

Defining upcycled food: the dual role of upcycling in reducing food loss and waste

Article

Accepted Version

Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

Aschemann-Witzel, J. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6737-3659>, Asioli, D. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2274-8450>, Banovic, M., Angela Perito, M., Odile Peschel, A. and Stancu, V. (2023) Defining upcycled food: the dual role of upcycling in reducing food loss and waste. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 132. pp. 132-137. ISSN 0924-2244 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2023.01.001> Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/109761/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2023.01.001>

Publisher: Elsevier

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Journal Pre-proof

Defining upcycled food: The dual role of upcycling in reducing food loss and waste

Jessica Aschemann-Witzel, Daniele Asioli, Marija Banovic, Maria Angela Perito, Anne Odile Peschel, Violeta Stancu



PII: S0924-2244(23)00001-8

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2023.01.001>

Reference: TIFS 3958

To appear in: *Trends in Food Science & Technology*

Received Date: 20 July 2022

Revised Date: 19 December 2022

Accepted Date: 5 January 2023

Please cite this article as: Aschemann-Witzel, J., Asioli, D., Banovic, M., Perito, M.A., Peschel, A.O., Stancu, V., Defining upcycled food: The dual role of upcycling in reducing food loss and waste, *Trends in Food Science & Technology* (2023), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2023.01.001>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2023 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Dear editor at Trends in Food Science and Technology,

I herewith submit the commentary ‘The dual role of upcycling in reducing food loss and waste’ for consideration in Trends in Food Science and Technology. Upcycled food is a new trend on the market with various definitions presented by academics and stakeholders. However, we think that these do not yet shed sufficient light on the two types of products that we see emerging, and that it is currently undervalued how upcycled food in its more radical sense can not only avoid food waste, but broaden the food available. We thus suggest expanding the definition of upcycled food with the two-folded definition that we explain in this commentary. We also think that to further holistic food system thinking, it is important to highlight that upcycled food entails a dynamic over time and is interdependent. We thus explain the boundaries that this entails and discuss how different actors should deal with it.

We hope you can see the value of this topical commentary for the readership of Trends in Food Science and Technology.

Thank you very much in advance.

On behalf of the authors, Jessica Aschemann-Witzel

The dual role of upcycling in reducing food loss and waste

Jessica Aschemann-Witzel ¹ *; Daniele Asioli ²; Marija Banovic ¹; Maria Angela Perito ³; Anne Odile Peschel ¹; Violeta Stancu ¹

¹ MAPP - Centre for Research on Customer Relations in the Food Sector, Department of Management, Aarhus University, Fuglesangsalle 4, 8210 Aarhus, Denmark

² Department of Applied Economics and Marketing, School of Agriculture Policy and Development, University of Reading, Reading, United Kingdom

³ Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Teramo, Faculty of Bioscience and Technology for Food, Agriculture and Environment; Via R. Balzarini, 1 64100 Teramo, Italy

* corresponding author: Jessica Aschemann-Witzel, Professor, (Tel: +45 87165217; e-mail: jeaw@mgmt.au.dk)

Daniele Asioli d.asioli@reading.ac.uk

Marija Banovic maba@mgmt.au.dk

Maria Angela Perito maperito@unite.it

Anne Odile Peschel peschel@mgmt.au.dk

Violeta Stancu viost@mgmt.au.dk

Author contributions:

JEAW conceptualized the content and wrote the draft. All other authors contributed otherwise equally to the discussion preceding the commentary and finetuning of the content and to the manuscript and are therefore listed in alphabetical order.

Declarations of interest:

None.

1 **Defining upcycled food: The dual role of upcycling in reducing food loss and waste**

2 **Abstract**

3 Background: Food loss and waste over-uses natural resources and is responsible for a
4 considerable share of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Moreover, increasing food prices and
5 growing food insecurity internationally make instances of food wastage appear even more
6 irresponsible and showcase the inefficiencies of the current food system. A new concept in the
7 toolbox for fighting food loss and waste is upcycling – value enhancing use of ingredients
8 otherwise wasted – that leads to upcycled food. However, not all products currently called
9 ‘upcycled food’ live up to the resource-saving and value-adding promise entailed in the idea of
10 ‘upcycling’, and products markedly differ in how ‘radical’ the upcycling is from a consumer
11 perspective.

12 Scope and Approach: To shed light on this, we introduce a two-folded definition that hinges
13 on current consumer edibility perception and has a view to changing consumer perception; We
14 show that there are two types of upcycled food which each have a distinct role and contribution
15 to preserving natural resources - one is avoiding resources are wasted that have gone into food
16 production, thus constituting upcycled foods through *alternative* use, the other is diversifying
17 and broadening the food resource base, thus constituting upcycled foods through *novel* use. We
18 provide examples of these upcycled food types and highlight potential boundaries from a
19 sustainable development goal perspective.

20 Key Findings and Conclusions: Mainstreaming the idea of upcycling in food systems has huge
21 potential for improving circularity in the food system. Untapping this potential needs
22 collaboration across the whole value chain and taking a food system perspective, such as when
23 being well-aware of the boundaries arising from the dynamic nature of the topic and the
24 interdependencies.

