**SP1: My first question is how would you briefly define circular economy and sustainable consumption in one sentence each?**

SP2: For me circular economy is an economy that is resource efficient, first of all and then through where it makes sense and is feasible through closing material loops and the second sentence; the main part for me is the resource efficiency, it is not, you know, to close resource loops at any costs but resource efficient, that is the primary through where it is feasible, economically and sustainably closing material loops and for me circular economy kind of embraces the entire economy with both production and consumption. Sustainable consumption for me is about efficiency and sufficiency, so kind of devising sustainable consumption patterns and also levels. Then of course you can divide these into greening products and different consumer behaviour strategies like notching so whatever it takes to design and have a society system that enables consumers to consume sustainably and again resource efficiently. And then levels are about, perhaps each individual levels but also the aggregate levels, to keep them within planetary boundaries.

**SP1: okay!**

SP2: A bit more than two sentence, but..

**SP1: Perfect!** **Then** **I have a bit more detailed question about the circular economy. So how would you explain the key characteristics of circular economy towards others, for example to friends or relatives? So, people that don’t really know what the circular economy is all about.**

SP2: So I would start to have by saying that our economy is linear which means; we extract resources and use them inefficiently, both and in production stages and in consumption stages and then we dispose all of them into the nature and we are running out of both resources and the assimilating capacity of the earth and the landfill space. So we need to find ways to improve the efficiency of the utilization of resources in production stages and especially in distribution and consumption. So for me circular economy, for example it is about reusing products and components and then also materials. So circular economy for me is in three levels, kind of circles, reusing products. So in the consumption stage, then when we can not reuse them anymore they degrade and we can not add value, so up cycle them anymore. Then we can go into first cycling or the second cycling then for product or component reuse. So either pair them or refurbish, remanufacture. So were we don’t get to the level of materials yet but try to keep the value of embedded in product of component. Then do that as long as possible and if that is not possible then we go down to the lower level of kind of value is to material level.  So to not dispose them into nature but to cycle them into the same or other kind of, maybe processes that not require as high quality material as they used to be when we first extracted them.

**SP1: okay.**

**SP2:** It’s about the cycles in the economy, the different stages.

**SP1: Okay, very nice explanation. my next question is imagine a truly circular economy: How would consumption change? So what do you believe, it is really about what your idea is, like based on this idea of the ideal circular economy, how do you think would consumption change in that circular economy?**

SP2: For me the ideal is if you only look at the consumption part, it is a little bit like it is happening now, with people kind of reducing the perception that everything has to be new. Newly produced I think is chancing a little bit towards people expecting, ‘okay it can be second hand or I can buy stuff on Ebay or on Amazon’. It can be new for me but it doesn’t have to be newly produced. I think that this is a big, big or it’s a small kind of change in our brain but it has big implications because it doesn’t have to be newly produced, it has to have the novel value for me as a person because we are always looking for innovations and we want to have something new. But that’s fine we can not fight the human nature but if we can satisfy this need in a new way by getting access to all new products. New to us but not newly produced then we are quite a bit on the way. But then for me it is also I think what is the most critical part and that is where the sharing economy or collaborative economies coming into play. So on it’s own as it stands now it’s something that people or consumers or interpreters are coming up with seeing the possibilities on the market or we can provide the platform so it enables people to reuse their stuff or exchange their swap or whatever. My problem is with this is that the link, or at least when I work with PSS, that this link between production and how this change in the consumption patterns could potentially affect the producers. For me this is link is missing now.

**SP1: Okay.**

SP2: Meaning that products since white good producers, they are not part of this sharing economy. They are not getting anything, they are not benefitting from it. So this economy doesn’t, this reuse of products doesn’t create the incentive for producers to design long durable, long life durable products.

**SP1: Because it’s more informal at the moment right? Like a lot of the sharing and reuse is informal.**

SP2: Yes, I mean there is no, producers are largely not involved. I mean you can find some examples like Patagonia who produces their jackets and then organizes this sharing or reuse side where people can actually so, they are kind of part of this and then they can redesign their jackets to meet the needs of these multiple users. But I think, largely, 99.99% of producers they are not part of this. So for them there is no, why should they bother designing their product so that somebody else could benefit from reusing them. And for all I know they could say well we are not part of this and for us it actually creates problems because before when people bought an new product it got broken up to whatever 3-5 years then they came back to us, to buy a new one. But now they are staying in this, you know, sharing circles and sharing things, then we never see them before. So you know we could as well reuse the quality to kind of hamper this sharing economy. So this if for me the biggest problem with kind of my ideal where production works together with consumption, adjusting and deceived in the consumption which has a big potential, to have kind of life skill implications for resource use on aggregate level. It is not materializing now because producers and the whole machinery is not part of the deal.

