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*Abstract*

The United Nations’ target for halving Food Waste (FW) and the related actions required by *The 2030 Agenda* should be achieved in just six years, and there is a lot to be done. Considering that FW worldwide is causing 8% to 10% of GHG, the phenomenon has become a preoccupation for the European Union (EU). As a member state, Romania is aligned with the EU policy lines regarding environment and sustainable development. Bearing in mind the consumption-based economic model, the governmental approaches and challenges regarding environmental and sustainable development issues, a robust civil society is needed to influence the adoption of efficacious and improved public policies regarding FW and to contribute to maintaining green topics on the public agenda. This paper aims to identify the factors that explain civil society's ability to influence public policies on FW and keep these green topics on the governmental agenda. In this sense, I have carried out a literature review to identify the current situation and the levers available to Romanian civil society and data analysis. Data was gathered via 11 semi-structured in-depth interviews with representatives of central public authorities, HoReCa, civil society, and Romanian consumers conducted in the spring of 2022 for my dissertation paper. The interviews revealed that civil society as a soft power can influence Romanian public policies regarding FW and has a crucial role in covering the critical areas of education, communication, awareness, and changing consumer behaviour. Moreover, the data underlines that, second to the central authorities, civil society is the next stakeholder responsible for taking action to reduce FW. The development and evolution of a solid and vigilant civil society is essential for influencing the adoption of effective and improved public policies regarding FW and contributes to maintaining green topics on the public agenda in order to achieve the ambitious goals set by the international community, which aim at the well-being of people, and the Planet, but also of the future generations.
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 *Current debates and Policy evolutions in the field*

 Food Waste is a recent concern for world leaders and scholars, although it has existed for decades and is causing pollution and other side effects. The issue of food waste effects on the environment has been on international forums’ agenda since 1979 along with the World Climate Conference, which called nations “to halt preventable environmental damage”, and afterwards with the creation of the United Nations (UN) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in 1988 (Smith 2020: 41). However, the awareness of food waste as a global phenomenon came much later. After more than 30 years, in 2011, a few concrete initiatives emerged: “Save Food”, which advanced the subject of global food losses onto the political and economic agenda in Germany and the Food and Agriculture Organization’s (FAO) Communication informing that around 1/3 of the world’s food was lost or wasted every year. Two years later, FAO launched the first study on FW’s environmental impact. Following this study, the topic of food waste is gaining global attention.

 In September 2015, the UN General Assembly adopted *The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* with 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 targets to mitigate and stop food loss and waste. All world leaders have been committed to achieving the targets of this “ambitious vision for sustainable development’. In this context, the European Union claims that it is “taking the issue of tackling food waste very seriously” (The European Commission 2024). In this context, the EU launched in 2020 the *Circular Economy’s Action Plan* and the *Farm to Fork Strategy* as an essential part of the well-known *European Green Deal*. Moreover, after four years, these EU policies caused large protests from European farmers at the beginning of February 2024 across important Member States such as France, Italy and Belgium.

 Food waste is included in Sustainable Development Goal 12 of the 2030 Agenda - *Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns*, the target 12.3 for *halving food waste per capita at the retail and consumer level and reducing food losses during production and supply chains by the end of this decade*. FW is also related to Sustainable Development Goal 2 - *Zero hunger* (UN 2015). Empirical data reveals that, in 2022, 1.05 billion tonnes of food were wasted in households, food service and retail, compared to 931 million tonnes in 2019 (Food Index Report UNEP, 2024: 46), causing 8% to 10% of global greenhouse gas emissions (Food Index Report UNEP, 2021: 20). Households produce over 60% (i.e. 631 million tonnes), food service 28% and retail 12%. According to the Food Waste Index 2024, released at the end of March 2024 by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), this amounts to 132 kilogrammes of food wasted per capita per year, compared to 121 kilograms per capita per year in 2019. Related to these data, FAO (2023: 7-8) estimates that in 2022, between 691 and 783 million people worldwide faced hunger, representing up to 122 million more than in 2019. On the other hand, the World Bank estimated in 2020 that the food wasted globally is worth more than US$1 trillion (Food Index Report UNEP, 2024: 2).

