



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE GENERAL JRC

JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE

Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (Seville)

**Sustainable Production and Consumption Unit**

**1<sup>nd</sup> Ad-Hoc Working Group Meeting for the revision of  
the EU GPP criteria for  
Food and Catering Services**

**8th March 2016, 9:00-18:00**

**JRC IPTS Seville, Spain**

**Minutes of the meeting**

## Participant List

1	BARRES	Teresa	Ministry of Agriculture- Food and Environment- Spain
2	BERGMANN MADSEN	Betina	Municipality of Copenhagen
3	BOUSSEMART	Christophe	Nestlé
4	BRUNING	Tamara	City of Ghent
5	BRUSCHERA	Eliana	Novamont
6	CHANDLER	Caroline	ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability
7	CINO	Bernard	Ministry for Infrastructure and the Environment- The Netherlands
8	CIOCI	Grazia	Health Care Without Harm Europe
9	CLARK	Alexandra	Humane Society International
10	DRI	Marco	Joint Research Centre- European Commission
11	FERNANDEZ- ALLER	Paloma	FEDERACIÓN ESPAÑOLA DE ASOCIACIONES DEDICADAS A LA RESTAURACIÓN SOCIAL (FEADRS)
12	GALLAND	Erika	Sodexo
13	GALLI	Francesca	Department of Agriculture- Food and Environment- University of Pisa
14	GAMA CALDAS	Miguel	Joint Research Centre- European Commission
15	HEIJINK	Rob	Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment - Rijkswaterstaat
16	HERNÁNDEZ	Paola	Mensa Civica
17	JACOBSEN	Hanne Seidler	Madkulturen
18	KAUKEWISTCH	Robert	DG ENV- European Commission
19	KROMP	Bernhard	Bio Forschung Austria
20	LEE	Peter	Oakdene Hollins
21	LOPEZ	Patricia	FoodDrinkEurope
22	MARIANI	Maurizio	RISTECO
23	MASCIOLI	Alessandra	Ministry of Environment
24	MEDYNA	Galyna	Joint Research Centre- European Commission
25	MEREDITH	Stephen	International Federation of Organic Agriculture (IFOAM) Movements EU Group
26	NETO	Belmira	Joint Research Centre- European Commission
27	NYSSÖNEN	Marika	City of Helsinki
28	OVASKAINEN	Elina	MOTiva Oy
29	PEACOCK	Nina	Food Service Europe
30	PUIG MORÉ	Rosa	Novamont SpA
31	RODRIGUEZ	Rocio	Joint Research Centre- European Commission
32	SJOGREN	Pernilla	Oakdene Hollins Ltd
33	SOUSA	Rosa	ICS - Lisbon
34	TEUFEL	Jennifer	Öko-Institut e.V. / EEB
35	TLAGA	Justyna Maria	European Institutions and other
36	VAINIKAINEN	Anna	Finnish Food and Drink Ind. Fed. (ETL)

37	VAN RANST	Marijke	BioForum Vlaanderen vzw
38	VETERE	Mariagiovanna	European Bioplastics
39	VIS	Jan Kees	Unilever
40	WARREN	Keith	European Federation of Catering Equipment Manufacturers

DRAFT

# AGENDA

	AGENDA	SCHEDULE
	<b>Start of the AHWG</b>	<b>09:00</b>
1.	<b>Welcome and introduction</b> Introduction to the objectives of the EU Green Public Procurement. Timeline.	
2.	Summary of the Preliminary Report: Presentation and Discussion Key results from the market, technical and environmental analysis and improvement potentials	
3.	<b>Product group specifications - Presentation and discussion</b> Product group scope and definitions	
	Coffee break	<b>10:30 – 10:45h</b>
4.	<b>EU GPP Criteria proposal for <u>Food</u> - Criteria set presentation and discussion.</b> - Organic food products - Marine and aquaculture food products - Seasonal produce - Integrated production - Animal welfare - Fair trade products - Packaging - Sustainable palm oil - Other schemes of sustainable production	
	Lunch break	<b>13:30 – 14:30</b>
5.	<b>EU GPP Criteria proposal for <u>Catering Services</u> - Criteria set presentation and discussion</b> - Food procurement ( <i>overview of the abovementioned criteria set proposals for Food</i> ) - Menu planning - Staff training - Consumable goods	
	Coffee break	<b>16:00 – 16:15</b>
6.	<b>EU GPP Criteria proposal for <u>Catering Services</u> - Criteria set presentation and discussion (cont.):</b> - Equipment - Vehicle fleet and planning of food delivery - Environmental management measures and practices - Waste sorting and disposal	
7.	<b>Conclusions, next steps and meeting closure</b>	
	<b>Close of the AHWG</b>	<b>18:00</b>

The following minutes cover the discussion on the EU GPP criteria for the product group "Food and Catering services".

