MEAT SUBSTITUTES FOR FLEXITARIANS:
A design driven approach to inspire food developers
Appendix 2.1 Interview Summary

INTERVIEW: MSc. WOUTER VELDMAN, Food designer

Introduction:

The goal is to interview MSc. Veldman to find out the advantages and disadvantages of having an industrial designer perspective in the food design world. Also to have his perspective in how culture has an impact on the development of food concepts.

Wouter Veldman:

Graduated form the Industrial Design Engineering at the TUDelft, MSc. Wouter Veldman is a product designer and a professionally trained chef who works at Phillips as Product Research manager Food & Recipes. He also works independently on projects related to food: advises restaurants, creates new food concepts or does creative sessions with chefs. He strongly believes that observing food culture in different exciting parts of the world is an important inspiration: Wouter has been living in Berlin, San Francisco and made trips to Japan, China, Vietnam and various parts of Europe and the USA.

His catering company Kookinspiratie, designs food concepts for restaurants, food companies and culinary events. Kookinspiratie has worked for Theaters Tilburg, Restaurant La Tasca, The Royal Dutch Embassy of Berlin, Fier Concept & Design, TNO, Quinity, Ordental, NFN, Dentalways and others. Inspiring food lectures have been given at the TU Delft and Van Berlo.

“As a designer you learn to look at the total picture of a product. In food taste and appearance is important but what about tactility- And even beyond the direct interaction place, time and culture plays a role. Food consumption is highly based on habits that are often determined by culture.”

Part 1: Food and Design

- The advantage that you acquire with industrial design is that you are train to look for answers. The designer mindset is pushing for innovative perspective always, that is something you can translate to food.
• His interest in cooking started since he was a child. However, pursuing a professional
degree in cooking occurred in bachelor while he was studying industrial design. Being immerse in
team work most of the time at the bachelor, make him realize how you have to discover your self
as a designer. In order to find this self-expression he decided to explore cooking and food prepara-

• His Graduation project at the Industrial Design Engineering TUDelft was named
Cooking Inspiration. The project aim was to showed a new method to translate trends into prod-
ucts and he designed innovative cooking concepts based on trend research.

• He now works in Phillips Consumer Lyfestyle in a new department “Food and Recipes”,
where they develop new products (or improve existing ones) taking in consideration habits, trends
and culture of people.

• As designer getting immerse in food design is important to focus on context, user experi-
ence, and trends. For example: he designed lunch for one company designers team, his objective
was to energitize , stimulate concentration and inspire the designers. The outcome was a folding
lunch box that carried 7 food spheres. The combination of the food ingredients was selected ac-
cording to literature (how to eat for productivity), they had to stimulate the brain and enhance
relaxation.

Part 2: Food and Dutch Culture

• Talking about dutch cuisine seems always difficult because most of the local people don’t
consider that there is such richness in dutch cuisine. They would prefer to go to Italian restaurant
or something else.

• The food culture in Netherlands tends to pragmatism. But instead of convenience prod-
ucts, there is a lot of interest in slow food, in a “from your garden” approach.

• It is believed that the typical dutch dinner is “Meat, vegetables and potatoes”. But he
believes that is not the situation anymore, in last years there is a lot of people that is changing this
habit because they want to improve their health. Or because they consider it old fashioned. A lot
of young people do not follow that food regimen.

• Advise for a designer trying to work in a food project (me): Try to use all the expertise
from the people who is surrounding you in the project (WUR, TUDelft, classmates, designers,
chefs). Be creative.
Appendix 3.1
Publishable executive summary: Deliverable 1.1 Target groups and corresponding functional product properties: qualitative study.