 At the European Union’s level, data indicate that in 2021, there were more than 58 million tonnes of fresh mass of food waste, from which 54% of the total FW (i.e. 31 million tonnes of fresh mass) were produced by households, which has a 132 billion euro market value calculated for the underlying asset (The European Commission 2023: 42). During the second year of the COVID-19 epidemic, in 2021, the EU generated approximately 131 kilogrammes of food waste per inhabitant, from which 70 kg per inhabitant was provided at household level (Eurostat 2023). As a member of the EU, Romania is aligned and committed to the European Union’s green policies regarding food waste and all other environmental problems. According to the Study of Food Waste (SFWR) in Romania (SFWR, 2021: 6), Romania started this process by preparing the accession to the EU. With “low confidence” regarding the reported data, Romania produces over 1.32 million tonnes in households, representing 67 kilogrammes of FW per inhabitant per year, with no data regarding food services and retail (Food Index Report UNEP, 2024: 166).

The Romanian authorities claim that they are concerned about the food waste problem. Therefore, Romania adopted the *National Action Plan on Combating Food Waste* in 2014, the *Law No. 217 on reducing food waste, the so-called “Anti-Food Waste Law”,* adopted in 2016, the *Sustainable Development Strategy 2030* in 2018, and modified the Anti-Food Waste Law in 2024. Few national campaigns, debates and conferences were initiated[[1]](#footnote-1) and conducted in partnership with academic and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).

 Considering the purpose of public policies and active Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations (ENGOs) but also approaches and challenges regarding environmental and sustainable development issues, this article hypothesises that *a robust civil society influences the adoption of efficacious and improved public policies regarding FW and contributes to maintaining green topics on the public agenda*. This paper aims to identify the factors that explain civil society's ability to influence public policies on FW and keep these green topics on the governmental agenda. In this sense, I have carried out a literature review to identify the current situation and the levers available to Romanian civil society and data analysis. Data was gathered via 11 semi-structured in-depth interviews with representatives of central public authorities, HoReCa, civil society, and Romanian consumers conducted in the spring of 2022. The interviews revealed that second to the central authorities, civil society is the next stakeholder responsible for taking action to reduce FW. Moreover, the data underlines that civil society, as an essential stakeholder, can influence Romanian public policies regarding FW and has a crucial role in covering the critical areas of education, communication, awareness, and changing consumer behaviour, as identified through the interviews.

 *The state of Civil Society*

Scholars highlight that, nowadays, civil society is in the attention of democratic governments, holding a pivotal role in maintaining the health of democracies, fulfilling international goals regarding the management of environmental problems and achieving goals related to sustainable development[[2]](#footnote-2).

 Civil society is a polysemantic concept with “variable geometry”, depending on the specific context in which it is used, on the era and society, and also on the lexical or ideological evolution, being in a “continuous redefinition” (Pirvulescu 2016: 22). For Dinham (2009: 50), civil society is “understood as that intermediate realm somewhere between the nation state and the individual”, but the most popular definition is that of civil society as a collection of institutions functioning as intermediaries between the government, the family (e.g. individuals, households), and the economic production/the market (Kopecký and Mudde 2003:5).

 Moreover, Chandhoke (2007: 607) underlines that civil society was rediscovered and given prominence in political practices after causing the fall of some mighty nations, such as the Stalinist states of Eastern and Central Europe and Latin American military regimes. Afterwards, in the 1990s, civil society became “a mantra for everyone from presidents to political scientists”, and civil society became a “key element of the post-cold-war zeitgeist” (Carothers 2000: 19). In his turn, Gramsci stated that “states that do not possess civil societies are more vulnerable than those that do possess” (apud Chandhoke 2007: 611). Furthermore, Fukuyama (1995: 4-12) underlines that “liberal political and economic institutions depend upon a healthy and dynamic civil society for their vitality”, explaining the crucial role of social capital and the trust level within society. In his turn, Chandhoke (2007: 609) underlines that civil society is considered nowadays an “answer to the malaise of the contemporary world”.

 In addition, Pirvulescu (2016: 19) underlines that, for many contemporary scholars, civil society refers to a type of soft power, expressing “the different ways of actively representing the interest groups and the game of influence”. The scholar explains that civil society is contained in three explanatory models generated by the liberal paradigm: 1) the *organic-communitarian model*; 2) the *deliberative model*; and 3) the *cognitive model[[3]](#footnote-3)* (Pirvulescu 2016: 19-21).