25 **Keywords**

26 Food waste; Consumer behaviour; Upcycling; Waste to value; Definition; Concept

Journal Pre-proof

27 **Introduction**

28 The food system alone is responsible for a third of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions
29 (Crippa et al., 2021; Foley et al, 2017; Poore & Nemecek, 2018). Food waste (common term
30 used to cover both food loss and waste) account for circa 8-10 % of total human caused GHG
31 emissions (IPCC 2019). This inefficient use of up to a third of our food (UNEP, 2021)
32 unnecessarily heightens the strain that agriculture puts on the planetary ecosystems (Steffen et
33 al. 2015; Godfray et al., 2010). In addition, in a situation with increasing food prices and
34 growing food insecurity around the world (FAO, 2021, 2022; Hasegawa, 2021; van Dijk et al.,
35 2021), wastage of nutrients or food reveals the inefficiencies in the current food system and
36 appears irresponsible in the light of the sustainable development goals (EC, 2020a). Luckily,
37 the issue of food waste has been acknowledged internationally. There are more and more
38 initiatives taken to exchange knowledge and data on how to curtail food waste across the value
39 chain and in public-private partnerships (for example: EC, 2022; WFP, 2022; FAO, 2022).
40 Food waste, however, is a complex challenge not easily solved, and needs a broad and diverse
41 range of actions (Aschemann-Witzel 2016).

42 A new concept in the toolbox of food waste reduction is upcycled food. The term is increasingly
43 used in the food area and trend reports predict a huge market potential (BusinessWire 2021;
44 FMCG Gurus, 2022; Forbes, 2021; The Washington Post, 2021; Euromonitor, 2022). Upcycled
45 food has also been discussed under the terms waste-to-value, value-added-surplus products, or
46 side-stream valorization (Aschemann-Witzel & Stangherlin, 2021; Teigiserova et al., 2020;
47 Coderoni & Perito, 2020). Upcycled food introduces a key concept from circular economy, the
48 upcycling, to the food sector. It is well in line with policy trends towards supporting ‘closing
49 the loop’ in major industries, including the food and agriculture sector (EC, 2020b). At the
50 same time, upcycling is also a term gaining popularity as a green consumer behavior trend
51 (Wilson, 2016; Kamleitner et al., 2019; Adıgüzel & Donato, 2021). Environmental concern,

52 climate change worries and willingness to take sustainability into account in food choice and
53 diets are rising – 78% of Europeans regard climate change as a serious problem
54 (Eurobarometer, 2021). The Eurobarometer (repeated European-wide surveys funded by the
55 European Union) 513 showed that up to 2 out of 3 Europeans see the food industry (i.e.
56 producers, manufacturers) as “the most important actor to make food systems sustainable” (p.
57 47). Due to these reasons, ‘upcycled food’ can be expected to entail an important potential for
58 the sustainable transition of the agriculture and food sector. Given such a sustainable transition
59 of the production as well as consumption of food needs more diversity as well as more plant-
60 and less animal-based foods, we argue that upcycled foods are well in line with the planetary
61 diet suggested by the EAT-Lancet report – they are about uncovering new and diverse sources
62 of food, and most upcycled food are plant-based (Willet et al., 2019).

63 However, pursuing upcycling needs a clear definition of the concept and being aware of the
64 boundaries and pitfalls that arises from the dynamic nature of the definition. Looking at the
65 market, we see two product groups emerging that differ in how radical upcycling of ‘waste’ is
66 from a consumer point of view because they differ in edibility perception, and these two groups
67 contribute to solving the problem in different ways. To put it more bluntly, we assess that one
68 of the two groups rather tackles the symptoms but not the underlying issues and thus has a
69 valuable but more intermediate contribution. The other group, in turn, goes more to the root of
70 food waste and sustainability issues, and thus has a more long-term and profound contribution.
71 We have written this piece and suggest the distinction because we are concerned that the first
72 gets more attention than the latter. If upcycled food is understood as restricted to the first group
73 of examples, it also restricts the contribution that the idea of upcycling can bring to
74 sustainability of food systems.

75 To strengthen awareness of this, we first pinpoint the main characteristics of current definitions,
76 and then expand previous definitions by introducing a two-folded definition of the upcycled

77 food concept which encompasses two product groups that we see emerging in the food sector,
78 and which each have a unique and different role in tackling food loss and waste. We highlight
79 which boundaries there are for their contribution to a sustainable food system, and why it is
80 important to adapt and change business models and communication along with the dynamic
81 change in both consumer perception and technological innovation.

82

83 **What is upcycling**

84 The word ‘upcycling’ was coined in contrast to recycling, which is understood as
85 ‘downcycling’. It goes back to the groundbreaking cradle-to-cradle (C2C) design concept,
86 where it was defined as “cyclical, cradle-to-cradle ‘metabolisms’ that enable materials to
87 maintain their status as resources and accumulate intelligence over time” (Braungart et al. 2007,
88 p. 1338). Braungart et al. (2007) criticized that the ‘recycling’ far too often meant that the
89 material was downgraded and lost its value, as for example if different types of plastic is mixed
90 and melted together as park benches, with the recycling just another stage on the way to
91 disposal. ‘Upcycling’ in contrast would be ways of re-using that allow the material to become
92 purer and better or add additional value to society. Phrased simpler, upcycling has been defined
93 as “reuse of discarded materials which results in an increase in ‘value’” (Bridgens et al., 2018,
94 p. 146), or “a process of converting materials into new materials of higher quality and increased
95 functionality” (Ellen McArthur foundation, 2019). Examples of upcycling in its ideal form are
96 hard to find, but ideas approximating it are metals such as aluminium re-melted and becoming
97 purer each time, and compostable packaging produced so that it improves soil and adds seeds.

