribution perspective	
Strengths	Challenges
- Provision of cold-chain in redistribution is usually easier than the hot chain - Products very much appreciated by the beneficiaries (especially children)	- Relatively small quantities
-	-

“Better potential” characteristics:

- Places with bigger volumes/turn-over

---

### 3.1.10 Bakeries

Main common characteristics:

- Bakeries are often offering both “normal” food (bread and other bakery products) and “hospitality type” products (e.g. pizzas) therefore we treat them here as well

Main strengths and challenges from the redistribution perspective	
Strengths	Challenges
- Regular surplus even at smaller bakeries - Most products can be redistributed in ambient conditions	- Shipping requires care (avoiding squeezing of products)

“Better potential” characteristics:

- Places with higher volumes and larger selection of products

## 3.2 Recipients

Recipient organisations are playing a key role in the redistribution process. These organisations are the “interface” between surplus donors and the final recipients – the people in need.

The recipient organisations’ primary activity is usually some kind of social work. They are in direct contact with their clients. Their focus can be different, some organisations work mostly with homeless people, some with children, others with families, elderly people, etc.

Most recipient organisations are at the same time usually not professionals in logistics and food distribution. Their infrastructure is often quite poor. Therefore food surplus redistribution requires extra effort from them which should be highly appreciated.

### 3.2.1 Type of organisations

The type of recipient organisations usually falls into one of the following categories.

#### a) Independent charities

Independent charities are non-governmental organisations (in our case with some social purpose). Charities are often connected or maintained by a church organisation. Independent charities might provide (and also get financed) some of their services in agreement with public bodies. The activities, size, the number of clients and geographical coverage of charities may strongly vary, including large scale national (or international) organisations as well as small local charities,

#### b) Public social organisations

Recipient organisations can also be public social organisations run and financed by governmental or municipal bodies. These organisations usually have standardised roles and responsibilities in their social work/activities,

---

giving the option of developing standard types of cooperation models in the food surplus redistribution domain as well.

A good cohesion among individual charities and public social organisations may often create a win-win situation by creating a symbiosis between the different resources available (e.g. a public organisation may provide better infrastructure for logistics whereas an individual charity may have more flexible volunteer staff for the activities)

### 3.2.2 Type of delivery

The recipient organisations may also vary by the type of delivery they provide towards their clients (some of them provide a mixed type of delivery as well).

#### a) Meal servers

Meal servers are providing meals to their clients at the location of the organisation. This is the highest level of service requirement as well as the highest level of infrastructure. For being able to serve meals the organisation needs to have cooking or serving kitchen infrastructure.

#### b) Package servers

Package servers are the organisations who distribute food at the location of the organisation but do not provide facilities for consumption. In these cases the final recipients visit the organisation and take the donations home with them.

#### c) Home deliverers

Home deliverers are the organisations who arrange delivery to the final recipients' homes. This method is especially useful in cases where the final recipients cannot easily go to the organisation's place of distribution (e.g. elderly, ill people).

A special mix of package serving and home delivering are the care centres without meal service, where clients live at the same place, common kitchen facilities are provided to them but there is no meal service provided (every person or family cooks for him/herself).

## 3.3 Coordinators

Coordinators (or mediators) play a key role in the distribution process as the food surplus redistribution "market" is not well developed. Potential supply and demand often doesn't find each-other even if a potential donor and a potential recipient organisation are very close to each-other.

Coordinators can be active at local, regional or national level as well and there may also be several coordinators working in the same territory – in this case of course, cooperation between coordinators is strongly advisable.

The key roles of the coordinators are:

- Searching for potential suppliers (donors)
- Searching for potential recipients (organisations)
- Matchmaking
- Training, knowledge transfer, consulting on both sides

---

The level of involvement of the coordinator may be different (see the different operational models in section 5), some roles, like monitoring, reporting, problem solving and change management in the activities may depend on the level of involvement.

It is strongly advised that the coordinator should be independent from all donors and recipients otherwise there is a risk of biased behaviour, especially in critical situations.

---

## 4 Type of products to be redistributed

### a) Raw materials

Any food that has been purchased by the kitchen, not used, but still in good condition for human consumption. This could typically be fruit and vegetables, sometimes meat and dairy products but rarely non-perishable food.

### b) Packaged food

One part of packaged products is non-perishable food products in unopened packaging, e.g. fruit juice, condiments, sweets, etc. This may mostly come from catering/event environment. The other part of packaged food may be prepared meals, salads and confectionary products requiring refrigeration. In this case the cold chain during the redistribution has to be secured.

### c) Meals

Meals can be donated in cases where they have neither been served nor offered for clients in a self-service mode (when clients put the meals on their plates themselves – e.g. in buffet type servings). Leftovers from plates cannot be donated. It is also recommended not to donate meals with highly perishable parts (e.g. meals with raw fish or eggs in them) meals cooked at lower temperatures (< 70°C, e.g. scrambled eggs)

It is recommended to exclude highly perishable food items (meals with raw meat, fish or egg in them, meals with mushrooms, etc.) or be extra cautious during redistribution process.

### d) Bakery products, fruits

Bakery products and fruits can also be donated if they have not been in direct contact with the customers.

---

# 5 Operation models

Operation models reflect the possible options of matching and managing donor supply with recipient demand. The models are grouped by the frequency of donations from a given donor.

## 5.1 Occasional

Occasional donations are cases where surplus is not arising on a regular (e.g. daily) basis but in a non-regular frequency (e.g. in the case of event caterers). We have observed three different operational models in these cases.