**SP1: Okay, so when the circular economy would have been achieved or will be achieved then that will change. Like then this production side and consumption side will match better and producers will be maybe more involved in this, the sharing and the reuse of.**

SP2: Yeah, so they are kind business model not only, they will not create value from producing and selling products, but also benefit from using and reusing products and also taking back resources and going through this cascade of product component and material. So kind of it will be a fine tuned machinery which will reduce them, in essentially what we want us to reduce input resources and output of waste.

**SP1: Okay, then I think that we are already touching up for the next question what is really nice. So the second part, we coming to the second part, that was about how you would think consumption in the circular economy would change right? Okay then the second part is about the sustainable business models. So it has three aspects to business models, the value proposition, then the value creation and delivery and finally the value capture. Each of them have different elements. So we start with the value proposition. So this element refers to the value the firm offers to a specific target customer segment. How should companies shape their value proposition when implementing circularity and sustainable consumption? And are you touched upon product and service but for example the example of Patagonia that you said that they would design the products in a way to facilitate these new sharing and reuse options?**

Yeah, I mean value proposition it is for specific customers but value proposition is about product and service. So then of course you can think of, you know design products first of all not durable but second considering that there are many more users involved. Each with their use patterns and how they use the product. So kind of more stress on the product, which needs to be taken care or into consideration in the design phase. So products that are easily disassembled, you know easy to repair. Probably easy to run a test, what happened with the product. You know replacing models instead of screwing the whole product not glueing parts or melting parts together but screws or clips or whatever will mind. Imagine how products are designed. So to enable this kind of easy check up, easy repair, easy kind of monitoring also how products are used and also kind of it’s linked again to value creation. If you monitor, I’m just thinking I had many years back a case of heat pumps for business to business. So they were selling and leasing them and then they had this IT-system attached where they could monitor how the product is used. So they can reduce their risks and to know exactly what customers are doing right or wrong and then intervene in the right time and explain how the product should be used to ensure the functionality of course but then to prolong of course product lives since they were taking it back after this sub new phase. I’m also thinking that with all this you know Internet things it could be the same thing with all our household products. Water Cooker, a coffee machine and what not? We have this monitoring and feedback to consumers about consumer behaviour. How the product should be used and then also something gets wrong. Maybe it can be self-repaired. You know whatever, email do this and this and this. So everything to gear towards this long and secure use phase.

**SP1: So the value propositions would include and obviously not just the product but the service and also this information and this more direct contact with the consumer or customer. So actually it reacts to, advice to, ensure the correct usage of the product.**

SP2: Yeah, so I think it could be beneficial both and of course we are living stressful lives. So it’s not like people have to or would want to be repairmen for all their wide goods and stuff, but I think again with this smartness of products is getting increase so I think you can do more and more online. You don’t need to leave, you know, computer to repair. There are so many things then can do online with distance kind of monitoring, repairing and checking and stuff. So I think as the level of smartness or IT-component of all householders increasing then this will become kind of more and more mainstream and then for other products I’m thinking also textiles and furniture and so. There of course we need there a different approach probably. You know, organize them, I mean collection systems and swapping in a match. Bigger volume in society and then also think about okay what if this, I mean in the last 20 years I think the quality of textiles or clothes at least got down dramatically. So it would be nice to see a reverse trend that people either, I mean work also then requires them to textiles themselves, the fibre’s, but of course also how the clothes look like. You know maybe more the classical idea, the classical design and so again with swapping that it is not, it doesn’t have to be new, newly produced, it can be just new for you.

**SP1: Okay, so also that the customers basically change again the attitude towards use things and they repair their own things. So would that change anything about the customer segments, I mean the relationships would I guess be much tighter between the company and the customers, but do you think customer segments would change or should change?**

SP2: I mean I looked a little bit at consumer behaviour in general and then I’m a bit sceptical towards, you know educating, let's enlighten people and raise their awareness and so on. At least in Sweden, I mean it’s impossible not to be aware about environmental problems but then when we look at the actual behaviour then it is a completely different story. So I’m more believing in this nudging, you know without, not to provide, not to overwhelm customers with information but to enable and kind of guide them into behaviours that we want. But for example infrastructure by, you know when you come to a shop, clothes store and then you know that you can return these clothes for upcycling or for reuse and get some money back. So different types of incentives and so it’s not like the customer segment. It will be mainstream customers or it will be customers who don’t care about environment but they would care to get some money back for their returned clothes. So I think we need to involve many more people in the cycling economy, without explaining them into greater details what circular economy is.