98

99 **What characterizes upcycled food**

100 Upcycled food as a term has gained traction in the past years. In the USA, an upcycled food
101 association has recently been formed, developing both a definitional framework as well as
102 launching a certification for ingredients and products (Upcycled Food Association, 2022). The
103 association writes that “Upcycled food is the easy way for anyone to prevent food waste via
104 the products they buy ...”. The definition that they suggested in 2020 is phrased as follows:
105 “Upcycled foods use ingredients that otherwise would not have gone to human consumption,
106 are procured and produced using verifiable supply chains, and have a positive impact on the
107 environment” (Upcycled food definition task force, 2020).

108 Comparing the various definitions in the literature of the field (e.g. Bhatt et al., 2018, 2020;
109 Spratt et al., 2021; Peschel & Aschemann-Witzel, 2020), we identify three important and
110 common characteristics in the definitions. When these three come together, the food can be
111 regarded as ‘upcycled food’. Accordingly, a food can be called upcycled food if it is 1) a
112 product consisting of or containing materials that otherwise would be *waste*, this material is 2)
113 turned into a *food* product for human consumption, and this is done via 3) a process that
114 involves an increase in *value*. We explain each point in the following.

115

116 *Waste*

117 Firstly, the starting point is a product or ingredient that is or would otherwise be ‘waste’.
118 Upcycled foods are usually defined as waste-to-value products, that is, “foods made from
119 surplus ingredients that would have been otherwise wasted” (Bhatt et al., 2018, p. 57) or “foods
120 that are manufactured from ingredients that are by-products from producing another food
121 product” (Bhatt et al., 2020, p. 3), or “foods that contain ingredients previously wasted in the
122 supply chain” (Aschemann-Witzel & Peschel, 2019, p. 1). With regard to the inverted waste
123 hierarchy pyramid (EC, 2008), it practically means that upcycled food begins with rescuing

124 material from the lowest end, which is the food disposal stage. The waste hierarchy provides a
125 hierarchy of preference for actions in how to deal with waste from an environmental
126 perspective: Waste should be properly disposed, but it would be even better to recycle it, and
127 even better than recycling is to avoid the waste. ‘Upcycling’ moves the items from the disposal
128 and brings them back to the intended use (see figure 1 for a simplified illustration of this).

129 Insert Figure 1 here

130

131 *Food*

132 Secondly, the resulting product is for human consumption. This holds logically for all
133 definitions specifying that it is about ‘foods’. However, also those definitions who do not do
134 so, typically exemplify the concept with food examples (Peschel & Aschemann-Witzel, 2020).
135 This characteristic is important to underline because even though a re-use as feed or pet food
136 might as well be a valuable upcycling of material, it is not an example of upcycled food, given
137 food is per definition for human consumption.

138

139 *Value*

140 The third crucial element is that the process involves an increase in value. This value can be of
141 two types. First, definitions of upcycled food (Spratt et al., 2020) or waste re-use in the circular
142 bioeconomy (Teigiserova et al., 2020) often refer to the (food) waste hierarchy (EC, 2008).
143 This hierarchy ranks actions to reduce waste by how favorable it is for the environment, giving
144 top priority to avoidance. Upcycling in this context means that the ingredient, product, or
145 process should contribute value by moving the use ‘back up’ to the upper levels in the
146 hierarchy. This benefit has a positive impact on the environment or society, as for example the
147 Upcycled Food Association underlines: society gains by a contribution to environmental

148 protection, reduction of strain on natural resources, and greater efficiency of the food system.
149 Second, definitions also stress that there can be an additional benefit and value of the product
150 itself, mostly for the user directly. This can result from the innovation entailed, as for example
151 expressed in the following definition “innovatively re-applied in new products with a greater
152 value as a result” (Peschel & Aschemann-Witzel, 2020, p. 1). For example, when the upcycling
153 increases fiber content of the food, the resulting product has a nutritional benefit for the user
154 directly.

155

156 **Introducing a two-folded definition**

157 On the basis of the three characteristics, we propose that there are in fact two types of upcycled
158 food which each have a distinct potential contribution to preserving natural resources. One is
159 avoiding that those resources which have gone into food production are wasted, thus
160 introducing upcycled foods through alternative use, the other is diversifying and broadening
161 the food resource base by introducing upcycled food through novel use. The crucial distinction
162 is based on the consumer perception of whether the starting point is food or not, that is, whether
163 it is currently perceived as edible or not.