### 5.1.1 Automated

The automated operational models are based on IT applications matching supply and demand. In order to be able to redistribute surplus both donors and recipients have to be subscribed to the service. The applications are web and/or mobile based tools. For actual surplus food, the donors have to enter relevant data to the system; the data is forwarded to potential recipients by different ways of alerting them. When matches are created, the recipient gets in contact with the donor so that they can arrange the logistics.

An example of an existing automated application is Foodwe: [www.foodwe.be/](http://www.foodwe.be/)

Main strengths and challenges of the automated operational model	
Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- 24/7 availability</li><li>- No human resource needed for dispatching</li><li>- Possibility of simultaneous alerting</li><li>- Additional optional tools in the applications (e.g. support for route planning, preparation of shipping documents, etc)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- May require more efforts on the donor side (data entry)</li><li>- Automation not necessarily finding the optimal recipient (e.g. as is a "first comes first served" process)</li><li>- Lack of "human interface", "central customer service" towards the donor side, fulfilment of non-standard requests</li><li>- No mediation in case any problems occur</li></ul>

### 5.1.2 Dispatched

In the dispatched operational model there is a coordinator mediating between the donors and the recipients. The coordinator receives the donation offer from the donors' side and is responsible to find the best possible recipient partner. Coordinators might also use various IT tools for their work (e.g. map based databases of recipients)

A good example for the dispatched operational model is the organisation Boroume in Greece (<http://www.boroume.gr/> )

Main strengths and challenges of the dispatched operational model	
Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Easy use by the donor side (just have to make a phone call)</li> <li>- Flexible, optimal matching</li> <li>- "Human interface" helping more efficient communication with donors and recipients</li> <li>- Operational data from donors and recipients in the dispatch centre enabling complex optimization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Operation requires continuous human resource, even beyond working hours</li> <li>- Slow action of dispatcher may cause significant delay in the process</li> </ul>

## 5.2 Regular

Regular operations mean donors with a frequency of surplus relatively well predictable (e.g. a canteen with some surplus at the end of each day). Regularity does not necessarily mean "always" because food waste reduction is a goal of every business, but even if it happens often in cases of a restaurant or other hospitality service providers, it is worth developing standardised operational processes.

The operational models here may vary mainly based on the level of involvement of the coordinator in the process.

### 5.2.1 Centralised

In the centralised model, the coordinator is both involved in the management of the logistics processes and in the actual execution of the logistics tasks as well (shipping). The donor is in contact with the coordinator (who is in this case an operator as well), and the coordinator is in contact with the recipients. This model is the closest to the traditional model of the food banks even in cases of fresh meals, because of the very short delivery timeframe the food is not transferred to and from a central food bank warehouse but directly to the recipient. Some of the food banks in Europe have also started to deliver surplus from the HORECA sector (e.g. Citicibo by the Italian Food Bank - <http://www.bancoalimentare.it/it/siticibo2012>)

Main strengths and challenges of the centralised operational model	
Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Full control on logistics</li> <li>- Easy control of quality assurance</li> <li>- Route optimisation options (all logistics done by the same fleet)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high logistics costs for the coordinator (operator)</li> <li>- Requires bigger team on the coordinator's side</li> </ul>

---

## 5.2.2 Decentralised

In the decentralised operational model the coordinator takes the lead in creating and managing connections on both the donor and the recipient side, and organises the matching process. Although the actual logistics operations are executed by the recipient organisation (or occasionally by the donor). In this model the coordinator acts as a single point of contact for the donors in management issues, but has a day-to-day operational contact with the recipients as well. The decentralised model was tested in the FUSIONS pilot of the Hungarian Food Bank Association ([www.elelmiszerbank.hu](http://www.elelmiszerbank.hu)).

Main strengths and challenges of the decentralised model	
Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- High level management and control on the operations</li><li>- Single point of contact option for larger HORECA organisations/chains</li><li>- No logistics costs on the coordinator</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Requires logistics resources from the recipient side (or donor or 3<sup>rd</sup> party logistics support)</li></ul>

## 5.2.3 Facilitated

In the facilitated model, the role of the coordinator is to create bilateral connections between donors and recipients or a local community of donors and recipients. The coordinator is not involved in the actual execution of the process and managing the logistics operations. The execution in this case is supported by process descriptions and document templates prepared by the coordinator.

The decentralised model is run for example in the Las Minute Market organisation in Italy (<http://www.lastminutemarket.it/>) or Dariacordar in Portugal.

Main strengths and challenges of the facilitated model	
Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Large focus of the coordinator towards development of the network</li><li>- Little centralised administration involved in the process</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Less control on execution means higher risk (many parties involved with various level of knowledge and commitment)</li><li>- If a problem arises, donors may get less help from the coordinator</li></ul>

---

# 6 Distribution models

In the distribution models we have analysed the two most important aspects, the delivery chain and the temperature chain in the logistics process.

## 6.1 Delivery chain

### 6.1.1 Kitchen-person

In the kitchen-person chain the donated food is directly given to the final recipients on-site. In this model the redistribution happens by inviting people to the donor HORECA service provider, meaning there is no shipping of the donated goods. The recipient organisation's role in this case can be the organisation of the relevant number of people to the place and the selection of people eligible for the donation. For example, the distribution can be organised by using a limited number of free vouchers. Sometimes restaurants themselves are organising the distribution by giving the surplus food to people on the street.