` Furthermore, Anheier (2017: 4-5) considers that civil society is part of the New Public Managementmodel, defined as “an arena of self-organization of citizens and established interests seeking voice and influence” and facing inevitable weaknesses such as *resource inadequacy*, *paternalism*, *free-riders*, and *particularism*. Furthermore, Smismans (2006: 4-5) underlines that the concept is a “recent entrant at the European level”, being launched into policy rhetoric alongside the Prodi Commission’ White Paper on European Governance (July 2001) “as a way to improve both the efficiency and legitimacy of European governance”.

 On the other hand, scholars consider the growing involvement of civil society in policy-making over the past few decades to be one of the most significant trends (Wuthnow 2004; Pirvulescu 2016; Anheier 2017). Dinham underlines that “the public policy matrix” is closely related to the members of civil society who “inform and influence it” (Dinham 2009: 50). Furthermore, Wuthnow (2004: 286) argues that when scholars research the relationship between public policies and NGOs, “they usually emphasise how civil society can shape public policy”.

 In this light, Anheier (2017: 6) invokes that CSOs-state relation is “complex and multifaceted”, governments seeing differently the roles that civil society can play in the future: 1) CSOs primarily as service providers and disregard their advocacy capabilities: 2) sources of new ideas and innovations; and 3) organizations that interfere with the policy-making process, attempting to exert influence or even dictate governmental agendas.

 In addition, scholars consider that civil society is one of the most important stakeholders, even though the latter is contested as a concept in the academic area (Bryson, Patton and Bowman 2010; Caniato et al. 2014; Miles 2015; Morone and Imbert 2020; Archip et al. 2023). Bryson, Patton and Bowman (2010: 1) define *stakeholders* as “individuals, groups, or organizations that can affect or are affected by an evaluation process and/or its ﬁndings[[4]](#footnote-4)”, but Miles argues that the concept is “an essentially contested one” (Miles 2015: 437-459). Caniato and colleagues argue that, forth to the governmental authorities, the private sector, and academia, civil society is a broad stakeholder which covers public awareness, health, and environmental protection, along with the local community and media (2014: 941-942).

 In a highly complex world, civil society faces numerous challenges and obstacles, which prevent them from developing and evolving to make a better world, at least for bona fide NGOs that have the good of society at the centre of their vision and mission. In this light, Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu point out (2002: 88) that also the “funding matters”, aiming at the funding co-dependency, which is unlikely to change but does raise some questions regarding the independence of NGO research and analysis, calling for transparency and accountability. Furthermore, Heemeryck (2018: 257) states that “financially, the NGOs are fully dependent on their funders”. In addition, Nastase and colleagues (2019: 852- 853) argue that the lack of civic culture is associated with both the dearth or fragility of independent civil society organisations and the non-participatory method of local administration.

*The Civil Society and the Green agenda*

 Over the past years, there has been a noticeable shift in the public and academic spheres towards environmental issues. This shift can be traced back to the intensified efforts of the UN and the EU in combating climate change and other environmental problems since 2015, as well as to the increased involvement of the political sphere. Smismans (2006: 174) argues that environmental policy, which initially emerged due to public pressure and environmental movements, has now expanded to encompass a wide range of issues, including tourism, agriculture, and transportation, as well as new problem areas like climate change.

In this light, scholars prefer to approach civil society involvement in relation to global environmental governance (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu 2002; Robert et al. 2004; Bernauer 2023), but they also approach the national and local dimensions (O'Brien 2009; Böhmelt 2013). Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu (2002: 77-78) identify five key roles of civil society regarding global environmental governance, which I also consider valid for domestic activities: a) information collection and dissemination; b) policy development consultation; c) policy implementation; d) assessment and monitoring; and e) advocacy for environmental justice. The authors explain that a wide range of local, national, regional, and worldwide NGOs with a variety of missions devoted to environmental protection, sustainable development, poverty reduction, animal welfare, and other issues are among the non-governmental organizations participating in environmental governance (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu 2002: 77-78).

Considering the levers used by civil society to maintain or change the green agenda, Dodge (2014: 161) explains that CSOs[[5]](#footnote-5) are using storylines to influence the dynamics of the deliberative process and to promote their perspectives on environmental issues and the formulation of public policy, regardless of existing barriers or challenges. The scholar underlines that civil society specifically uses storylines to: a) “set the agenda for environmental hazards”; b) create the structure of public discourse by altering the rules; c) create the content of public discourse by forming meanings around environmental policy; and d) couple/align forums, arenas, and courts throughout the system (Dodge 2014: 161).