We targeted as prospective consumers of the LikeMeat product, people who already have an eating pattern in which meat isn’t a daily component but who still eat meat: flexitarians. We assume that these flexitarians are easier persuaded to consume the LikeMeat product as they don’t necessarily need to have meat on a daily basis. As these flexitarians don’t require meat every day, we also assume that they are also open to products that don’t resemble meat, but can be appreciated for their own sensory characteristics. A study of these flexitarians, of their eating patterns and motivations, should make it possible for the product developers to empathize with the consumers and their world, and so ignite the creative process of product concept generation from the perspective of the consumers.

The first step in our consumer research consisted in the exploration of flexitarians by conducting qualitative, individual, in-depth interviews. The interviews consisted of two parts. The first part was a discussion of the actual eating and related behaviour during one week using a photo diary that respondents had made of their main meals during one week. In the second part of the interview, we asked the respondent on the conscious processes behind this eating pattern: the why’s of this pattern. In both the Netherlands and Germany 9 respondents were thus interviewed.

Based on the respondents’ descriptions of their eating patterns, and on the respondents’ statements why they have this eating pattern, the following segments of flexitarians can be distinguished.

- Health flexitarians. Health conscious flexitarians don’t eat meat daily because they think that that frequency is unhealthy, but they don’t think that meat eating itself is bad. They appreciate the taste and bite of meat, and consider the moderate consumption of it healthy.

- Animal friendly flexitarians. These people don’t eat meat daily because they have problems with the bio-industry, and related to that with the killing of animals. They therefore limit their meat consumption in quantity, and often also to animal friendly meat. Their behaviour and motivations are part of a wider awareness of the problematic nature of the bio-industry, but also of other practices with a negative impact on environment and economic fairness.
· Hedonist flexitarians. Hedonist flexitarians are people who judge food first of all for the sensory pleasures it gives them. In this enjoyment, they are open to new experiences and don’t adhere to the traditional pattern of meat as an indispensible part of a meal. They skip meat not because they are motivated to skip meat, but because they plan their meals according to the sensory characteristics of it and the kind of foods they fancy at that moment.

· Convenience flexitarians. The convenience flexitarians skip their daily meat because it’s too much effort to prepare it, or to prepare it well. They like meat, and will on the occasions that they put effort in a meal definitely prepare it, but they don’t miss meat so much, that if are too lazy to prepare it, they will leave it out.

The results of this study contain the material that has been used in the creative session to generate product concepts. These qualitative data make it possible to describe the different consumers in evocative detail and hence make it possible to empathise with the different segments.
In WP1.1 the main drivers and barriers for the consumption of alternative protein products were studied. These results are used as input to the design of new protein products that may or may not replace meat. The input that is derived from this WP consists of consumer behaviour, attitudes and beliefs related to their meat (or other protein) products, assuming that new products should at least cover the needs that are now being fulfilled by existing protein products.

In the qualitative part, four consumer groups were discerned: Health oriented (meat) consumers; animal welfare oriented (meat) consumers; convenience oriented (meat) consumers; and hedonist (meat) consumers. This report describes the quantitative consumer survey that was performed to validate and quantify these segments.

In each country data were collected among representative samples of size n=700 consumers that consume meat one to six times a week (flexitarians or reduced meat consumers). These flexitarians are considered the most interesting consumer target for alternative protein products. The survey questioned the consumers about their food related lifestyles; their food related attitudes; their meat related beliefs; the importance of different product characteristics; consumption of different varieties of meat and other protein products; about reasons (not) to reduce meat consumption; and about demographic characteristics of the consumers.

From the data five relevant consumer segments were determined: consumers with a strong interest in Health and nutrition; Social consumers; Convenience oriented consumers; Conscious consumers; and Price driven consumers. Group sizes vary between 300 (Social) to about 600 (Convenience). Roughly, the first four segments resemble the segments that emerged from the qualitative study, respectively: health oriented; hedonist consumers; convenience oriented consumers; and consumers that are concerned about animal welfare. Interestingly, the reasons (not) to reduce meat were not distinctive between groups, indicating that this is not a main driver for product choice. It confirms the idea central to the consumer studies in LikeMeat, that the interest of specific consumer groups in new protein products by no means needs to be driven by a desire to consume less meat.