164

165 *Upcycled food through alternative use*

166 The first is upcycling in an ‘alternative use sense’, because it is about food or ingredients that
167 could as well be eaten and are rescued from the threat of disposal, upcycling it in one way or
168 other into alternative foods, and contributing value to society through avoidance of food being
169 wasted. Because many current upcycled food examples are of this type, this first circle is larger
170 in the figure (see figure 1). These products contribute especially to *food waste* avoidance.

171

172 *Upcycled food through novel use*

173 The second is upcycling in a ‘novel use sense’. The difference to the first is that it starts with
174 ingredients that are not regarded or commonly seen as edible, but by upcycling these in one
175 way or other, results in new foods. This process contributes value to society through ensuring
176 these ingredients become food, thus leading to more food available. Because fewer upcycled
177 food examples are of this type, this second circle is smaller in Figure 1. These products make
178 use of inedible parts of food or uncover food potential in yet widely underused sources, and
179 they majorly contribute to avoidance of *food loss* because they untap a food potential. With
180 regard to the inverted waste hierarchy pyramid (EC, 2008), the starting point is then an
181 ingredient that is not even regarded as edible yet – which practically means that there is no
182 awareness yet of the wastage of potential for food taking place.

183 However, as individuals and societies differ by culture, practice, and awareness in what they
184 regard as edible in the first place, what is ‘novel use’ of something considered inedible for
185 some, can be commonplace as an edible ingredient for others. Therefore, the two circles
186 overlap. We suggest that the distinction between one and the other should hinge on consumer
187 and not on professional perception, but this necessarily means that there is overlap and a
188 dynamic difference.

189 Insert Figure 2

190

191 **Examples of upcycled foods**

192 Examples of ‘upcycled food in an alternative use sense’ are ketchup, soup or jam made from
193 surplus or suboptimal fruit and vegetable, bread gone stale or nearing/passing the date label
194 reprocessed into a beverage such as beer, or sunflower seed pressings and brewers spent grain
195 processed into flour instead of being used as feed (e.g. Grasso & Asioli, 2020). This can also

196 be examples where excess supermarket counter or canteen food is repurposed to new products,
197 for example soups, meals or broth (Aschemann-Witzel et al., 2017). This is food currently
198 wasted, often due to overproduction or because it is perceived as ‘suboptimal’ (Aschemann-
199 Witzel et al., 2005) - or side-streams regarded as edible but not used as food turned into
200 alternative foods and contributing value by avoidance of food waste. This upcycled food does
201 not avoid the use of resources such as water, energy, packaging material, transport, storage that
202 has already gone into the food being produced, and it adds use of further resources in the
203 process of upcycling, but it avoids the loss of the ingredients, the resources used in disposal,
204 and ensures the food is used as food after all.

205 Examples of ‘upcycled food in a novel use sense’ is spent coffee turned into flour, olive leaves
206 processed into crackers, fish skin made into a snack, protein extracted from grass (Aschemann-
207 Witzel & Peschel, 2019; Perito et al., 2019) or made from pine tree needles or bark. These are
208 ingredients or side-streams commonly regarded as unavoidable food waste or not as food in
209 the first place. Using these as food ingredients contributes to value by uncovering new food
210 potential that is currently overlooked. Note that many of these novel uses might fall under the
211 novel food regulation in in the European Union. However, given the novelty of the use is based
212 on the consumer perception, upcycled food in a novel use sense might as well also be examples
213 of food that are not novel to Europe, but are novel to the majority of today’s consumers. This
214 is also relevant when considering that upcycling might tap into ‘forgotten’ traditions or
215 practices from times of scarcity that most current consumers have not experienced. In fact, the
216 above-mentioned examples of grass as well as pine are sources of food that have been explored
217 or used decades ago, but today’s consumers are not aware of that.

218 Two examples of the overlap between alternative and novel use are given below and highlight
219 how dynamic and context dependent the distinction can be. One example of the overlap is
220 sweets made from the cashew nut fruit (see figure 2). Consumers of cashew ‘nuts’ in the

221 countries with colder climates are mostly unaware of the wastage and even of the existence of
222 the cashew fruit – for them, this is a novel use, because they did not know it can be eaten.
223 However, for consumers in the countries that grow cashew, producing sweets from the fruit is
224 an alternative use, because they might traditionally use the fruit, but they know about the waste
225 of the otherwise perfectly edible cashew fruit in the export-oriented production chain of cashew
226 nuts (Casju, 2022; Aschemann-Witzel et al., 2021). Another example is sunflower seed
227 pressings and brewers spent grain – we categorize this as alternative use because sunflower
228 seeds and grains are commonly regarded as edible ingredients by consumers, even though these
229 side-streams are currently fed to animals. However, from a food processing professional
230 standpoint, these are ingredients along a continuum of market diffusion and acceptance, with
231 spent coffee simply a relatively new idea, while brewers spent grain is more established. The
232 two examples given highlight that we suggest the distinction should hinge on what the major
233 consumer perception entails, and that it should change when this perception shifts over time.
234 In this sense, spent coffee grain and fish skin might as well become upcycled in an alternative
235 use sense, once a much greater share of consumers regards these as edible or a straightforward
236 source of food ingredients.