Main strengths and challenges of the kitchen-person model	
Strengths	Challenges
- Shortest possible route from kitchen to person, thereby limiting risks - Logistics costs are zero or minimal	- Distribution activity causes extra effort (and cost) for the HORECA service provider

Comments:

- In cases where the food is not served in the restaurant, a packaging is required in order to be able to redistribute the food
- In some cases access to the HORECA service provider is restricted (e.g. office canteens where only employees working in the building can enter)
- Some restaurants having used this method in the past reported problems because of more and more people lining up on the street at the restaurant, sometimes hours before closing, causing mixed feelings in clients.

### 6.1.2 Kitchen-kitchen-person

In the kitchen-kitchen-person model, the donated surplus food is being delivered to the kitchen of the recipient organisation to be served on-site or repackaged/reportioned and then distributed to the final recipients.

This model can only be applied where a proper kitchen environment exists at the recipient organisation. As there is no preparation of food required a serving/satellite kitchen infrastructure is sufficient for carrying out the redistribution activities.

In cases using this model, the food from the donor to the recipient can be transferred in bulk using appropriate carts and containers for shipping.

Main strengths and challenges of the kitchen-kitchen-person model	
Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Low cost distribution between kitchen and kitchen (no need for packaging for portions)</li> <li>- Easy for donors (no need of portioning at the donor's place)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Higher investment for infrastructure (kitchen infrastructure, double-wall containers, etc.)</li> <li>- Dishwashing required for crates/containers</li> <li>- Serving, reportioning also needs tools and efforts (causing extra associated costs)</li> </ul>

Comments:

- Serving/reportioning can be organised in a way it uses plates/food containers of the recipients themselves, thereby extra costs can be reduced.

### 6.1.3 Kitchen – distribution - person (portioned)

In the kitchen-distribution-person model the distribution activity is carried out by the recipient organisation, usually at the place of the organisation but in this model there is no kitchen facility at the recipient therefore, the conditions of serving and/or repackaging/reportioning are not provided. That means the donated food has to arrive at the place of distribution in the form it can be given to the final recipients – for meals, this means packaged in portions (portions may be larger portions for families)

Main strengths and challenges of the kitchen-distribution-person model	
Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Easy redistribution on the recipient side</li> <li>- Doesn't require initial investment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Packaging causes constant (and relatively high) cost for redistribution</li> <li>- Packaging means extra effort for donors</li> </ul>

Comments:

- In some cases the packaging can be helped by the recipient organisations (e.g. by providing volunteers to the donor for packaging of food), this can especially be useful in cases of larger volumes (e.g. after events when the event catering staff are already overloaded)
- Packaging costs may be lowered by involving a company producing plastic boxes as strategic partner/sponsor to the project.

## 6.2 Temperature chain

The temperature chain options describe the potential alternatives for redistribution in the case of the donated food items that require special thermo conditions.

The temperature chain requirements are not relevant for non-perishable food items (bakery products, soft drinks, condiments, etc.)

---

Irrespective from the selected temperature chain, the date limit of consumption always has to be set by the producer of the relevant food item and this must be respected during the redistribution process.

a) Cold-cold

A provision of constant cold-chain is required for products that need refrigerated (or frozen) conditions at storing. A list of products and a suggested temperature can be found in some of the existing initiatives material (see the EC resource library link in Chapter 17). Cold chain during logistics can be provided by vehicles providing appropriate thermo conditions or during short distance shipments using thermo boxes.

b) Cold-hot

For food that is being stored at the donor's site cold (mostly prepared by cook chilling process) and is meant to be reheated before consumption, the surplus delivery can happen by using the cold chain. This food can then be reheated and served by the recipient (kitchen-kitchen-person model) or by the final recipients themselves (kitchen-distribution-person model)

c) Hot-hot

For food that has been kept hot (over 63°C) at the donor and given hot to the recipient organisation, one option is to keep the hot chain during the distribution process. Food can only be transported in thermo boxes or containers and have to be reheated before consumption. In this case timeframes must be carefully taken into account. Where the temperature of the food was decreased below 63°C, serving has to take place within a maximum of 3 hours from the start of the process. Food can only be reheated once after the 3 hour period, food that was already reheated once cannot be reheated again.

d) Hot-cold-hot

For hot food (kept over 63°C) surplus remaining after the end of service period, as long as the food has not already been reheated, it is possible for cooling the food and then using the cold-hot chain. Cooling down may happen at the place of the recipient but the cooling process has to happen quickly, so that the period of having the food at ambient conditions (between 63°C and 8°C) is as short as possible (not more than 3 hours).

---

# 7 Partnerships

## 7.1 Identification of actors

### 7.1.1 Donors

The most critical part of launching the redistribution activities is finding appropriate donors who have and are willing to donate their surplus. The most important characteristics of a potential donor are:

- Having a sufficient amount of surplus (at least 5-10 portions/day regularly or larger amounts occasionally),
- The surplus is feasible for redistribution (food was not served, there is enough time for redistribution, etc.) or the donor is willing to make internal changes to make it feasible (e.g. by analysing and lengthening use by date of own produced food),
- The management is flexible and has a responsible thinking.

For finding/contacting donors, direct contact of catering service providers is always a good option, especially where there are existing personal connections. Some other suggested ways/methods for finding donors are by contacting:

- Sectorial alliances/associations organised on regional or national level (association of restaurants, mass caterers, event caterers, hotels, etc.),
- Multinational catering companies' local branches where they have internal (international) references for redistribution activities (most of them have some but not necessarily easy to find out about it, it is often not even known internally within the company chain),
- Bigger companies and/or real-estate owners contracting or renting out restaurant spaces (In line with their corporate social responsibility thinking, they might motivate or even oblige the caterer to donate surplus),
- Public administration bodies operating or controlling catering activities (in hospitals, schools, army, ministries, etc),
- PR, HR and event managers (and their agencies) organising events with catering (they can also motivate/oblige catering service providers into donating surplus).