Stakeholders were invited to provide comments on the first draft of the technical report (before April 5<sup>th</sup> 2016) through the BATIS on-line system.

PDF versions of the presentations given during the 1<sup>nd</sup> AHWG meeting can be found on BATIS and on the project website.

DRAFT

## 1. Welcome and introduction

The meeting opened with an introductory round table and brief presentation by the chairman of JRC-IPTS, followed by an introductory word by DG ENV. The agenda for the meeting was set with the chairman proposing slight alterations for one of the presentations (namely the one on the criterion on equipment was rescheduled to be presented before the afternoon coffee break).

## 2. Timeline, summary of preliminary report, criteria structure

JRC-IPTS first presented the next steps in the project timeline – comments on the first draft of the technical report can be provided until April 5, 2016, and the project is expected to be finalised by mid-2017. A short summary of results from the preliminary report followed and covered market analysis, technical and environmental analysis and improvement potential. The structure of the proposed EU GPP criteria set was presented. The preliminary report can be found on the project website:

[http://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/Food\\_Catering/stakeholders.html](http://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/Food_Catering/stakeholders.html) .

No comments or questions were received for this section of the presentation.

## 3. Product group specifications

This section covered the proposed texts describing the EU GPP product group scope and definitions.

It was proposed to hold discussions after each sub-section of the presentation and the following points were raised during the discussions:

### 3.1 Product group scope and definition

- (General) A stakeholder introduced the topic that local farmers expressed their concerns that the price they are paid at the start of the process (primary production) is not high enough when publicly contracted. There is a lack of stimulus to take into account environmental concerns if they are not paid enough. According to local farmers and their trade unions, it's a cross cutting problem at the sectorial and horizontal levels. JRC answered that fair trade is covered by the proposals to be presented later on and further thinking is needed to understand how, within the EU GPP framework, it would be possible to cover the mentioned aspects.
- (structure of criteria) One stakeholder stated, as general feedback, that it is good to have separate criteria for food and catering as the criteria for food within catering should be approached differently than if procuring food alone. Food procurement is done for specific products, such as coffee or vegetables, and thus it is possible to be more specific when procuring food than when procuring catering services. Same stakeholder stated that it could be interesting to make a distinction between food procurement and procurement for food within catering. Another stakeholder said that the proposed catering criteria are too focused on food products and they only refer to whether to choose meat/no meat at the end (menu planning). A general approach to limiting the overall impact is missing and more focus should be given to choosing between product categories and seeing what can lead to most environmental (and health) impact reductions over e.g. a whole year. Another aspect that seems to be missing in the criteria set is the prevention of food waste and losses. The waste

directive provides targets for food waste reduction and methods that could be taken into account within catering. One stakeholder stated that they would appreciate if the criteria could be reworded, as there may be different levels on which to address the environmental hotspots and only looking at food categories is not a good idea.