The groups differed significantly with respect to food related lifestyle factors, food related attitudes, the importance of different product characteristics and protein product consumption. Also
demographically the segments differ significantly with respect to age, income, household composition, education, nationality (Germany predominant in Price driven segment; Spain in Social and Healthy nutrition; The Netherlands in Conscious and Convenience segments); gender (more men in the convenience group); and between geographical regions (especially Spain, not for Germany or The Netherlands).

The Conscious and Convenience oriented consumers seem most open to new products. Especially for the Conscious consumers non-meat products could represent added value. Thirdly, the Health oriented consumers that want to reduce meat consumption might offer opportunities for new LikeMeat products.

In the subsequent design sessions in WP1.2 and WP6 and after consultation of the consortium partners, the drivers and barriers specified in this report can be used to create specifically designed new protein product concepts for each or a selection of segments.
Appendix 4.1: Creative session guidelines.

Purpose
The purpose of this session is to think out-of-the-box to generate meal concepts for the product “LikeMeat”, always empathizing with the flexitarian perspective. The outcome of this sessions should add more diversity to the previous concepts generated for the project.

People
Participants:
Johan Verbon  chef
Jeroen Knol  product developer, specialised in meat substitutes
Bea Steenbekkers  researcher, specialised in home cooking practices
Machel Gorselink  researcher with work experience in commercial setting
Adriaan Kole  consumer researcher
Rob van Veggel  consumer researcher
Walter Aprile  Assistant Professor at Delft University of Technology
Nancy Holthuizen  Sensory researcher
Facilitator:
Karla Rosales  TUDelft DFI MSc Graduate Candidate

Place
Meeting Rooms (Lab Building)

Ask to all participants:
I. Purpose
The purpose of this session is to think out-of-the-box to generate meal concepts for the product “LikeMeat”, always empathizing with the flexitarian perspective. The outcome of this sessions should add more diversity to the previous concepts generated for the project.

II. People

Participants:
- Johan Verbon  chef
- Jeroen Knol  product developer, specialised in meat substitutes
- Bea Steenbekkers  researcher, specialised in home cooking practices
- Machel Gorselink  researcher with work experience in commercial setting
- Adriaan Kole  consumer researcher
- Rob van Veggel  consumer researcher
- Walter Aprile  Assistant Professor at Delft University of Technology
- Nancy Holthuizen  Sensory researcher