### 7.1.2 Recipients (direct, charity alliances, municipalities)

Finding organisations willing to receive free food might seem to be easy on the face of it, but there are some critical points where the actual launching of redistribution activities may fail:

- Sufficient extra staff or volunteers carrying out the work associated in the redistribution (receiving, serving, administration, etc.) – especially if these activities become regular, maybe on a daily basis,
  - Available infrastructure for shipping, storing (if needed) and distribution/serving,
-

- 
- Funding for associated costs (fuel, tools and material, etc) or ability to access donations or in-kind support from companies or private individuals

Recipient associations can mostly be found directly or through different sectorial and regional NGO alliances. An open invitation for application via different communication channels indicating the major benefits and conditions may also help find the most appropriate partners.

## 7.2 Preparation

In order to find the best (and feasible) matches between donors and recipients, a good profiling system has to be made on both sides (and stored/maintained by the coordinator).

Donor profile information main items:

- Company and personal contact data
- Location data
- Type of HORECA activity
- Type of products to be redistributed
- Estimated volumes and frequency, potential timing of donations
- Potential operation model(s)
- Potential distribution model(s)
- Take over timing estimation
- Available infrastructure (e.g. blast chiller)
- Other important information related to the redistribution (e.g. no near parking possibility)
- Existence of required special certifications/registrations for redistribution activities (in countries where it is required)

Recipient profile information main items:

- Organisation and personal contact data
- Legal status (e.g. eligibility for tax benefits for donors)
- Location data
- Type of organisation (distribution)
- Clients (number, age groups, categories, etc)
- Available infrastructure (e.g. cars, cold room, refrigerators, etc.)
- Number of employed and volunteer staff
- Available catering expertise and certifications (e.g. food hygiene)
- Timing flexibility (e.g. open to take food at night or over the weekend?)
- Existence of required certifications/registrations for redistribution activities (if applicable)

As the geographical distance is a key factor in the redistribution (both because of time and cost constraints) it is advisable to start the preparation and profiling activities in one location (city or part of a big city) in order to find potential matches early. (It is also worthwhile to note that time is an important factor in the launching process. This is because donors may lose their motivation).

---

## 7.3 Partner matching and launching

Based on the profile information the matching can potentially be done and the actual redistribution processes can be prepared and launched. The related actions are:

- Create the contact between suitable donor and recipient organisations (where there is no match, try to search for new recipients for available potential donors)
- Create the customised versions for the donor and the recipient from your general targeted guidelines adapted to the actual situation (or let them agree and do it)
- Agree on the contractual structure and create signed contracts
- Agree on launch date and pilot period
- Make sure all tools and material are available or will be available by the time of launching
- Possibly be there at the launch and provide advice in response to questions/problems
- After the pilot period do an evaluation and make changes if necessary, changes might be:
  - Changes in the actual process (timing, logistics, administration, etc.)
  - Partner change (in cases of strong unforeseen incompatibilities)
  - Discontinue activities (e.g. where the pilot period reveals significantly less amounts of donations than originally planned).

## 7.4 Relationship management

A continuous monitoring of activities may help in maintaining or even improving the redistribution activities (e.g. by extending the list of donated food items). A regular communication with donors and recipients is important, both using formal (e.g. newsletters, questionnaires) and informal (phone calls, personal meetings) channels. (See sections on information management and quality assurance).

---

# 8 Logistics process

## 8.1 Separating

First step of the logistics process is the selection/separation of surplus food to be donated. This part of the process is usually done by the donor but it could be done by the recipient in some cases, within a common agreement with the donor. Food that does not meet the conditions of redistribution has to be sent to other channels, preferably in the order of the food waste hierarchy (animal feed, composting, renewable energy).

## 8.2 Packaging/labelling

Food has to be redistributed using appropriate packaging/handling. This may be food containers, boxes, packages, bags or other packaging tools and assets. In all cases food can only be transported and served when food safety conditions are met.

The information that is required from the final recipient's (consumer's) point of view and also in respect of traceability requirements, have to be attached to the food items either in the form of labelling or in the form of escorting documents. These need to provide all necessary information to the redistribution organisation, both in terms of time limits and product information necessary for distribution.

## 8.3 Shipping

It is a crucial part of the process that shipping can be organised in the most efficient way. The smaller the potential donated volume, the better the low cost shipping option can help in reaching the most positive return on investment on the redistribution.

In many cases vans/cars might be the only viable option, but in other cases bikes, hand-held thermo containers or bags can significantly lower the costs (e.g. final recipients can also volunteer in these cases, by walking to closer locations or using public transportation if needed).

## 8.4 Storing

Storing of food at the recipient organisations premises must adhere to the required temperature conditions. Storage place and equipment (e.g. cold rooms) must adhere to relevant food safety and other requirements.

---

---

In cases where food is supplied from different donors, the identification of the different lots is important so that traceability requirements are met. Identification can be done with main lot information, made visible or using lot numbers and an internal system containing detailed information about all lots.

In the handling process the first-in-first-out principle should be mixed with a continuous checking of the quality of food and expiration dates, ensuring the donated food arrives to the final recipients safely.

## 8.5 Delivery

The delivery process is mainly dependant on the type of the recipient organisation (meal server, package server or package deliverer – see in section 3.2.2.). How the food is delivered partly determines the social benefits generated between the individuals who consume the food. For example, in a model that serves the meals to users, the meals are a tool which creates a social interaction between users, thereby helping the social integration process. In this case, wherever is technically possible we recommend the meal serving delivery.