- (scope missing) One stakeholder highlighted that the sector of kindergartens is missing from the document and request for a clarification as to what is meant by “caring homes”? They supported the concerns raised on local farmers, as their situation is rather bad and they’re not in direct contact with the public authorities.
- (scope) A stakeholder welcomed the aspects considered within the proposed scope by stating that both outsourced and in-house catering are important to be included in order to have a level playing field between the two.
- (scope on sustainability aspects covered) A stakeholder applauded the fact that the set of criteria covers multiple views of sustainability but wanted to reiterate that the scope should be changed from environmental to sustainable public procurement as there are ethical aspects as such animal welfare to consider. Moreover, they highlighted that the industrial sector has been working on continuous actions to impact reduction. The stakeholder also mentioned the Environmental Footprint (PEF) pilots on-going for the sector of food and drink products and that these should be considered more for assessing the sustainability of food.
- (scope on sustainability aspects covered) One stakeholder said there seems to be some confusion between environmental impacts and the concept of sustainability. The sustainability issues covered in the criteria could be further explored from a broader sustainability point of view by looking at the FAO sustainability assessment guidelines for food and farming. Another stakeholder pointed out that an additional piece of information should be taken into account - UN food and agriculture principles.
- (documents) One stakeholder said that the preliminary report made some assumptions that should be described and defined in more detail (e.g. there is a need to define the boundaries of the analysis for the emission of CO<sub>2</sub> for the city of Helsinki) and stated that 3-7 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per meal seems to be the most frequently cited numbers in literature. Furthermore, they highlighted several other points including that no mention is made of the existing EPD on the certification of food production and transport of meals (more than 130 certifications exist). In the background report, the organic market value is stated to be decreasing in Europe, however, evidence from the European Environmental Agency shows that this value is increasing. They also pointed out that the technical report states that cooking and chill systems contribute to lowering food waste but there is no adequate support for this statement.
- (criteria applicability) One stakeholder informed the participants that the sector’s catering companies operate in a large number of countries and thus their policies are not exclusively specific to the EU. As an example, it was mentioned that for some criteria, such as the criteria for organic products, it may be difficult to put in place a strategy for a catering services company as a whole to comply with this criterion as they also operate in non-EU countries where availability is low.
- (sustainability aspects) A stakeholder said that addressing environmental issues hasn't stopped social issues from also being incorporated within companies' environmental management systems.
- JRC responded that the structure of the set of criteria proposed aims to cover all the elements linked to the procurement of food products and also the procurement of catering services. The menu planning criterion attempts to cover the large number of environmental hotspots identified (such as red meat consumption, food waste) and, in addition, the whole criteria needs to be useable in all Member States and should be verifiable by procurers. The proposal is intended to be general in order to cover the different types of catering services provided.

- DG ENV responded on the fact that the focus of the criteria is green and not sustainable public procurement. DG ENV, together with JRC, has experience in the field of environment and the question of corporate social responsibility is under the responsibility of DG Employment, which publishes guidelines that cover social aspects. The Food and Catering service project is already complex enough when looking only at environmental criteria and thus more complexities should not be added to it within such a limited timeframe for development.
- JRC added that the scope of green public procurement is set in the frame of the public procurement communication. The criteria proposed are meant to provide guidance and individual procurers should build up on this GPP criteria.

## 4. EU GPP criteria set for Food

### 4.1 Organic food products

- (General and threshold) One stakeholder said that GPP is a voluntary instrument but once public procurers adopt the criteria, it becomes mandatory and it has an impact on market availability and prices. The organic criteria, when based on purchase volume, might be hard to meet due to market availability and the thresholds based on purchase costs might be better. Moreover, the targets set out might be too ambitious as it has been shown that thresholds of 20% are not easily met in France. Social-economic studies about market availability are lacking to allow setting a target and many parts of the EU do not have a very developed organic market (e.g. Eastern countries). The stakeholder mentioned that by not specifying a specific target it would make it possible for the procurers and companies to work together to set out a manageable target based on organic product availability within a particular market.
- (general and threshold) On the issue of budgets, a stakeholder said that although organic products tend to cost more, a planned catering menu doesn't have in overall to be more expensive. A stakeholder said that is important that organic is considered at the level of technical specifications. This is because it is essential that tenders are compared on the same level so there aren't differences in terms of prices on the technical specification level. Although the goal percentage may be seen as high, there is a need for public kitchens to serve as an example. The stakeholder proposed that for vending machines, the goal threshold would work better if expressed in terms of units of products in the machines instead of in percentage.
- (thresholds) A stakeholder agreed with the ambition levels set out but stated that it would be preferable to leave the choice up to the procurer as to whether cost or volume of food (mass) should be considered. They also said that they failed to see more arguments for supporting organic produce within the criteria set.
- (thresholds and evidence aspects on organic) A stakeholder said that they supported the inclusion of goal percentages for organics (particularly in mass) to the criteria as it would to ease the verification for procurements made in smaller towns and would allow for an easier uptake and promote procurers working together with suppliers to develop the market. Regarding the budget, they proposed that it is possible to combine organic produce with menu planning in a way that would not increase costs. Finally, they highlighted that the formulation of the arguments for organics are quite confusing as to whether they were for or anti-organic farming and that written comments and new information sources on organic farming will be sent in after the meeting.