237 Insert Figure 3

238

239 **Boundaries of the value contribution due to dynamic interactions**

240 We suggest that adopting the two-folded definition of upcycled food can help pinpointing what
241 is upcycled food, and what is not, and sharpens awareness of the two contributions that
242 upcycling in the food sector can make – to food waste avoidance on the one hand, to food loss
243 avoidance by untapping food potential on the other hand. To safeguard that upcycled foods

244 contribute value to a sustainable food system, we caution that actors should be aware of two
245 boundaries of the value contribution by the respective two types of upcycled foods.

246 **First, the value of food otherwise wasted being turned into alternative foods needs to be**
247 **assessed on a case-by-case basis as well as continuously.** This is because when the
248 opportunity to use the ‘rescued food’ as food in its original state (re-)arises, this might as well
249 be more resource efficient. If that is the case, it would render the upcycling an inefficient
250 deviation. This is because the ‘rescuing’ of food in many cases only tackles the symptoms, the
251 actual wastage, but not the cause, such as standards, perception and overproduction. Being
252 aware of this ensures that the repurposing of the food to upcycling is well-considered against
253 other, maybe more favorable options.

254 To give an example: Reprocessing ugly fruit and vegetable into an alternative processed
255 product is only adding value to the extent that these fresh products cannot be sold. If consumers
256 aesthetic standards shift and a broader variety of ‘ugly’ fruit and vegetable can be sold ‘as is’,
257 doing so might be the more resource efficient option. Another example is old or close to/past
258 the date bakery products used to produce high-end alcoholic beverages. As long as the bakery
259 products are disposed as waste, this is of value. However, in case an opportunity arises to
260 redistribute the bakery products to populations in need before they become old, this might be
261 of even higher value from a sustainable development goal perspective. These opportunities
262 might be for example technological or societal innovations such as new digital applications
263 that can efficiently organize the redistribution.

264 **Second, upcycled ingredients and foods should only be called upcycled as long as they are**
265 **commonly wasted.** When the process of upcycling ingredients currently not regarded as edible
266 becomes a common and familiar process and is not innovative anymore, the food can also not
267 be called ‘upcycled’ anymore, because the ingredient has become a food ingredient in the

268 perception of most actors. Being aware of this ensures that the upcycling definition raises the
269 bar for future innovations.

270 To give an example: In the past, whey protein was a mere side-stream diverted to waste or feed
271 in dairy production in Northern Europe. In the wake of the protein trend, whey has been
272 successfully established as a much sought-after ingredient, at times even making whey the
273 more valuable ‘main-stream’ of the production. Now, it is not needed to call the use of whey
274 ‘upcycling’. Whey is well established as a food ingredient, and this is rightly so – this way the
275 focus is shifted to the next frontier in change of perception. The same will happen with other
276 upcycled food ingredients – once it is achieved, for example, that brewers’ spent grain is
277 commonly used for food, using this ingredient for food ceases to be an avoidance of food waste
278 – the ingredient is not ‘otherwise wasted’ anymore. Thus, with the dynamic change in
279 perception, the understanding of the ingredient’s must change as well, and with it the
280 communication to the end consumer.

281

282 **Conclusions and implications - what different stakeholders can do**

283 There is huge potential for reducing food loss and waste in the food system. There can be many
284 diverse and conflicting opinions about how best to reduce food waste. The idea of upcycled
285 food creates a lot of controversy. This is because it appears to simply re-introduce ‘old’ ideas
286 as part of a ‘fancy’ new market trend, but in particular, because many examples of upcycled
287 food currently seen in the market ‘only’ address the symptoms but not the root cause. Despite
288 of this, we argue that among the many routes to a sustainable and circular food system, the idea
289 entailed in upcycling has a huge potential to contribute.

290 For this to happen, the idea of upcycling needs to become 1) streamlined in how it is understood
291 to avoid confusion, 2) mainstream thinking among all food value chain members in order to

292 achieve upscaling, and 3) repeatedly re-assessed against the boundary conditions to check if a
293 particular application still delivers the value intended.

294 Of course, the idea of upcycling is not completely new – it is partly a re-establishment of the
295 ‘use all that you have’ thinking or ‘frugality’ (Aschemann-Witzel et al., 2022). Traditionally,
296 in times of scarce resources, a lot of produce has been made into foods in diverse forms. This
297 can be also seen in traditional recipes and cookbooks. This diversity was reduced in the wake
298 of industrialization of agriculture and food production, where not every side-stream or part of
299 a produce was economical to process further. Also, consumer preferences have shifted to the
300 ‘best parts’ in increasingly affluent societies, creating side-streams that end as waste or not as
301 food due to lack of demand. This is why cashew fruit are wasted in production focused solely
302 on the cashew nuts, or less-valuable parts of slaughtered animals end as pet food. What is new
303 in the interest in upcycling today is the motivation to establish a more sustainable food system,
304 mitigate environmental effects and climate change. The motivation has shifted from economic
305 scarcity to voluntary natural resource efficiency.