## 8.6 Logistics of material and devices

Different processes require different types of logistics material and devices, but these can be a major factor in creating a good ROI for the redistribution.

Shipping food in bulk is always less expensive in the long term, although it may require initial investment (mostly from the recipient side). Using multiple use devices (crates, containers, etc.) decrease the cost of shipment but it requires additional effort by the necessity of cleaning/disinfection. Cleaning also requires appropriate conditions; where the recipient organisation cannot fulfil those conditions then the only available option is the donor cleaning meaning extra effort from their side (they do not necessarily want to take this on).

Shipping food in portions results in easier final delivery, where there is no kitchen facility available at the recipient side, this might be the only available option for the process. Portioning requires more effort at the point of donation, putting extra workload on the donor (unless the recipient helps in the process at the site of the donor – e.g. by sending volunteers to an event's place for packaging the surplus before shipping).

A mixed option is transferring in bulk from the donors to the recipients place – or a central (kitchen) location, where portioning can take place and the next step of the redistribution can be managed in the portioned way.

---

# 9 Information management

In order to be able to develop, manage and monitor the redistribution activities, the coordinator has to collect and maintain information relevant to specific processes and tasks.

## 9.1 Donor and recipient info database

A database including all information related to both donors and recipients is key for coordination activities.

A proper database should include all profile information (see section Partnerships/Preparation (section 7) and the coordinator should also ensure the updating process (e.g. by a yearly re-collection of data). The channels of communication are especially important and should be regularly updated (contact persons and e-mail addresses), as the database also serves as the basis of internal communication activities.

Location data of donors and recipients entered/managed in a digital map (e.g. Google maps) may well help the matching process.

A categorisation or tagging of the organisations by different factors can be a good help of grouping requirements or filtering requirements during the matching process - e.g. where the coordinator needs to find an organisation with special infrastructure (e.g. blast chiller) or with special conditions (e.g. willing to redistribute also during the night).

The donor side of the database can also indicate the actual state of involvement of the donor during the starting phase of the relationship (initial interest, waiting for decision, matching in progress, ongoing, inactive, etc.), thereby acting as well as a process monitoring tool.

Entering relationship data (who was/is the contact person related to a donor or recipient from the coordinator's side) historical data and any important comments in the database related to both donors and recipients may well help knowledge sharing between coordinator's team members or changes to the team members.

## 9.2 Logistics monitoring

The main reasons of logistics monitoring are:

- Traceability, recall - food safety regulations require the traceability of the products. If you need to recall a product, it is necessary to know who the recipients of the products in question were (but traceability does not mean any requirements tracing the information to the final consumer),

- 
- Avoiding misuse - in case of any problems, potential misuse of the donated product information, the delivery chain may help to locate the problematic actor in the chain,
  - Tax benefits - to be able to claim tax benefits of food donation, recipient organisations need to have evidence of the amount donated,
  - Communication - for communication purposes it is good to know how much product was donated in a given period of time.

Data to be recorded (by the recipient organisations)

Between donors and recipient organisations,

- On the shipping/take-over document:
  - day (and time if needed) of the donation
  - products and volumes
- At the recipient organisations internal administration
  - value (for accounting and tax benefit purposes – value should be given by the donor).

Between the recipient organisation and the final recipients (consumers) take-over administration is also recommended including,

- date of donation
- name, address (or another identification data) and signature the final beneficiary person (and number of people in her/his household if relevant)
- amount of food given.

Coordinators usually require regular reports from recipient organisations including

- volume and value of redistributed food (maybe also per food types)
- number of people the donated food reached

---

# 10 Date/time limits of consumption

It is very important that the all actors in the chain understand and apply the relevant limitations in the redistribution process.

## 10.1 Best before and use by dates

Some products have use-by dates (e.g. prepared meals), some products have best before dates (e.g. packaged non-perishable food products), and some products do not have formal limitations on consumption (e.g. most fruits and vegetables).

As the expiration of a use-by date means food safety risk for the consumer, products beyond this date (time) cannot be redistributed.

Products over the best before date can be consumed but in some countries the retail and redistribution of those products is prohibited by law.

## 10.2 Setting and indication of dates

Date limits are set by the producers of the food items concerned, taking into consideration the ingredients, technology and other relevant conditions. The usability by the end of the period can only be applied where storage conditions were met during the whole lifecycle.

Product information and date limits have to be attached during the redistribution process, either in the form of labels (e.g. on portioned meal packages) or by using accompanying documents (shipping documents).

---

# 11 Legal issues

## 11.1 Food law

The main EU food regulations in relation to the redistribution of food (at this point in time) are:

- Regulation (EC) 178/2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety
- Regulation (EC) 852/2004 on the hygiene of foodstuffs
- Regulation (EC) 853/2004 laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin
- Regulation (EU) 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers

Comment 1: all recipient organisations of redistribution activities are considered as food businesses/food business operators and must take care of all relevant legal requirements regardless of the fact that they are distributing food free of charge.

See: Article 3 (Other definitions) of (EC) 178/2002:

2. "Food business" means any undertaking, whether for profit or not and whether public or private, carrying out any of the activities related to any stage of production, processing and distribution of food;
3. "Food business operator" means the natural or legal persons responsible for ensuring that the requirements of food law are met within the food business under their control;

Comment 2: the most relevant chapters related to food surplus redistribution in Annex II (General hygiene requirements for all food business operators) of (EC) 852/2004 are:

- General requirements for food premises (Chapter I.)
- Transport (Chapter IV.)
- Equipment requirements (Chapter V.)
- Personal hygiene (Chapter VIII.)
- Provisions applicable for foodstuffs (Chapter IX.)
- Provisions applicable to wrapping and packaging of foodstuffs (Chapter X.)
- Training (Chapter XII.).