**SP1: So that it automatically does do it rather than actually think about it.**

SP2: For different reasons, whatever there might be.

**SP1: Okay, and what do you think is then the value proposition for the society and the environment?**

SP2: The value proposition for the society then would be reduce the virgin resource consumption with kind of associated then reduced environmental impacts and perhaps social impacts and then perhaps also reduces problems with landfilling and stuff. So I guess that's also part of the value proposition. I was also thinking about that when you compare mainstream clothes shop and second-hand shops. There is much more diversity in second-hand shops. So that could maybe be another way to sell circular economy to consumers, this is the value they get. That can be from different time designs, fashions and stuff. So that people with different types of tastes can kind of satisfy their needs with this kind of reused products.

**SP1: That is more individual then just going to one of the mainstream retailers or high street retailers.**  **Great, then we are coming to the second part of the business model that is value creation and delivery. I think we already touched up on some aspects of that. So I think we already covered for example technology and product features. So that things are connected, then we give feedback and that the product would last longer ideally and maybe again better material and so on. And how do you think should companies change their activities to create a delivered value that customers are willing to pay for, how should they change that into the transition into the circular economy?**

SP2: I’m thinking there are maybe three types of companies. Those that are producers and have a possibility for direct access to the final customers. So for them the change would then be to extend the service to local the reverse logistics would look like to organize the interface with customers. So that again it enables the customers to return or to swap stuff and then of course the product design. Then of course I think for many companies this is not feasible, they don’t have the capabilities or interest in expanding their kind of direct line of business to final customers. So then they need to go into their networks with other companies who can be whatever service provider or the circular economy kind of mediator, who then interact with customers, organizes the systems for distribution and collection of product and so on. And then there are other companies who, maybe I’m just thinking about these gap exploiters, who are there at the end or in the reverse part. Who are capitalizing again on the products that are already there and kind of by repairing or reusing or refurbishing them. They are also part of this scenery, but then it is better to talk about two types of companies, though that covers the whole chain or those that do not and they need to collaborate with the service providers or the gap exploiters or different kinds then.

**SP1: Okay, so the importance of partners and suppliers will then increase because not every company can necessarily cover in reverse supply chain but it might make sense to have a specialist who's very good at that, who does that for several companies.**

SP2: It is, I mean, servitising is also not for all kinds of companies. So it falls kind of forwards and backwards.

**SP1: And how do you think might or should distribution channels change? So the way a firm goes to market and how it actually reaches its customers.**

SP2: I mean, here as well, we can think about how our retailers can play a different role, can take on this role of service providers instead of using kind of sale arguments in their marketing. They would use a very different argument to establishing long-term relations, leasing and meeting customers. Here I’m thinking about children clothes and toys and everything. This is a market where you clearly see that people would need to come back and so instead of coming to a shop and buying a toy or clothes and then leaving and again going into second hand markets themselves, spending time on all these transactions. Retailers could instead take this role over, this organizing node. For exchange and upgrade and so on. I mean it doesn’t have to be the retailer; some producers would probably need to establish their own distribution or whatever shops. Which might be combined again with repair shops to enable this. So that is kind of about it, what we have for distribution channels really.

**SP1: Okay, and what do you think about key resources, like tangible resources, intangible resources and human resources, how do you think these roll of key resources should change in the transition?**

SP2: I mean, and then we are thinking about product design to enable this remanufacturing, refurbishing and repair. So you need designers to change their view on how things have to be designed and we are talking about the distribution and marketing channels. Again very different message and a very kind of different relation with consumers. Much more direct with sometimes, if you are talking about smart products then it’s kind of that you need to have that feedback. Both then to the producer or provider and to consumers about the use of the product.

**SP1: So, in that case the important resources would be in the first place the people who design that but also the people in marketing who communicate about that or the people in sales, whichever service concept that is and then also the IT-components of the product.**

SP2: Yes, I mean it is this big data discourse where computers are processing all this data, but then there has to be a person or people, department of the company who can analyse this big data and understand what is happening and what kind of implications they stay to have for the product design or maybe marketing strategy for reverse logistics, so also that’s another thing. Should reverse logistics department be established or should it be another company with whom the producer communicates. So these are also kind of new question marks and for some they might need to develop their own capacity. Others want to win, engage and disvalue network with others. So I think this may be three primary types of internal resources that companies needs to think about and then of course the financial resources because the financial scheme changes but that is probably when we talk about value capture.