Facilitator:
- Karla Rosales  TUDelft DFI MSc Graduate Candidate

III. Place
Meeting Rooms (Lab Building)

IV. Detailed Session Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Brief Explanation</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Duration (Min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>1) Introduction</td>
<td>Who I am? Why I am there? Who is everybody?</td>
<td>•Labels for the names of the participants •Markers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>2) Session Introduction</td>
<td>Purpose, Stages, Observations (and off course coffee time.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:55</td>
<td>3) Warming-up activity</td>
<td>“The imaginary box”: Everybody standing in a circle. An imaginary box will be pass around.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>4) Explore the challenge “Meat substitutes”</td>
<td>Elaborate a general mindmap with all the participants about “Meat substitutes” and their context (people, products and places). Discussion about while execution.</td>
<td>-Flip-overs, Markers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1) Mindmap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Sensitizing the team “Flexitarians” | Separate the people in two groups with different expertise. | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>5.2) Presentation of the “Personas”</td>
<td>Presentation of the communication material about the users. Assign a “Persona” to a team (two by team). The material will include a complete individual story, anecdotes and picture. They will be color coded by type of “flexitarian”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>5.3) Storyboards</td>
<td>Each group will create a storyboard of the personas they were assigned and should include some of the followings: Consumption situation, Shopping for groceries, Product choice and Preparation of food and Additional details in a logical order. (of a meal without meat) It can be included the findings of the mindmap that fits in the story. Each team will chose the aspects that are integral part of their story. This could be done both by drawing or writing down what would happen in each story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>5.3) Presentation of the personas to the other participants.</td>
<td>The teams will introduce their personas and storyboards. We will discuss all the persona stories. The objective is to complement or modify the stories if necessary. End this session with asking participants about their experiences of it: what went well/wrong etc? Use this as to make them feel comfortable with this kind of exercises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>5.1) Brainwriting</td>
<td>Group idea generation. The participants will be ask to try and generate as many ideas as they could of products or characteristics of products for the personas in the storyboard they received. After 20 minutes, the storyboards with these initial ideas will be exchanged between the groups and they will be ask to elaborate on the ideas that the previous group had come up with. This will be repeat to allow all groups to interact with each others’ storyboards and ideas. The ideas are not mean to be detail at this point and participants must be encouraged to be as limitless as they can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>Energizer</td>
<td>Swapping places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:50</td>
<td>5.2) First idea selection</td>
<td>By group (Selection of a number of ideas) depending on how well they fit in the context, and which are the most interesting ideas. These ideas will be later taken as a starting point for the next phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>5.3) Detailing of the selected ideas</td>
<td>Relate the ideas according with the personas and in the storyboard.Ask participants to think more about the experience of the consumer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20</td>
<td>5.4) Prepare a quick explanation of your best ideas.</td>
<td>At the end of this activity, each group will briefly introduce to the rest of the participants the ideas that they selected. After that ideas will be discussed and suggestions will be made to improve these ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>6) Elaboration on the Ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>6.1) Provocative Technique: Card Twist</td>
<td>Starting from the previously selected ideas. The teams will receive a card that will contain a change in the context or characteristic that will add a different attribute to the idea. The participants will have to generate ideas again to fulfill that requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:25</td>
<td>6.2) Selection</td>
<td>Selection of (1 or 2 per group) the ideas according to the previous step.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>6.3) Prototyping &amp; Presentation preparation</td>
<td>&quot;Thinking with the Hands&quot;. Making a &quot;prototype&quot; of the product. Probably in this stage the team will made small changes to the concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:55</td>
<td>6.4) Present ideas, acting scenarios.</td>
<td>The team should prepare an explanation of the product and how according with their perspective fits in the user's context. Dialogue about the ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:10</td>
<td>7) Evaluate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:10</td>
<td>7.1) Brief Evaluation</td>
<td>Which are potential ideas and why?. What else do we need to complement the idea? Discussion with all the participants. (C-Box, clustering or dot's techniques)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>7.2) Recommendation and thoughts about the Session.</td>
<td>Ask to all participants: This session is like_______because.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>End</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
v. Personal Expectations, Concerns and Strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Think out-of-the-box and generate completely different ideas in comparison</td>
<td>- Ending with characteristics without embodied them in a general product idea related with a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the first creative session.</td>
<td>specific context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>- That, being most of them scientists, the participants can be able to work</td>
<td>- video and audio recording the session. Bringing an observer to take notes of the session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with abstract challenges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>- Emphasis EMPHATY? with the user YES BUT NOT CLEAR HOW YOU BRING IN THAT</td>
<td>- Missing the process goal along the session. Missing some observations or comments from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMPHATY</td>
<td>participants in a discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development and Selection of good meal ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Active participation of all the participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Creative spark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>- Central table that allows the participation of everybody.</td>
<td>- Not a big place. There could be difficulties to walk around the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- There is not natural illumination, neither windows. People can get tired more easily (or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>claustrophobic) because of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- There is no screen for the use of a beamer or videos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>- Follow the program.</td>
<td>- Novice expertise in creative sessions. Reluctance of the participants to contribute in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaning</td>
<td>- Invite the participants to express their ideas.</td>
<td>exercises that are very different from their expertise in sessions. That they could perceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lead the productive flow of the session.</td>
<td>the benefit of them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities Terminology by order of appearance:

- Warming-up and Energizers activities: Creative sessions requires a high degree of involvement and concentration. For the participants could be stressful to defer their judgment to be creative. By alternating several techniques a good energy level in the group can be achieved. A Warming up activity is an activity that forces the participants to do something out of the ordinary to stimulate the imagination. An energizer is an activity that makes the participants to be active.