 In his turn, O’Brien (2009: 145-146) argues that the status of ENGOs has evolved over time, moving towards professionalism and collaborative efforts with administrative establishments. This shift signifies a departure from non-conventional social actions. The scholar further emphasises that NGOs recognise the importance of increasing public involvement in shaping government actions and note that believing in the government’s ability to provide solutions can hinder change in this area (O’Brien 2009: 151).

Moreover, UNEP considers civil society (i.e. NGOs, trade associations and research organizations) as a third party often playing a pivotal role in public-private partnerships (PPP), not just for their involvement but also for the credibility they bring to PPP through negotiations, execution, and management. Their impartiality, honesty, and ability to provide unbiased, private counsel free from conflicting interests make them a trusted partner in these partnerships (Food Index Report 2024: 90).

 In addition, Smismans (2006: 174-202) points out that scholars like Wilson mentioned that, at the EU level, in the late 1980s, environmentalists, consumer and tax-payer groups were excluded from the policy process, which is no longer the case taking into account that civil society players have “a crucial role in providing the Commission with information, expertise and strategies”, and validation. The author reveals that civil society actors have proven their capacity to impact EU consumer and environmental protection laws, being significant players in applying environmental laws but also in overseeing their implementation (Smismans 2006: 204-205). Smismans (2006: 205) concludes that, in this way, ENGOs are acting as “watchdogs” for how EU policies are implemented at the national level and as monitoring agencies in general.

 On the other hand, moving towards the domestic dimension, Böhmelt (2013: 702) explains that if governments are unable to gather data regarding climate change, they can turn to ENGOs, who invest significant resources in policy research and provide data, analysis, and knowledge. The scholar highlights that, given the history of civil society advocacy through participation in UNFCCC negotiation delegations, ENGOs will not be able to influence or alter state policy regarding climate change, compared to the corporate organisations' lobbying success (Böhmelt 2013: 710), and O'Brien (2009: 153) adds that ENGOs participation is somewhat tolerated than being sincerely welcomed.

 Furthermore, related to nations’ international cooperative behaviour, Robert and colleagues (2004:39) invoke the importance of the number of ENGOs registered in a state as one of the most significant indicators. The scholars emphasise that “the number of [E]NGOs in a nation appears virtually synonymous with its likelihood to participate in environmental treaties” (Robert et al. 2004:39). Extrapolating from this argument, one might consider that the number of ENGOs might be a crucial indicator for efficient environmental public policies and maintaining the green agenda at public and governmental attention. Therefore, the development and evolution of a solid and vigilant civil society are essential for influencing the adoption of efficacious and improved public policies regarding FW. It also contributes to maintaining green topics on the public agenda to achieve the ambitious goals set by the international community, which aim at the well-being of people and the Planet, as well as future generations.

 *The state of Civil Society in Romania*

The Communist regime in Romania played an essential role in shaping the development of civil society. It hindered the establishment of inclusive and participatory modes of governance by replacing grassroots civil society organisations with top-down, centralised structures for control (Kluvánková-Oravská et al. 2009; Stringer and Paavola 2013). The NGO sector, however, emerged swiftly following the fall of the Ceausescu regime in 1989, advocating for the preservation of the environment, cultural heritage, and democratic ideals (Parau 2009: 121). Despite the challenges it faced, such as the Romanians’ distrust in formal organisations and a preference for private/informal networking, the sector stabilised over time[[6]](#footnote-6) with the passage of the 2000 Government Ordinance on Associations and Foundations and other dedicated laws, and the growth of a more qualified labour force (O'Brien 2009: 150).

 Furthermore, Parau (2009: 137) argues that the level of empowerment of civil society depends on the stage of accession the state is going through, underlining that when the Executive is hostile, it tends to limit itself during the final stages of accession negotiations. The scholar explains that, in Romania’s case, the empowerment of NGOs resulted from the Executive's overriding desire for EU membership and its acceptance into the global community, giving rise to an advocacy network that has been trying to impede it. In addition, Heemeryck (2018: 257) considers that the most influential NGOs in Romania work in democratisation and the development of civil society, most of them becoming solid due to the significant involvement of US and European organisations. The scholar observes that the 2007 financial crisis has had little effect on the Romanian NGO’s public standing, defying all predictions and appearing extraordinarily resilient, much like multinational enterprises (Heemeryck 2018: 259).