306 To establish upcycling of yet underused or otherwise wasted ingredients across the system
307 requires circularity or system thinking by all stakeholders. Systems thinking in the food system
308 means being aware of the interdependencies and complexities, such as the boundary conditions
309 described in this perspective, and to take them into account when seeking the best solution in
310 each value chain and case (e.g. Meadows, 2008). This awareness and thinking is needed among
311 both value chain stakeholders, and consumers. Currently, barriers to the circular economy are
312 not that much of technological nature – the most prominent barriers have been identified to be
313 company and consumer patterns of practices and thinking (Kirchherr et al., 2018).

314

315 *Value chain stakeholders*

316 Producers and processors should push harder to seek and establish alternative uses and new
317 food applications, even when the business model is not apparent from the start (Donner et al.,
318 2020). Collaborations and knowledge exchange across and between value chains is key for
319 this, as well as a resolute sustainability strategy that supports employees in this endeavor and
320 channels financial investments in respective research and innovation. Once an upcycled food
321 production is established, stakeholders should frequently check if the solution chosen is still
322 creating most value for society – or if there is a better and more efficient opportunity arising.

323

324 *Consumer-citizens*

325 Consumers can support food waste avoidance through upcycling via their purchase behavior
326 for these products and the new ingredients or processing behind them. This requires more
327 awareness and knowledge about how upcycled food contributes to food waste avoidance,
328 climate change mitigation, and at times provides even a nutritional benefit to the user. This
329 calls for education and information efforts. In the long run, citizens might also need to become
330 active supporters of upcycling in society via their behavior, as for example through their use
331 of water, their waste treatment and sorting, or composting, supporting e.g. local nutrient cycles.

332

333 **References**

- 334 Adıgüzel, F., & Donato, C. (2021). Proud to be sustainable: Upcycled versus recycled luxury
335 products. *Journal of Business Research*, *130*, 137–146.
336 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.03.033>
- 337 Aschemann-Witzel, J., de Hooge, I., Amani, P., Bech-Larsen, T. & Oostindjer, M. (2015).
338 Consumer-related food waste: Causes and potential for action. *Sustainability*, *7* (6), 6457–
339 77.
- 340 Aschemann-Witzel, J. (2016). Waste not, want not, emit less. *Science*, *352*(6284), 408–409.
341 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf2978>
- 342 Aschemann-Witzel, J., de Hooge, I. E., Rohm, H., Normann, A., Bossle, M. B., Grønhøj, A.,
343 & Oostindjer, M. (2017). Key characteristics and success factors of supply chain initiatives
344 tackling consumer-related food waste – A multiple case study. *Journal of Cleaner*
345 *Production*. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.11.173>
- 346 Aschemann-Witzel, J., Asioli, D., Banovic, M., Perito, M. A., & Peschel, A. O. [Anne Odile]
347 (2022). Communicating upcycled foods: Frugality framing supports acceptance of
348 sustainable product innovations. *Food Quality and Preference*, *100*, 104596.
349 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2022.104596>
- 350 Aschemann-Witzel, J., Bizzo, H. R., Doria Chaves, Ana Carolina S., Faria-Machado, A. F.,
351 Gomes Soares, A., Oliveira Fonseca, M. J. de, . . . Rosenthal, A. (2021). Sustainable use of
352 tropical fruits? Challenges and opportunities of applying the waste-to-value concept to
353 international value chains. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 1–13.
354 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2021.1963665>
- 355 Aschemann-Witzel, J., & Peschel, A. O. (2019). How circular will you eat? The sustainability
356 challenge in food and consumer reaction to either waste-to-value or yet underused novel

- 357 ingredients in food. *Food Quality and Preference*, 77, 15–20.
358 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2019.04.012>
- 359 Aschemann-Witzel, J., & Stangherlin, I. D. C. (2021). Upcycled by-product use in agri-food
360 systems from a consumer perspective: A review of what we know, and what is missing.
361 *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 168, 120749.
362 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120749>
- 363 Bhatt, S., Lee, J., Deutsch, J., Ayaz, H., Fulton, B., & Suri, R. (2018). From food waste to
364 value-added surplus products (VASP): Consumer acceptance of a novel food product
365 category. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 17(1), 57–63. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1689>
- 366 Bhatt, S., Ye, H., Deutsch, J., Ayaz, H., & Suri, R. (2020). Consumers' willingness to pay for
367 upcycled foods. *Food Quality and Preference*, 86, 104035.
368 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2020.104035>
- 369 Braungart, M., McDonough, W., & Bollinger, A. (2007). Cradle-to-cradle design: creating
370 healthy emissions – a strategy for eco-effective product and system design. *Journal of*
371 *Cleaner Production*, 15(13), 1337–1348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2006.08.003>
- 372 Bridgens, B., Powell, M., Farmer, G., Walsh, C., Reed, E., Royapoor, M., . . . Heidrich, O.
373 (2018). Creative upcycling: Reconnecting people, materials and place through making.
374 *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 189, 145–154.
375 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.317>
- 376 BusinessWire (2021). Whole Foods Market Forecasts Top 10 Food Trends for 2021. Retrieved
377 from [https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20201019005038/en/Whole-Foods-](https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20201019005038/en/Whole-Foods-Market-Forecasts-Top-10-Food-Trends-for-2021)
378 [Market-Forecasts-Top-10-Food-Trends-for-2021](https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20201019005038/en/Whole-Foods-Market-Forecasts-Top-10-Food-Trends-for-2021)
- 379 Casju (2022). Cashew fruit caramels. Retrieved from <https://www.casju.dk/>