- Mindmap: “Mindmap are way to make notes that combines visual and verbal thinking. They can be used for several purposes. In this case we will use to develop a shared vision in the product development of “LikeMeat”.

  [www.mind-map.com](http://www.mind-map.com) Buzan’s website on mindmaps. Under the tab “mindmaps”

  [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mind_map](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mind_map)

- Presentation of the “Personas” (Sensitizing): “Series of cards that emphasize empathy for “real persons”. The card contains individual stories and anecdotes to visualize the most important themes in the person’s experience.”

  Context and Conceptualization Reader. (2007)

- Brainwriting: “Brainwriting is particularly useful with a group of people who are somewhat reticent and
would be unlikely to offer many ideas in an open group session such as **Brainstorming**. It is also useful when everyone has different problems that they want to solve.”

http://creatingminds.org/tools/brainwriting.htm


- **C-Box**: “The C-Box is a 2 x 2 Matrix. Two axes are determined that represent criteria according to which the ideas are evaluated. In a C-Box usually the criteria ‘innovativeness’ (for the users) and ‘feasibility’ are used. A C-Box has four quadrants based on these axes. You are able to judge quickly whether ideas are immediately feasible or not, and whether they are highly innovative or not.”

http://www.wikid.eu/index.php/C-Box
Appendix 4.2: Flexitarian Concept-Maps.

Health Flexitarian

Basic Concepts
- Supplement for a Fruit shake
- Quiche with LikeMeat
- Baked Stripes LikeMeat
- Ham
- Cubes with Olive Oil
- LikeMeat Marshmallows

Product Characteristics
- Looks
  - complete
- Flavour
  - seasonal
  - regional
- Features
  - less fat
  - right fat (omega)
  - low carbs
  - light
  - fresh
  - all nutrients
  - regional
  - seasonal
  - artisanal
  - to
  - grill
  - in the oven
  - traditional preparation
- Could be
  - Combine with
    - vegetables
    - meat
  - Child friendly
    - fun

Information
- Fresh
  - Pro-health
    - organic/natural
    - sustainable

Image
- fashionable
- Fresh
- Pro-health
- organic/natural
- sustainable

Package
- health information
  - seasonal
  - artisanal
  - natural
  - no plastic
  - fill in the super
- fill in the super
  - reusable
  - no plastic
  - natural
  - artisanal
  - seasonal
  - health information

Pro-health
- Fresh
- Pro-health
- organic/natural
- sustainable

Information
- Fresh
  - Pro-health
    - organic/natural
    - sustainable

Image
- fashionable
- Fresh
- Pro-health
- organic/natural
- sustainable

Package
- health information
  - seasonal
  - artisanal
  - natural
  - no plastic
  - fill in the super
  - reusable
  - no plastic
  - natural
  - artisanal
  - seasonal
  - health information

Pro-health
- Fresh
- Pro-health
- organic/natural
- sustainable
Appendix 5.1: Developers Session Agenda Draft.
I. Purpose

The goal of this session is to narrow down the characteristics of several product concepts. However the main purpose of this session is to motivate to “don’t think product, think experiences”.

II. People

Participants:

1. Johan Verbon  Chef Restaurant of the Future
2. Jeroen Knol  Product developer, specialised in meat substitutes
3. Bea Steenbekkers Consumer Researcher, specialised in home cooking practices
4. Rob van Veggel  Consumer researcher
5. Nancy Holthuizen  Sensory researcher *
6. Charon Zondervan  Coordinator Satiety Program
7. Miriam Quataert  Fresh Food Chains
8. Angela Schereven  Student
9. Valeska Kooijman  Project Coordinator

* not in recipe tasting

Facilitator:

Karla Rosales  TUDelft DFI MSc Graduate Candidate

III. Place

Experience Room.