**SP1: Yes, I was about to say that! Exactly, the next aspect is about value capture and one of the elements then is cost value and revenue streams and the question is: how should companies capture value in order to achieve circularity?**

SP2: Yeah, I think for them it is a big challenge to because now they are getting paid at once, for the product and it sits in a way and then the next time when they are paid is when the product is broken and the customer comes back but in the circular economy then if we think about the usage, would probably also be shorter. Cause now once we bought our car and we want to first of all use it as much as possible but then we are keeping it alive, if you are a kind of economical customer. But if we do not own the card we might want to exchange it after three years when we are tired of its colour or whatever it might be. So there will be more cycles. Of course of use and then for producers it also means that instead of getting paid once they are getting paid for example monthly fee or per every time you use a product. So there are kind of needed returns are not as needed as is in the linear and for that somebody needs to finance the production of this product in the first place. So for them it’s kind of a delay in their payments, like stroking down, but in a slow motion way and for that we need probably capital investments from some investors to support this kind of, unless the companies itself can or wants to experiment with that. So I think that is the main problem with the financing, the costs involved in production and then also the costs of servicing. If you want to prolong product life or enable reuse by repairing and refurbishing. Then of course it is a high labour intensive activity which and labour in Western countries but already in China as well the costs of labours is increasing. So that is also a substantial cost which companies need to think about and then including calculation.

**SP1: Okay, so based on that, what do you think about growth, strategy and effort** **how should they change? What should be the growth strategy and effort of companies in the circular economy?**

SP2: I mean, perhaps it is about the link in the kind of financial growth of a company. It could be two scenarios. One is perhaps this decoupling growth of a company kind of value, financial value from the amount of resources they are using for creating this value. So that is one or second is actually this zero growth strategies. The company has it market, responsible for its consumers, responsible for its workers, does a good business but doesn't strive to actually expand all the time. I think that is also a kind of wishful thinking or dream scenario where companies occupies sudden position on the market and have a kind of stable customer base and take care of their employees and everybody is happy.

**SP1: And what do you believe and will be the role of the growth strategy and effort in the circular economy, what do you think is likely scenario?**

SP2: Yeah, I mean I don’t think people are as smart as we want us to believe. I’m thinking that this kind of ruthless kind of competition and increasing, it is the same thing as with linear economy. I don’t think it changes I think the ethos, those companies that want to expand then they will use similar kind of expansion strategies and perhaps go in kind of vertical integration of their supply chain. So that they can provide the whole value to a final customer and kind of capitalize on this collaborative or sharing economy, bit and so on. So there are many strategies for them to grow actually. So those companies that want to grow in a circular economy, I don’t see any contradiction line in restricted factor from the fact that you did go from linear to circular.

**SP1: Okay, then we have one final element in the value capture and that it is the value capture for others, so the environment and the society.**

SP2: Value capture then are we talking again about financial value?

**SP1: No, not necessarily, like in the first part we had what kind of value is proposed to, for example the society environment now, how is it captured and measured. So how can you for example measure the value that the company has created or has captured for the environment and the society?**

SP2: Yeah I guess we need to look kind of not into negative value, but the reduction of negative impact. You know, if the company shifted from linear to circular, what kind of added value they created for society. They reduce their negative impact. I think we need to go from the opposite. So they are hopefully doing something good and then we could measure perhaps the reduction and the need for virgin resource extraction. Reduction in terms of waste generated, and then perhaps maybe also more people are satisfied through circular products. Meaning that they are not looking for newly produced products and then maybe we will also see a reduction in the need of production of new products. Then it becomes complicated because that’s what we don’t see now is the link between, what kind of impact circular economy will have on the labour market. Will we create more jobs? Because service and circularity are so far more labour intensive but this is because we haven't looked in this and we haven’t industrialised this bits. So, services are provided by people, remanufacturing also is kind of labour intensive because we haven’t focused on that. I think that if the focus will be on these parts then process will come for remanufacturing, disassembling and so on. So this will become in time less labour intensive and then also essentially our goal is to reduce virgin resource use and then maybe production of new products. So again then people who are involved in this production now, what will happen to them and there are different scenario’s but I feel that it’s very much speculations now because depending on who is ordering the study then you see results. So we need to be aware about this kind of unresolved question but I don’t think we have the answer yet.