 On the other hand, Margarit (2018: 219) underlines that Romania's public sphere had one of the most turbulent and persistent periods of popular mobilisation and civil unrest in its recent post-communist history between 2013 and 2015, beginning with the anti-fracking campaign and the protests against mining exploitation in Rosia Montana and culminating in the Colectiv Revolution. “In a country where the communist past left deep scars, the social movements of the past four years could not pass unnoticed. Moreover, these events marked the rise of an authentic civil society, willing to prove its opposition toward the political actors and decisions and, simultaneously, to demand them to act accountably and legitimately”, argues the scholar (Margarit 2018: 219).

 *The evolution of the Romanian ENGOs*

 Romania's environmental preoccupations began to take shape with a conservation attitude emerging spontaneously after the fall of Communism in 1990, despite the initial governmental indifference to the environment (Stringer and Paavola 2013: 141). Furthermore, Stringer and Paavola (2013: 141) highlight that the political party that assumed control of Romania after the 1990 elections harboured mistrust towards civil society, hindering the development of Romanian ENGOs. These ENGOs represented only 5% of the total number of NGOs, and most of them were local or regional players with limited influence or awareness on a national scale. Moreover, the scholars resumed the idea that the interest of the government and the nation's scientific community in environmental policies increased once the EU accession, which required and expected the Romanian authorities to address ecological issues, such as biodiversity conservation and environmental degradation (Stringer and Paavola 2013: 141).

 With the advent of Europeanization in Romania, the environmental sector, though weaker, presented more opportunities for social players, albeit with limited capacity to utilize them (O’Brien 2009:150-153). In contrast to Hungary and Poland, Romania was considered an “environmental laggard”, and therefore, Europeanization[[7]](#footnote-7) had a profound influence on environmental action there (Börzel and Buzogány, 2010: 718). Stringer and Paavola (2013: 144) also underline that Romania’s transition towards more inclusive environmental governance methods has been significantly bolstered by its EU membership, but “the lack of civil society remains a barrier to the more widespread internalization of conservation”.

 In addition, Jiglau (2016: 221) invokes that the collaborative efforts of Romanian ENGOs with European associations or networks of associations, their participation in international conferences and events, and their experience exchanges with other NGOs have played a pivotal role in the professionalization of environmental organizations. The scholar highlights that this cooperation has led to the emergence of the first think tanks or advocacy-focused organizations, which have been instrumental in implementing Community legislation, showcasing successful case studies from European nations, and creating pilot initiatives, mainly locally (Jiglau 2016: 221).

 Furthermore, O'Brien (2009: 155) underlines that although Romania has a shorter history of transparency, it has made progress in this area with the establishment of laws creating rights of participation and access to information, but environmental issues are still low on the political agenda, and participation is seen more as a duty than a necessity[[8]](#footnote-8). The author concludes that, although Romanian ENGOs participate in decisions that are peripheral to themselves, and environmental issues continue to be side-lined in favour of economic development, there are indications that they are starting to take a more active part in influencing policy and decision-making processes (O’Brien 2009: 155).

 Nevertheless, following “two big scandals” which sparked environmental protests and made authorities aware of the influence of NGOs[[9]](#footnote-9), the investment projects with a significant impact on the environment, the Dracula Land in Sighisoara in 2001 and the Rosia Montana mining operation in 2002, Romania's environmental status changed (O'Brien 2009: 152). Along with initiating these two projects, new local organizations that opposed them also appeared, such as the Sustainable Sighisoara Association and the Alburnus Maior Association (Jiglau 2016: 221).

 Hitherto, the most famous example of an environmental social movement in Romania was the one caused by the Rosia Montana mining project that generated the Salvati Rosia Montana (SRM) movement[[10]](#footnote-10), also known as “the Romanian Autumn”. Margarit (2018: 220) considers that this movement is the most complex of all the Romanian protests because of demonstrated cooperation on local, national, and international levels, serving as the impetus for future Romanian civic movements and undoubtedly had an impact on how they developed and were implemented. The non-heterogeneous environmental mobilization brought together residents of Rosia Montana and its environs, NGOs[[11]](#footnote-11) operating locally, nationally, and internationally, coalitions of NGOs, unofficial organisations, trade unions, professional associations, universities, and other academic bodies, student organisations, churches, sports fans, artists, public intellectuals, and private citizens (Branea 2015: 266).

 Regarding the FW agenda, Archip and colleagues (2023: 6) included civil society as a critical sector involved in food waste reduction, along with public administration, food waste business, and consumers, which have a significant influence on the formulation and application of plans and directives. The scholars conclude that there are still significant issues to tackle when approaching waste management in Romania, including *path-dependency*, *fragmented and ineffective decision-making*, and the lack of proper communication and engagement between various stakeholders (Archip et al. 2023: 16).

