



This flyer is devoted to a problem of practical consequence to how we look for Greenwashers. It will therefore be concerned aspect of *wicked problems*: that the problem grows to the size space it gets, and will grow beyond that size if it can. If constrained it will take less time and space. Very common! I got a link from Lydia that initiated an exchange between us: the [HEALabel](#) app—ethical consumer guide—that will help QUAD-groups to get unstuck from discussions on examples of Greenwashing. Reading the terms of service, the paragraphs on *affiliate disclosure* and *privacy policy* we paused. It turns out that HEALable is an Amazon associate. And also that it gleans *metadata*—used to “oil” sales-operations—from a target group of environmentally aware users. Which raises the question: can an app, no matter the content, really do without large affiliates and without dispensing metadata?

Affiliate Disclosure
 HEALabel is an Amazon Associate and may promote affiliate products on HEALabel.com that will accrue commission if purchased by the Website user.

TERMS of SERVICE

Privacy Policy

HEALabel, LLC takes your privacy seriously. This privacy policy is designed to assist you in understanding how we collect and use the personal information you provide to us and to assist you in making informed decisions when using our site and our products and services. Please review this Privacy Policy before you use the Website or any of the services or features offered on or through the Website. By using the Website and its services and features, you agree to be bound by this Privacy Policy. If you do not agree to this Privacy Policy, please do not use the Website or its services and features.

Information Collected

- HEALabel, LLC may collect certain personal information from you when you register to use the Website or its services and features, such as any e-mail newsletter or membership, including, but not limited to, your name, e-mail address, and location.
- We may collect additional personal information, including your physical address, in order to deliver products.
- We may also collect certain non-personally identifiable information from users of our site, such as their internet protocol address, the type of browser and operating system they use, the domain name of your Internet service provider, and the web pages, content and advertisements you may have visited, viewed or clicked on.

Can we even start working on the *sustainability* of apps—in general—given their dependency on “free” data-search, without knowing the detail of how it works in practice, and the actual CO₂ footprint? Maybe not. But we may progress if we understand the structure of the problem, by *theorising* it.

Please remember: ‘theory’ does *not* means ‘abstract’—theory means finding a way to see the problem from *elsewhere* (that is to define the *other* view). In J.K. Rowling’s *Fantastic beasts and where to find them*, we learn that the [Occamy is a choranaptyxic](#): a bird known to occupy space available to it.

In the movie, a scene relates this property: the Occamy has grown to *huge* proportions in a big hall. [Newton Scamander](#) has to pull off the trick of catching a fly in a tea-pot in full view of the Occamy, trap the bird as it flies into the pot to eat its coveted prey, close the pot with a lid. Now it is *small*.

Do we have examples of the Occamy-problem? Are the internet protocols tailing so-called “free” apps growing for real, or are they growing beyond proportion because of the space we give them in our discussions? In what degree do Occamy-problems overrule our ability of relating *real* problems?

For instance, will an administration grow if left to its *own means* in a larger space? Conversely will it shrink if constrained to work *alongside* substantial and pressing needs? We may be presently tempted to ask this question, and sometimes it can be timely. But it can also lead us to false problems.

At other times, it is the *core* of the matter: procrastinating instead of working, delaying the payment of our bills. In both cases, the task we should complete will be growing beyond proportions. Ultimately, it causes trouble to ourselves and others. We begin delving in *conspiracy* theories. Segregating *us-them*.

How can we bring a problem *down to size* and deal with it in relevant and competent ways? One answer to this is that a theory—such as the *Occamy bird*-theory above—is of little avail, if it is not based on/followed up by *investigation*. But what kind of investigation is adequate for us (in design)?

A prerequisite is, of course, a notion that a designer *should investigate*. Also the question of *how & what* designers are really good at investigating. A third prerequisite is to seek *interaction* with areas of the problem that ones *not* already understand. A fourth is to find a good way of *keeping track* of it.

However, we will find that people upon occasion will resist the progress of investigation. Here, Freud evoked the ‘kettle-logic’: a neighbour returns a broken kettle. Later s/he insists that the kettle was returned undamaged, that it was already damaged, *and* that s/he never borrowed it (or, all at once).