National legislation should be in line with the EU legislation but in some cases national adaptations are different (mostly more strict) than the general EU rules. Coordinators are recommended to check relevant national legislation, consult with relevant national authorities and issue a national localised guideline about the donation process and requirements.

---

## 11.2 Tax

The two important tax items are relevant to the redistribution/donation process: VAT and corporate tax benefits.

In a number of EU countries donations are exempt of VAT, but in some countries VAT is still applicable. In the latter case donors or recipients have to pay the VAT based on the actual value of the surplus food. The actual value in this case can be close to zero, as it is stated by the VAT committee of the EC (see [taxud.c.1\(2012\)1701663 – Working Paper No 745 FINAL VAT Committee – Guidelines from the 97th meeting<sup>1</sup>](#))

In a number of countries donors are entitled for corporate tax benefits as well, based on the value of the donations. Condition of this can also include special status of the recipient organisation.

For further details you can consult the EESC “Comparative study on EU Member States' legislations and practices on food donation”<sup>2</sup> or relevant national legislation and authorities.

Checking the required accounting rules and requirements in order to maximise the potential taxation benefits is of primary importance as tax benefits play a major role at the donor side when calculating their ROI of the surplus redistribution.

Accounting practices should also be communicated and maintained by the recipient organisations as accounting problems on the recipient side may also cause problems on endorsing benefits on the donor side! The main critical accounting items are

- preparing and storing proper take-over and distribution logistics documents
- recording incoming and outgoing stock volumes
- recording statements of values (by donors)
- issuing and storing acknowledgments (by recipient) for donor tax benefits (where appropriate)

## 11.3 Contracts

Signing contracts is recommended (or might also be obligatory based on national legislation) in order to describe main roles and responsibilities in the redistribution process. Contracts may only contain major elements and operational details can be annexed or included in a separate document as well.

### 11.3.1 Proposed main elements of the contract

- rights and responsibilities of the donor
  - Responsibilities related to the preparation of food products and proper storing/handling of them until the point of take-over

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food\\_waste/library/docs/guidelines-vat-committee\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food_waste/library/docs/guidelines-vat-committee_en.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.eesc.europa.eu/?i=portal.en.events-and-activities-eu-food-donations>

---

- In case of own production, responsibility of the setting the date/time limit of consumption (best before or use by dates)
- Responsibility of not donating food already passed the date limit of consumption
- Right of refusal of donation in case of non-appropriate circumstances (e.g. lack of thermo boxes)
- Informing the recipient about the value of the donated food (in case of accounting/tax requirements)
- rights and responsibilities of the recipient
  - take-over of responsibilities of handling at the point of take-over of food from donor to recipient
  - responsibility for conditions of storing and serving (refrigeration, reheating, etc)
  - responsibility for personal hygiene requirements of staff and volunteers taking part in the redistribution process
  - responsibility of (free) distribution towards people in need
  - responsibility for traceability
  - right of refusal of donation in case of quality problems and passed or too close date/time limit of consumption
  - responsibility of storing documentation
  - responsibility issuing tax benefit acknowledgments towards donors (if applicable)
- responsibilities based on agreement between the parties
  - taking all tasks and costs related to the redistribution logistics
  - provision and handling of logistics/packaging material (thermo boxes, plastic boxes, etc.)
  - cleaning of multi-use assets (e.g. containers)
- process
  - take-over timing and frequency
  - contacts and communication process
  - documentation requirements
- optional
  - PR/communication agreements (use of logo, references, etc.)
  - right of donor of auditing redistribution process at the recipient's premises
  - reporting obligations towards coordinator and/or donor(s)

### 11.3.2 Contractual structure options

Contractual structures may vary depending on the actual actors and the used operational model(s). There are three main options for the structure:

#### a) Simple bilateral contracts

In the case of simple bilateral contracts all roles and responsibilities are handled between donor and recipient, the coordinator is not involved in the contracting. This may be the most relevant option where there is no coordination in the process (everything is being agreed and operated by the donor and the recipient) or where a "light" coordination, mainly in the case of automated or facilitated operation models.

#### b) Three party contracts

Three party contracts may be signed where "stronger" coordination activities (e.g. for decentralised or managed operational models). In this case roles and

---

responsibilities of each-party towards the others can exactly be set. The advantage of this contractual structure is the transparency of roles from each side; the disadvantage is the extra coordination effort signing it.

c) Double bilateral contracts

For double bilateral contracts one contract is signed between the donor and the coordinator and another one between the coordinator and the recipient. Contracts have to be prepared so that relevant tasks and responsibilities of donors and recipients are mirrored. Double bilateral contracts are usually preferred by larger donors operating several places of redistribution and working with several recipient organisations. The coordinator in this case acts as a “main contractor” for the project, often also providing a single-point-of-contact option for the donor’s headquarters.

---

# 12 Financing

A careful financial plan of every redistribution activity is key for the long term success.

A proper calculation of all costs associated with the redistribution process helps calculating the potential return on investment for the project. The positive ROI (value of the food redistributed compared to the costs of redistribution) is key, the higher the ROI, the easier to get funding for the costs.