 Besides all this, in Romania, food waste is not seen nowadays as a subject with major environmental consequences, such as mining and deforesting projects, which is why a few NGOs manage it. At the governmental level, the FW dimension is regulated in Romania by the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), which has a limited partnership with non-governmental organizations active in the food waste sector.

 *Qualitative research on food waste and civil society implications*

In 2022, I researched food waste management at the household level. I gathered qualitative data via 11 semi-structured in-depth interviews with representatives of central public authorities, HoReCa, civil society, and Romanian consumers. From the beginning, civil society was considered one of the stakeholders responsible for managing food waste in Romania, third after the state and the business environment.

When I started the qualitative research process in February 2022, I established a list of stakeholders potential interviewees comprising institutions of the central public administration in Romania, such as the MARD, the Department of Sustainable Development of the Romanian Government or the Romanian Parliament, NGOs running programs to combat FW, the Federation of Food Banks in Romania, social shops, retailers, chefs and restaurants that promote the concept of zero food waste, young people who develop applications to combat FW and also consumers. Because the process of reaching all the representatives of the stakeholders taken into account initially was difficult and time-consuming, although I reached some contact data, primarily such as e-mail addresses or profiles on online services such as LinkedIn or social media, the list was permanently changing.

Therefore, at the end of the allocated period for collecting qualitative data, February-June 2022, I conducted 11 in-depth interviews with important actors within the FW process. One of the missing stakeholders was the retailers, who were reticent about having an interview or avoided answering the e-mails or the messages. Ten interviewees are activating in Bucharest, and one in the Romanian city of Sfantu Gheorghe, from Covasna County. Moreover, ten interviewees are Romanians, and one is an Austrian established in Romania. The interviews were held in three different ways as follows: five using GoogleMeet online meetings, five on the phone, and one using e-mail. I prepared a set of 14 questions, which were not applied entirely to all the interviewees, and during the discussions, there were some other supplementary ones. One of the 14 questions asked regarding the current situation of the FW, the 10th,, was related to the responsibility for tackling FW. It was formulated as follows: “Who has the responsibility to take action to combat food waste: the state, the business community, civil society or citizens? Argue, please!”. The interviews were held between May 13 and June 07, 2022.

*Discussion and findings*

 The interviews revealed that civil society as a soft power could influence Romanian public policies regarding FW and has a crucial role in covering the key areas of education, communication, awareness, and changing consumer behaviour, as identified through the interviews. Moreover, the data underlines that, after the central authorities, civil society is the next stakeholder that has the responsibility for taking action to reduce FW. Regarding the responsibility to action for reducing FW, five interviewees (more than 45% of the participants in the research) consider that *everybody*/*all the stakeholders* have such responsibility. Almost 73% of the interviewees (eight of the participants) identified the *state* as being responsible, seven (more than 63%) of them pointed out the *civil society*, six opted for the *business* and another six for the *citizens* (counting each more than 54% of the respondents). In addition, the interviewees identified other responsible stakeholders such as the *mass media* (more than 45%), the *Church* with all its cults (10%) and also the *influencers* and *food bloggers* (10%), and more than 70% of the interviewees (eight stakeholders) identified *consumerism* as being a driver of FW, from which five participants consider it one of the leading causes. Furthermore, the research underlines that ENGOs should cover *education*, *communication*, *awareness*, and *changing consumer behaviour* by “implementing as many projects as possible by Chefs and NGOs”, “educating citizens from a financial perspective - *FW means money thrown in the trash bean*”, and “social movements such as the one created by the *Eat Foundation*”.

 On the one hand, the data reveals that interviewees consider civil society more as a “doer” which takes action, rather than as a party that influences the policies and maintains the green agenda on the public and governmental attention. On the other hand, the identification of civil society as a stakeholder responsible for taking action to combat FW involves also the action to influence public policies regarding reducing food waste, as it results from the broader discussions with the interviewees. Moreover, it should be noted that the Anti-Food Waste Law in Romania as a public policy was only possible with the contribution and influence of a few Romanian ENGOs, as noted by one interviewee. Thus, the adoption of the first Anti-Food Waste Law is an excellent example of the influence of public policy regarding FW in Romania.