- 380 Coderoni, S., & Perito, M. A. (2020). Sustainable consumption in the circular economy. An
381 analysis of consumers' purchase intentions for waste-to-value food. *Journal of Cleaner*
382 *Production*, 252, 119870. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119870>
- 383 Crippa, M., Solazzo, E., Guizzardi, D., Monforti-Ferrario, F., Tubiello, F. N., & Leip, A.
384 (2021). Food systems are responsible for a third of global anthropogenic GHG emissions.
385 *Nature Food*, 2(3), 198–209. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00225-9>
- 386 Donner, M., Gohier, R., & Vries, H. de (2020). A new circular business model typology for
387 creating value from agro-waste. *Science of the Total Environment*, 716, 137065.
388 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137065>
- 389 EC (2008). Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC (WFD). Retrieved from [https://eur-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32008L0098&from=EN)
390 [lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32008L0098&from=EN](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32008L0098&from=EN)
- 391 EC (2020). European Commission, Directorate-General for Communication, Circular
392 economy action plan: for a cleaner and more competitive Europe. Retrieved from
393 <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2779/05068>
- 394 EC (2020). Farm to Fork Strategy: For a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food
395 system. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/food/horizontal-topics/farm-fork-strategy_en
- 396 EC (2020). Report of the 5th SCAR Foresight Exercise Expert Group - Natural resources and
397 food systems: Transitions towards a 'safe and just' operating space. Retrieved from
398 [https://scar-europe.org/images/FORESIGHT/FINAL-REPORT-5th-SCAR-Foresight-](https://scar-europe.org/images/FORESIGHT/FINAL-REPORT-5th-SCAR-Foresight-Exercise.pdf)
399 [Exercise.pdf](https://scar-europe.org/images/FORESIGHT/FINAL-REPORT-5th-SCAR-Foresight-Exercise.pdf)
- 400 EC (2022). EU Platform on Food Losses and Food Waste. Retrieved from
401 [https://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food-waste/eu-actions-against-food-waste/eu-platform-](https://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food-waste/eu-actions-against-food-waste/eu-platform-food-losses-and-food-waste_en)
402 [food-losses-and-food-waste_en](https://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food-waste/eu-actions-against-food-waste/eu-platform-food-losses-and-food-waste_en)

- 403 Ellen MacArthur Foundation (2019). Circularity Indicators. An Approach to Measuring
404 Circularity, Methodology. Retrieved from [https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/material-](https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/material-circularity-indicator)
405 [circularity-indicator](https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/material-circularity-indicator)
- 406 Eurobarometer (2021). Eurobarometer 513 - Climate Action and the Environment, Climate
407 Change. Retrieved from <https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/surveys/detail/2273>
- 408 Euromonitor International (2022). Top 10 global consumer trends 2022. Retrieved from
409 <https://www.euromonitor.com/article/what-are-the-10-global-consumer-trends-in-2022>
- 410 FAO (2021). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2021. Transforming food
411 systems for food security, improved nutrition and affordable healthy diets for all. Rome,
412 FAO.: FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. Retrieved from
413 <https://doi.org/10.4060/cb4474en>
- 414 FAO (2022). FAO Food Price Index. Retrieved from
415 <https://www.fao.org/worldfoodsituation/foodpricesindex/en/>
- 416 FAO (2022). Technical Platform on the Measurement and Reduction of Food Loss and Waste.
417 Retrieved from <https://www.fao.org/platform-food-loss-waste/en/>
- 418 FMCG Gurus (2022). FMCG Gurus – Top Ten Trends for 2022 – Global Report. Retrieved
419 from <https://fmcggurus.com/reports/fmcg-gurus-top-ten-trends-for-2022-global-report/>
- 420 Foley, J. A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K. A., Cassidy, E. S., Gerber, J. S., Johnston, M., . . .
421 Zaks, D. P. M. (2011). Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature*, 478(7369), 337–342.
422 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10452>
- 423 Forbes (2021). Upcycled food is the coolest trend you’ve probably never heard of. Retrieved
424 from [https://www.forbes.com/sites/daphneewingchow/2021/05/31/upcycled-food-is-the-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/daphneewingchow/2021/05/31/upcycled-food-is-the-coolest-trend-you-probably-never-heard-of/?sh=352135e2f0ab)
425 [coolest-trend-you-probably-never-heard-of/?sh=352135e2f0ab](https://www.forbes.com/sites/daphneewingchow/2021/05/31/upcycled-food-is-the-coolest-trend-you-probably-never-heard-of/?sh=352135e2f0ab)