Typical costs that should be considered:

- Cost of packaging (boxes, crates, bags, containers, etc.)
- Transportation costs
  - distance between donor and recipient is a key issue
  - depending on the expected volumes the optimal means of transportation should be used (for smaller quantities it may be possible to deliver on foot using thermo-handbags)
- Storage costs (rooms, refrigeration, etc.)
- Cost of serving (or re-packing)
- Cost of cleaning and disinfecting
- Cost of human resources

Costs should ideally be covered by a secure and long-term funding. All efforts put into the launch of a new redistribution channel will be superfluous if the process will have to be stopped later because of the lack of sufficient sources/funding for continuous operations.

Typical sources of funding:

- Financial donations (individuals, corporate funding, grants, etc)
  - One time donations (e.g. grants) can be well used for building infrastructure resulting lower operational costs (e.g. buying a car instead of paying for a continuous transportation service) whereas continuous donations may well fund operational costs
- In-kind donations (offering tools or services for free or at a discounted price)
  - Supply of packaging material
  - Storage/serving space (i.e. fridge)
  - Logistics services
- Volunteer work
- Financial contribution of the final beneficiaries (the amount has to be very low compared to the market price of the donated food)
  - some organisations and/or donors exclude this option and take free distribution as obligatory

Some of the funding may also come from the donor's side (e.g. free shipping) and the coordinator may also absorb some costs (e.g. shipping or providing certain tools).

Coordinators may also help in searching and proposing optimal sources of supply for certain things (e.g. bags, plastic boxes) and possibly also agree in general discounted terms for all recipients.

---

# 13 Quality assurance

One of and maybe the most important role of the coordinator is to provide an overall quality assurance for the redistribution activities. The high quality of services and activities is key for the expansion of activities, as reliability and trust are key factors for donors and funding providers as well. There are two main risks associated to the whole process.

## 13.1 Main risks

### a) Food safety risks

Any illness caused by the redistributed food are a problem in itself but in addition it can cause a huge mistrust in the whole redistribution system as well. Irrespective of who is to blame, the overall outcome may easily take a negative effect on all of those involved, the donor, the recipient and the coordinator; in the worst case scenario even for the whole redistribution domain.

### b) Misuse, fraud

Donors are usually donating surplus food for charity reasons and it is crucial for them that the food really arrives to those whom it is intended for. Any misuse (given to others) or fraud (reselling donations) can strongly harm the trust in the system. Coordinators therefore have to do as much as they can in preventing risks, where negative events do occur do their best to treat and mitigate the negative effects.

## 13.2 Main elements of quality assurance

### a) Selection of partners

Main selection criteria:

- Background, legal status (NGO, religious, local government, eligibility for tax benefits, etc.)
- Field of operation (families, homeless, children, elderly, etc)
- Geographical range of activities
- Type of service (kitchen, package distribution)
- Infrastructure for transportation and storage
- References
- Staff volunteers to have required training and certification for personal hygiene

### b) Monitoring

Continuous monitoring of activities can significantly limit risks. Monitoring activities can include regular reports from recipient organisations to the

---

coordinator and personal visits when the whole redistribution process can be reviewed and evaluated.

c) Problem solving

Where problems occur in the process, a quick and accurate reaction is vital. Especially in cases of food safety related issues, the reaction-time can be crucial in avoiding or limiting negative consequences. The coordinator therefore has to be “always alert” and capable of effective interaction.

d) Education/training

As most of the recipient organisations are not catering professionals, basic training is essential for them in terms of related logistics processes, administration, food safety and hygiene requirements. Coordinators are proposed to develop training material for this, based on the adapted local processes, electronic training material and the use of online learning tools might save significant training costs.

e) Collecting and analysing feedback

A continuous learning curve and development of processes can be assisted by surveys and interviews with donors and recipients organised by the coordinator. Feedback can highlight problematic points of the process that require improvement and/or best practices that can be shared with other actors. The good news is that surplus redistribution is not a competitive sector, so usually every organisation is open and willing to share their knowledge and experience.

---

# 14 Communication

Good communication activities are key for the launch, existence and long-term sustainability of redistribution activities. Here we have collected some key aspects of the communication plan

## 14.1 Target groups and messages

### a) Donors

The main message for donors should focus on the main potential benefits for them, namely

- A natural and easy option for social responsibility for any players in the HORECA sector
- High social value creation with minimal or even no extra costs
- Financial benefits through the reduction of waste management costs and the (possible) tax benefits
- No significant resource requirements based on the coordinators and recipients efforts
- Image growth potential providing competitive advantage towards their clients
- Increased employee motivation

### b) Recipients

The main messages for recipients are

- Potential extra source of donation for their beneficiaries
- Food with high nutritional value (often higher than usual food donations)
- General requirement for participation should clearly be communicated in advance (flexibility, logistics, etc)
- Social benefits – food donation can greatly help social inclusion
- Being part of the combat against food waste – another socially good aspect to what they are already doing

### c) General public

The general public is an important target group, as many people might be directly or indirectly involved in the activities, as potential

- Donors or recipients
- Clients of donors (indirectly increasing motivation of existing and new potential donors)
- Potential donors and volunteers – helping the coordinators and recipients work.

---

## 14.2 Communication tools and channels

An integrated communication strategy using a mix of mass and targeted communication is proposed in order to reach all relevant target groups with relevant messages. The main proposed channels are,

- A well structured website (for the coordinator)
- Direct channels, especially direct mails +calls and peer-to-peer communication are proposed towards potential donors
- Calls for applications distributed via relevant NGO channels and a portal might be a good tool for searching potential recipients
- PR activities are effective towards the general public
- Social media can involve all relevant target groups
- A well prepared crisis communication plan can be a good help in case of any unwanted situation occurring during the operation (mainly fraud or a food safety event)
- Background support for communication activities of donors and recipients can multiply communication efforts. Best tools for these are
  - Point of sale material (ready-made and templates) to be displayed at their site communicating the activities
  - PR support mainly by sending news and photos (about distribution toward final recipients, emotional feedback, etc.
  - Regular reports with calculation of volumes, values and impact (number of people helped, volume of reached, CO2 reduction, etc)

## 14.3 Branding

The creation and usage of special branding of the activities can help the integration of different communication channels. The main tool of branding should be a logo used in all possible communication channels.