 The initiator of the Anti-Food Waste Law, a young liberal deputy, explained, in the interview we had in May 2022, that the law was based on a wide consultation and furthermore improved at the initiative and argumentation of an NGO:

*The first legislative initiative [on FW] was in 2013, and it took a long time because it involved a broad consultation. Romania was unprepared and did not have the institutions and NGOs ready. There had to be debate and preparation of the market and the actors involved. Then, when the law was in the plenary of the Chamber of Deputies and it was on the final vote, an NGO appeared and told us that the law is very good, but, practically, through it, we were closing the possibility of thrift stores, of those who sell at low prices for the population with low income. Expressly, the law stipulated that goods approaching their expiration date should be donated 100% free of charge and should not be sold at a reduced price, precisely to avoid a black market. However, there were civil society representatives who said that this possibility exists in France, Denmark, Austria, and Germany. It also exists in Romania through two stores, one in Bucharest and another in Sibiu, that sell at a reduced price on a list of people with low incomes, who with 10 RON could buy a shopping basket. Therefore, they do not feel like they are getting alms; they buy a few affordable products. So I had to close and stop the law that was on the final vote and come back after a year or so of debate to find an appropriate form that would also allow this form of social economy, these social stores, to be able to develop in Romania and exist” (Initiator of the Anti-Food Waste Law interview, May 26, 2022).*

Furthermore, as one of the young people who developed applications to combat FW in Romania stated in her interview, civil society actions and collaborations bring hope for changing the food waste situation:

*Associations and NGOs have started to move a lot in Romania. I am delighted that this mentality - “This is not done here and no one shows interest”, “That the authorities do not show interest here”, has changed. Now, there have started to be smaller groups and all kinds of civic workshops that have started to move a lot, some concentrated hubs that at a given moment meet and say: “Let us collaborate”. We are all optimistic that change will come from there and opportunities will open up* (BonApp Developer interview, May 27, 2022).

 *The Romanian FW public policies*

 One could say that the public policies on food waste in Romania could be easily reduced to the Anti-Food Waste Law No. 217 adopted in 2016, and entered into force after two years of blockade and a substantial change in the provisions, and another amending and supplementing Low promulgated in March 2024. The analysis of public policy regarding FW in Romania, which I also carried out in 2022, establishes that food donation NGOs and NGOs dealing with the social economy shops, the so-called *economats,* are among the competition items and the target audiences.

 It is noteworthy that the Anti-Food Waste Law in Romania, before its drafting, was not a subject of genuine public interest or debate. However, a small segment of Romanian civil society, particularly the non-governmental sector through organizations like SOMARO - Social Store, More Green, Workshops without Borders, Carousel, Resource Centre for Public Participation, Terra Millennium III, Food Bank, and Romanian Food Consumers Association *Optimum Cibum*, played a pivotal role in formulating this law (Gheorghica 2019).

 Moreover, at the initiative of the MoreGreen Association and the Resource Centre for Public Participation, 34 other ENGOs asked the Romanian parliamentarians to adopt the law and to participate in the plenary session of the Chamber of Deputies dedicated to this vote on October 18, 2016 (Horeca Romania 2016; Green Report 2016). After the vote, many NGOs claimed that the more ambitious the law project was, which they consider to have an outstanding contribution, the less ambiguous the version of the voted law (Gheorghica 2019). In addition, the Romanian civil society representatives highlighted in online statements that the most significant initiatives[[12]](#footnote-12) undertaken in Romania to address food waste in a direct/practical way belong to the private sector, especially the non-profit and non-governmental sectors (Gheorghica 2019).

 *Conclusions*

 Food Waste is a recent concern for world leaders and scholars, although it has existed for decades and is causing pollution and other side effects, gaining global attention since 2013. The United Nations’ target for halving FW and the related actions required by *The 2030 Agenda* should be achieved in just six years, and there is a lot to be done. Scholars consider civil society an essential stakeholder in public environmental policies, the so-called *green agenda*, although it faces many challenges, limitations, and blockages.

Despite these challenges, academic literature confirms the hypothesis that *a robust civil society influences the adoption of efficacious and improved public policies regarding FW and contributes to maintaining green topics on the public agenda[[13]](#footnote-13)*. In recent years, both the public and academic spheres seem to pay much more attention to environmental issues, starting on one hand with the intensification of actions regarding combating climate change and other environmental problems by the UN and the EU since 2015 and, on the other, through a more visible involvement of the political sphere. Taking into account academic writing, the development and evolution of a solid and vigilant civil society, considered as part of the New Public Managementmodel (Anheier 2017: 4-5), is not just essential but powerful in influencing the fulfilment of the ambitious goals set by the international community, which aim at the well-being of people and the Planet but also of future generations.