- 426 Godfray, H. C. J., Beddington, J. R., Crute, I. R., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J. F., . . .
427 Toulmin, C. (2010). Food security: The challenge of feeding 9 billion people. *Science*,
428 327(5967), 812–818. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1185383>
- 429 Grasso, S., & Asioli, D. (2020). Consumer preferences for upcycled ingredients: A case study
430 with biscuits. *Food Quality and Preference*, 84, 103951.
431 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2020.103951>
- 432 Hasegawa, T., Sakurai, G., Fujimori, S., Takahashi, K., Hijioka, Y., & Masui, T. (2021).
433 Extreme climate events increase risk of global food insecurity and adaptation needs. *Nature*
434 *Food*, 2(8), 587–595. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00335-4>
- 435 IPCC (2019). Special report: special report on climate change and land: chapter 5. Retrieved
436 from <https://www.ipcc.ch/srccl/chapter/chapter-5/>
- 437 Kamleitner, B., Thürridl, C., & Martin, B. A. (2019). A Cinderella Story: How Past Identity
438 Salience Boosts Demand for Repurposed Products. *Journal of Marketing*, 83(6), 76–92.
439 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919872156>
- 440 Kirchherr, J., Piscicelli, L., Bour, R., Kostense-Smit, E., Muller, J., Huibrechtse-Truijens, A.,
441 & Hekkert, M. (2018). Barriers to the Circular Economy: Evidence From the European
442 Union (EU). *Ecological Economics*, 150, 264–272.
443 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.04.028>
- 444 Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in Systems: A Primer: A primer* ([11th printing]). White
445 River Junction, Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- 446 Perito, M. A., Di Fonzo, A., Sansone, M., & Russo, C. (2020). Consumer acceptance of food
447 obtained from olive by-products. *British Food Journal*, 122(1), 212–226.
448 <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-03-2019-0197>

- 449 Peschel, A. O., & Aschemann-Witzel, J. (2020). Sell more for less or less for more? The role
450 of transparency in consumer response to upcycled food products. *Journal of Cleaner*
451 *Production*, 273, 122884. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122884>
- 452 Poore J., & Nemecek T. (2018). Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers
453 and consumers. *Science*, 360(6392), 987–992. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaq0216>
- 454 Spratt, O., Suri, R., & Deutsch, J. (2021). Defining Upcycled Food Products. *Journal of*
455 *Culinary Science & Technology*, 19(6), 485–496.
456 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15428052.2020.1790074>
- 457 Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., . . .
458 Sörlin, S. (2015). Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet.
459 *Science*, 347(6223), 1259855. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855>
- 460 Teigiserova, D. A., Hamelin, L., & Thomsen, M. (2020). Towards transparent valorization of
461 food surplus, waste and loss: Clarifying definitions, food waste hierarchy, and role in the
462 circular economy. *Science of the Total Environment*, 706, 136033.
463 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.136033>
- 464 The Washington Post (2021). Upcycling food waste onto our plates is a new effort. But will
465 consumers find it appetizing? Retrieved from
466 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/science/upcycling-food-waste/2021/09/17/90fd81b2-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/science/upcycling-food-waste/2021/09/17/90fd81b2-0045-11ec-85f2-b871803f65e4_story.html)
467 [0045-11ec-85f2-b871803f65e4_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/science/upcycling-food-waste/2021/09/17/90fd81b2-0045-11ec-85f2-b871803f65e4_story.html)
- 468 UNEP (2022, May 5). UNEP Food Waste Index Report 2021. Retrieved from
469 <https://www.unep.org/resources/report/unep-food-waste-index-report-2021>
- 470 Upcycled Food Association (2022). Retrieved from <https://www.upcycledfood.org/>

- 471 Upcycled foods definition task force (2020). Defining Upcycled Foods: A Definition for Use
472 Across Industry, Government, and Academia. Retrieved from [https://chlpi.org/wp-](https://chlpi.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Upcycled-Food_Definition.pdf)
473 [content/uploads/2013/12/Upcycled-Food_Definition.pdf](https://chlpi.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Upcycled-Food_Definition.pdf)
- 474 Van Dijk, M., Morley, T., Rau, M. L., & Saghai, Y. (2021). A meta-analysis of projected
475 global food demand and population at risk of hunger for the period 2010–2050. *Nature*
476 *Food*, 2(7), 494–501. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00322-9>
- 477 WFP (2022). #STOPTHEWASTE. Retrieved from [https://www.wfp.org/support-](https://www.wfp.org/support-us/voices/stop-waste)
478 [us/voices/stop-waste](https://www.wfp.org/support-us/voices/stop-waste)
- 479 Willet, W. et al. (2019). Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy
480 diets from sustainable food systems. *Lancet*, Feb 2; 393 (10170), 447-492. doi:
481 [10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31788-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4).
- 482 Wilson, M. (2016). When creative consumers go green: understanding consumer upcycling.
483 *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 25(4), 394–399. [https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-](https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-09-2015-0972)
484 [09-2015-0972](https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-09-2015-0972)


Journal Pre-proof

Figure 1. A simplified waste hierarchy and the contribution of upcycling.




Source: Own.

Figure 2. Two-folded definition of upcycled food.



Source: Own.

Figure 3. Cashew fruit as an example for upcycling in food production, and example of sweets made of cashew fruit.



Source: Colourbox and <https://www.casju.dk/>.

The dual role of upcycling in reducing food loss and waste

- Upcycling can tackle food waste but its definition and boundaries are unclear
- We introduce two-folded definition differentiating alternative versus novel use
- Each of the two types has an own contribution to food loss and waste
- We outline the boundaries arising from the dynamic and interdependent nature of upcycling