IV. Detailed Session Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Brief Explanation</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Duration (Min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:50</td>
<td>2) Warming-up activity</td>
<td>Brainstorming names Mindmapping the possible name sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:05</td>
<td>3) Session Approach</td>
<td>Presentation of the Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activities Terminology by order of appearance:

- **Warming-up activity:** will instruct the participants about the objectives of the session and the methods to use.

- **Design Vision:** It is about the big picture, the intention of the product design. Help us to keep the overall picture of the people (to who we design) and the intended relationships with the product. It is the main story premise to cover.

- **Interaction Qualities:** are the intended qualities and characteristics of the interaction with the product designed. In other words, the intangible characteristics of the relationship between people and their products while using.

- **Product Attributes** are the tangible characteristics to be exhibited in the actual products to support the interaction qualities to form the design vision.
I. Purpose
The goal of this session is to narrow down the characteristics of several product concepts. However the main purpose of this session is to motivate to “don’t think product, think experiences”.

II. People
Participants:
1. Johan Verbon Chef Restaurant of the Future
2. Jeroen Knol Product developer, specialised in meat substitutes
3. Bea Steenbekkers Consumer Researcher, specialised in home cooking practices
4. Rob van Veggel Consumer researcher
5. Nancy Holtzuizen Sensory researcher *
6. Charon Zondervan Coordinator Satiety Program
7. Miriam Quataert Fresh Food Chains
8. Angela Schereven Student
9. Valeska Kooijman Project Coordinator

* not in recipe tasting

Facilitator:
Karla Rosales TUDelft DFI MSc Graduate Candidate

III. Place
Experience Room.

IV. Detailed Session Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Brief Explanation</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Duration (Min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:50</td>
<td>2) Warming-up activity</td>
<td>Brainstorming names Mindmapping the possible name sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:05</td>
<td>3) Session Approach</td>
<td>Presentation of the Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activities Terminology by order of appearance:

- **Warming-up activity**: will instruct the participants about the objectives of the session and the methods to use.

- **Design Vision**: It is about the big picture, the intention of the product design. Help us to keep the overall picture of the people (to whom we design) and the intended relationships with the product. It is the main story premise to cover.

- **Interaction Qualities**: are the intended qualities and characteristics of the interaction with the product designed. In other words, the intangible characteristics of the relationship between people and their products while using.

- **Product Attributes**: are the tangible characteristics to be exhibited in the actual products to support the interaction qualities to form the design vision.
Appendix 5.3: Flexitarians Session Agenda Draft
Appendix 5.4: Storyboard of product Concepts.

on the way back home...

Almost done...

family

in the supermarket

Crunchy
Ready to eat
Chilled
Flavour variations

Tasty meat-like strips of mild flavour as ideal complement for vegetable salads.
on the way back home...

what to eat tonight?

dinner for 2

I don't trust what to eat tonight? I don't know...

I would like something tasty. Please? I don't know...

I don't want to be the only one at the supermarket.

A Delicious LikeMeat piece coated in breadcrumbs with a traditional recipe.

Frozen different spices Pork combinations or chicken taste

in the supermarket

KITCHEN TIME!

fresh herbs bag

Frozen herbs bag

in the supermarket...
on the way back home...
dinner with friends

what to cook tonight?

I want to cook something different... impress my friends, I want to be creative

in the supermarket

Sauce
Recipe ideas

Sauce & my secret ingredient: Lekker!
on the way back home... what to cook tonight?

dinner for two...

what to cook tonight?

I want something tasty...

meat?

but my couple will complain...

I would like something truly Plant...

I don't know...

I want to reduce our meat consumption...

in the supermarket...

A delicious & new LikeMeat piece flavoured like your meat traditional recipe.