**SP1: Yeah, that was my impression as well. Depending on who has said it if they say the exact opposite from that point. Okay then we covered all points of the business model. Do you feel like an element is missing in the sustainable business model framework?**

SP2: Which one are you referring to?

**SP1: I think we covered those eleven elements underneath value proposition, value creation and delivery, and value capture. Do you feel like there should have been one more element that we should have talked about, that I didn't mention? Just spontaneously if anything comes to your mind.**

SP2: No, not necessarily. I like this approach with looking at positive value and then value that is not delivered or value that is reduced. I think it gives the more balanced view because if we are only talking about you know if the company shifts then it degrades value and generates value and everything is all positive but I think it is good to look at this like which values company is kind of reducing. In what and why? For company and society, where is this balance? Because I think that there will always be this you know balancing act between shall we add this part but then we are losing on that part.

**SP1: Okay and then we have talked a lot about the business model. Can you think of any outstanding examples? Examples in which some of these businesses model elements were used by the company in the transition through the circular economy. So there are some companies that have already tried to implement aspects of the circular economy. Can you think of any, like really good examples in which elements they have used or transformed especially?**

SP2: I mean we are having an approach of now or problem on circular economy where companies are involved. Both companies that are for example gap exploiters. So they have been found with this idea of you know repairing or reusing. So for them, we don’t need to explain what circular economy is or how their business model could be or could look like. On the other hand we also have companies like Volvo, Ericsson who are mainstream companies but in some departments they are kind of testing the circular ideas. So the little communication I had with these companies and since our question also is to look at what kind of methods companies use to design business models. I don’t think they use this structured way of thinking. So now when we work with them and you organize workshop then this kind of nine or eleven elements are good for structuring their thoughts but again what we also learn from our master thesis in these different companies is that the business model development is much more haphazard and kind of ad hoc then we as researchers want to portray it.

**SP1: And do you have the feeling that in the companies that you were in touch with a little bit that so far the efforts would achieve circular or some aspects of circularity were focused on specific elements of the business model or had they just done a little bit everywhere?**

SP2: No i mean of course they, like what Volvo, they were testing, this idea of, they had this electric batteries for busses and trucks and they want to grow from selling them to bus companies, to leasing for example. I think that it very might depend on what kind of problem it is for which they want a circular solution. So for this battery leasing model then they are interested in financial aspects or in aspects of agreement, how to develop an agreement between customer and provider. To make sure that products maintain well, are used well and so on. For Ericsson for example they are very early in their development in our program. So there it’s rather, the diversity of their activities is very broad. It’s from developing products, like this mobile station, to providing services. They are still at the station where they want to find a suitable product or a service, which is suitable for the circular solution. So I guess the first step is finding the line of business that is interesting to look at and then second is to look at different aspects I mean like with leasing it is the financial model and it is part of the kind of Osterwalder’s framework. They are thinking of course about the costs and revenues but then they don’t necessarily cover kind of methodically all the elements. So they concentrate on this financial part now.

**SP1: Hmm okay.**

SP2: And for others, I mean we are working with two gap exploiters, who are repairing and refurbishing IT-equipment; computers and mobile phones. So there we look at for example the environmental kind of value, what environmental impact is, how it is reduced and then they needed help with kind of logistics because they are working in the network of companies not indirectly with producers of this equipment. So I would say it depends very much on which level you are staying at. If it’s very general and if you talk to corporate level, which is strategic department then you can talk I guess about general view of a business model and generally about elements but then you go to the company. The further the company is in this work, and the more people are involved and are kind of working on specific solutions then you are working with marketing department. How should our marketing strategy change? Then it’s only this part. Then it’s not about all the rest, not about product, it’s not about, maybe even less the service but it’s the marketing message and the customers and so on. So that’s my feeling.

**SP1: Okay, so it is not a very like strategic approach to say: okay we are looking at exactly these aspects. Now it is more that by the product that they have or the product service that they want to offer certain emphasises and emerge on these different aspects or on some aspects.**

SP2: They identify; okay we are working with this product, this line/product doesn’t go well. Let’s try to service size it and then what do we need? Okay we need some marketing people to have a service size and then they have done the job but then the financial aspects. Who came in in this team of financial or just move the issue to the financial or accounting or economy department?