 At the EU accession moment, Romania was seen as an “environmental laggard”(Börzel and Buzogány, 2010: 718), and scholars pointed out, besides the negative aspects related to funding, state authorities’ ignorance and societal challenges, the significant influence of Europeanization, and progresses registered after the EU membership (O'Brien 2009; Parau 2009; Börzel and Buzogány 2010; Stringer and Paavola 2013; Jiglau 2016; Heemeryck 2018). Some might consider that Romania is still a “laggard” on some specific issues, and food waste seems to be among them.

 This paper aimed to identify the factors that explain Romanian civil society's ability to influence public policies on FW and keep these green topics on the governmental agenda. In this sense, I have conducted a literature review to identify the current situation and the levers available to Romanian civil society and data analysis. Thus, I sought to map the situation of civil society in Romania in the context of the worldwide green agenda launched in 2015, with attention to the environment and focusing on the food waste area. As can be seen from the previous sections, scholars have approached relatively limited the subject of environmental civil society in Romania (O’Brien 2009; Parau 2009; Börzel and Buzogány 2010; Stringer and Paavola 2013; Branea 2015; Jiglau 2016; Margarit 2018). It is worth mentioning that their focus is on the social movement Salvati Rosia Montana and the prevention of the deforestation project in the area of Sighisoara - Dracula Park (O'Brien 2009; Parau 2009; Branea 2015; Jiglau 2016; Heemeryck 2018; Margarit 2018), other environmental issues or green public policies than food waste. I have yet to identify any academic article or book dedicated to FW and civil society’s implications in this field in Romania. Therefore, my analysis brings attention to this topic, provides input, and opens the opportunity for further, more comprehensive analysis or research on this topic, which does not seem to be a national priority nor to be framed in emergencies or phenomena with devastating environmental consequences.

 Moreover, the 11 semi-structured in-depth interviews with representatives of central public authorities, HoReCa, civil society, and Romanian consumers, which I conducted in the spring of 2022, revealed that civil society as a soft power can influence Romanian public policies regarding FW and has a crucial role in covering the key areas of education, communication, awareness, and changing consumer behaviour. Furthermore, the interviewees underlined that, after the state, civil society is the next stakeholder that has the responsibility for taking action to reduce FW. On the one hand, the data reveals that interviewees consider civil society more as a “doer” that takes action rather than as a party that influences the policies and maintains the green agenda on the public and governmental attention. On the other hand, the identification of civil society as a stakeholder responsible for taking action to combat FW involves also the action to influence public policies regarding reducing food waste, as it results from the broader discussions with the interviewees. Thus, it should be noted that the Anti-Food Waste Law in Romania as a public policy was only possible with the contribution and influence of a few Romanian ENGOs, as noted by one interviewee.

 My research confirms the conclusions of Archip and colleagues (2023: 6), who included civil society as a critical sector involved in FW reduction, significantly influencing the formulation and application of plans and directives. Moreover, my findings contribute to several scholarly conclusions regarding the growing involvement of civil society in policy-making over the past few decades as one of the most significant trends (Wuthnow 2004; Pirvulescu 2016; Anheier 2017). Furthermore, the second part of my hypothesis is also confirmed by Anheier’s (2017: 6) consideration that the CSOs interfering with the policy-making process are attempting to exert influence or even dictate governmental agendas, and also by Dodge’s (2014: 161) idea that civil society uses storylines to “set the agenda for environmental hazards”.

 Nevertheless, my research can be considered refuted by that of Böhmelt' (2013: 710), who concluded that ENGOs would not be able to influence or alter state policy regarding climate change (at the global level), compared to the corporate organisations' lobbying success. However, one might say that Böhmelt’s outcome is invalidated by the Romanian Anti-Food Waste Law case, which demonstrated the power of civil society to influence public policy-making in an EU member state.

Recalling that, in Romania, environmental issues are low on the political agenda (O'Brien 2009: 155), the development and evolution of a strong and vigilant Romanian civil society is vital for the fulfilment of the ambitious goals set by the international community, which aim at the well-being of people, the Planet, and future generations. In this light, broader research is needed for analysing the number of active Romanian ENGOs in the food waste sector and also for mapping their implication and outcomes in FW public policies as an essential topic on the international green agenda.
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