The logo can also serve as a label for the participating donor, supporting the image communication towards the client of the donor (e.g. in a form of a sticker on the front door of a participating restaurant).

It is important to set the rules of using the brand elements by donors and recipients and to make sure they all accept the rules while joining the network. Rules should contain conditions of usage (including the obligations in case of discontinuing activities).

Some examples of branding ideas are shown in Annex 1; please consult with the Hungarian Foodbank Association in terms of copyright issues.

---

# 15 Closing remarks

We have tried to collect the most important aspects of the redistribution process in the Guidelines, but of course we couldn't include every bit of detail in the content.

We are willing and ready to update and extend the content and thereby create a "living document". We are very thankful for any kind of related feedback, if you have any comments please send it to us at [guidance@elelmiszerbank.hu](mailto:guidance@elelmiszerbank.hu) address.

We are also ready to provide additional help for those who are willing to start up these kinds of activities by consultation, workshops, project support, and help in preparation of tools and templates or other kinds of activities. Please contact us for any requests in this matter.

---

# 16 Vocabulary

**HORECA:** an abbreviation used for the sector of the food industry that consists of establishments which prepare and serve food and beverages (food service). The term is a syllabic abbreviation of the words Hotel/Restaurant/Café.

**Mass caterer:** means any establishment (including a vehicle or a fixed or mobile stall), such as restaurants, canteens, schools, hospitals and catering enterprises in which, in the course of a business, food is prepared to be ready for consumption by the final consumer ((EC) 1169/2011).

**Cook Chill process:** a technique involving the full cooking of food, followed by rapid chilling and storage at controlled temperatures (up to 3-5 days). Food must be reheated before service.

**Blast chilling:** a method of cooling food quickly to a low temperature that is relatively safe from bacterial growth. By reducing the temperature of cooked food from over 63 °C to 5 °C or below within 90 minutes, the food is rendered safe for storage and later consumption. This method of preserving food is commonly used in the HORECA sector.

**Blast chiller:** a special type of refrigerator designed for rapid cooling and storing of food typically between +3 °C and +5 °C, but is a higher grade and more expensive appliance and is usually only found in commercial kitchens.

**Satellite kitchen:** satellite (or receiving) kitchens are located at locations (e.g. typically in schools) that receive food from a central kitchen. Satellite kitchen usually don't cook food but reheat/serve food cooked in the central kitchen.

---

# 17 Additional sources of information

## a) Information portals:

Food waste information page of the European Commission:

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food\\_waste/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food_waste/index_en.htm)

Resource library:

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food\\_waste/library/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food_waste/library/index_en.htm)

FUSIONS Social Innovation Inventory:

<http://www.eu-fusions.org/index.php/social-innovations/social-innovation-inventory>

## b) Organisations with HORECA surplus redistribution expertise:

Dariacordar (Portugal)

<http://www.dariacordar.org/>

Citicibo di Banco Alimentare (Italy)

<http://www.bancoalimentare.it/it>

Last Minute Market (Italy)

[www.lastminutemarket.it](http://www.lastminutemarket.it)

# 18 Annex I. – Logo plans

Branding creative ideas



## The Hospitality Food Surplus Redistribution Guidelines

This Guidance Document was prepared within the framework of FUSIONS (Food Use for Social Innovation by Optimising Waste Prevention Strategies) project, funded by the FP7 program of the European Union.

Keywords: food waste; redistribution.

Clients: European Commission (FP7), Coordination and Support Action – CSA.

Contract number: 311972.

FUSIONS project leaders: Toine Timmermans, Hilke Bos-Brouwers Wageningen UR - Food & Biobased Research, The Netherlands.

Work package leaders: Sophie Eastel, Michael Wenborn, WRAP, UK.

Authors: Katalin Újhelyi, Balázs Cseh, Hungarian Foodbank Association

We Save Food logos: Well Advertising Agency, Hungary

Acknowledgments: Anna Zoltai; NÉBIH (Hungarian Food Safety Authority)  
Anne-Laure Gassin ; European Commission DG SANTE, Antonio Oliva ; Banco Alimentare (Italy), Ágnes Paul; Organic Communications, Bart van Gogh;  
Wageningen UR, Clementine O'Connor, Manuela Gheoldus, Polina Dekhtyar;  
BIOIS, Dorottya Kanizsár, Kornél Brassai; Well Advertising, Elaine Charlesworth, Michael Wenborn, Sophie Easteal, Sarah Bromley; WRAP, Krisztina Molicsné Szűcs, Lászlóné Joubert, Hungarian Catholic Caritas, Matteo Guidi; Last Minute Market, Paula Policarpo; Dariacordar , Tamás Szentkereszty; Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta, Tünde Harsányi; Sodexo Hungary

Name: Balázs Cseh

Address: 3 Lokátor u, 1172 Budapest, Hungary

Phone: +36 20 468 9593

E-mail: [cseh.balazs@elelmiszerbank.hu](mailto:cseh.balazs@elelmiszerbank.hu)

Website : [www.eu-fusions.org](http://www.eu-fusions.org)