**SP1: So it’s not that automatized that at some point these different things would be considered for example then if you have the service to think what distribution channels to be used or who do I need as partners and suppliers. So it’s more that it kind of automatically at some point touches these different elements.**

SP1: Ah yeah, I think exactly, it also depends on which level you are working with like for Ericsson we have a communication with, they have a research unit within Ericsson at corporate level and so these people they do speak in our language with business model elements and so on. It’s not them who run the show. So they have to communicate and kind of channel up to the top management and that’s not always happening so to say and how Ericsson is in trouble economically. So it depends very much on which level who is working and then if there is a top management commitment then some companies start with this kind of general workshop where they invite representatives but I haven't with conducted interviews, with these eleven companies with we are working with, I don’t think anyone of them started with this. Like okay now we are going circular, let’s have workshops, let’s have involve everybody, let’s map this, you know, any business model. It’s like someone has a idea pushes and then who do need else and then else and then it kind of evolves.

**SP1: Yeah, a more organic change. You talked about these examples, what would they need to do these companies, to really achieve true circularity, like the truly circular economy? What should be there next steps?**

SP2: Again they add very different levels; some are at the ideation stage where they are still looking for what product or service should we concentrate on and the use as our test bed. Other companies they have multiple departments, they have things going on and they are into testing or specifying the contract lines to make sure that the circular solutions works. Then it is beneficial financially to them and to customers. Some are like these gap exploiters they are in the kind of repair and refurbishing already and they are small companies but for them issues are okay. I mean apple is designing their mobile phones so that it is impossible to even change the battery and so it is completely different issues and others are also having one marketplace kind of exchange platform for public services to exchange their product and for them it is legislation that some organisations can not leave their products for exchange for example. They have to be disposed of which is also completely stupid. We at our institute we also had the cellar full of furniture and we wanted to send it to some children home in some other country and we couldn't do it because we needed to drive it to a landfill and then we were completely horrified.

**SP1: That is so sad, that is so horrible! I cannot allow to do something sensible without to use it. Okay, and if you look at for example the example of Volvo or like one of these examples, what really becomes circular? I mean they are working on one area but what do you think should they be doing afterwards to really achieve a full circular business model?**

SP2: Of course it’s a big company and it is hard to change their entire business plus their many businesses trucks and marine boats and so. So there should be commitment from the top, like okay we are changing. Again the process will never be as structured as we wanted to be but then the company has a vision and strategies and everything. It is kind of evolving; process and you need to find circular solutions then for the whole range of services and products you offer. I don’t know, it’s kind of what do you need for that? You need commitment for one but then it is a long time that’s what you also need for changing.

**SP1: And then step by step just looking at the different orient, developing and further trying to make it more circular. And what do you think are the key differences in the way business will be done in the circular economy from a consumer perspective? So not just saying consumption but if you picture a consumer in the circular economy and the truly circular economy. What would be the key differences you would notice compared to what you expect from the linear economy?**

SP2: Again thinking about the need to engage kind of non-environmentally where people, I don’t think they should notice anything. Or at least they could notice but they shouldn't feel that it affects their routines or whatever. The routines kind of have to wall so that they feel normal to them and they could be part of this big circular chain but kind of: okay person comes, buys, leases or whatever but there is some kind of transaction in whatever, in a shop or online and then they get the product, they use it and then they leave it somewhere or to someone in a very kind of convenient fashion and so on.  So if you are look at, only from traditionally consumers kind of perspective, in a way, nothing should be changing I think. I don’t think it is reasonable to rely on people like you know okay you have to buy from this producers and then you have to drive whatever kilometres to leave this products to this recycling station or to this repair shop. It has to be convenient.

**SP1: Okay then those were my questions for you. Are there any final thoughts or has there been anything that has not been covered that you would like to share?**

SP2: There are a lot of things that we can discuss but no, I have a question maybe to you. What is the main question or what are you after?

**SP1: At the moment I’m first trying to exploring for the next round, what should I be asking, what are the main things and the question is: what is the role of companies business model and the transition to the circular economy and achieving sustainable consumption?**

**Do you have like maybe person of industry or anyone who do you think would be relevant and interesting?**

SP2: It’s also a little bit, you know, the time issues for everybody. I mean, I guess you have Tim Cooper on your list. You could try Mathias Lindal, but he is quite busy. I mean everybody is busy. He is from Linkoeping. I’m just thinking that people I know there mostly from kind of design, engineering side. What is interesting for you is maybe to try to look at someone who’s studied consumer behaviour. Somebody working with consumer first and then kind of exploring the circularity. But now I can’t think of anyone.

**SP1: Can you think of any people in industry that I maybe should be talking to?**

SP2: I mean you can try this, to gap exploiters who are working with, although there are not consumer. They are repairing and then selling to other companies, who then sell to consumers. So not end consumers.