- (threshold) A stakeholder informed that in Denmark 30% in mass is easily reached with organic vegetables and dairy products and it did not result in increased costs compared to non-organic produce and products.
- (unit of measurement) A stakeholder said that in Copenhagen, 90% of the produce procured is organic in all meals and this did not result in extra costs for the kitchen budget and that the criterion requirements should be expressed in mass because it eases the verification and things like green produce can be used to bulk up orders. They recommended either to keep the requirements by mass or to have both requirements by mass and costs to give flexibility to the procurers.
- (organic & other criteria) A stakeholder stated that requesting organic products and produce is a way to prove that the reduction of pesticides is being considered within the requirements. Indeed, in the Netherlands, organic labels are used as verification for different requirements other than environmental (e.g. animal welfare). This use of organic labels for verification also seems to be possible for different requirements (for organic-related criteria) within the proposed criteria set. The stakeholder also said that the target seems to be very ambitious for organics as a whole but not when sustainable production is considered.
- (limitations for organics) A stakeholder commented on the uneven market availability of organic produce among EU member states. The sole focus on organic produce in the requirements seems narrow as there are multiple types of sector innovation that lead to the lowering of environmental impacts. SMEs might have problems in getting organic certifications and there should be other certifications and other ways of verifying that the produce is compliant with a reduction of environmental impacts.
- (small producers) A stakeholder said that requirements should be set out in a manner that would give incentives to small-scale consortiums/producers to consolidate to answer to a tender.
- (EU validity for organic certification and practical guidelines) A stakeholder said that it should be remembered that organic farming is the only EU wide certification that's controlled and verifiable and that recent market data exist showing that the organic market is growing by 6% in the EU. In respect to the ambition levels, the stakeholder stated they were good and added that practical recommendations on how to progressively develop the sector and the targets should be made available. Moreover, practical recommendations (organic mass catering was cited as an example of practical guidelines available) should be made available for new EU countries to assist with the implementation of the GPP criteria and to help them move in the right direction.
- JRC requested that stakeholders make available data that can corroborate amendments of the proposed thresholds. In relation to the observation made on an eventual overlap in the requirements for organics and other related criteria, JRC mentioned that to avoid this, organic produce are explicitly excluded in the criteria text for criteria where misinterpretations could result in the double counting of aspects covered by certified organic produce.

## **4.2 Marine and aquaculture food products**

- (general and organic aquaculture) A stakeholder pointed out that careful attention must be paid to avoid having mutually exclusive criteria. Moreover, they highlighted that reference should also be made to organic aquaculture in the overall criteria set as it seems not to be in the scope of this criterion. Finally, they requested a clarification as to why this criterion was expressed in terms of mass.
- (organic aquaculture) Another stakeholder agreed that reference to organic aquaculture seems to be missing from the overall criteria set as the criteria need to be comprehensive.

- (purchasing guidelines) A stakeholder informed that in Austria there is a position paper which recommends buying fish from the green list from Greenpeace and also takes into account WWF guidance. Moreover, to make the criteria more complete, pond fish production should be considered (e.g. trout, carps).
- (global contract caterers and purchasing guidelines) Another stakeholder said they were using lists other than the one from the marine conservation society for the purchase of fish and seafood species (e.g. WWF, Greenpeace, IUCN) and they will shared those with JRC. The stakeholder mentioned that global contract caterers make use of global fish purchasing guides, and prepare their own purchase guidelines based on them, whereas the guides from the marine conservation society (MSC) listed in the criteria seem to be very UK-centric and do not allow flexibility to adapt to different markets. Regarding the MSC and aquaculture stewardship council (ASC) lists, the stakeholder stated that market availability for the listed species varies from one country to another.
- (other certification schemes) A stakeholder said that there are other certification schemes that should be looked at besides MSC and ASC as these can be very expensive and some fish species considered to be sustainable are not listed. Moreover, they stated that the guidelines from WWF are meant for the large public and not public procurement.
- (wording) A stakeholder pointed out that the wording of the criterion needs to be revised to make it more precise and to avoid possible wide interpretation.
- (national experience) A stakeholder informed that in Italian national GPP, 20% of the fish must be MSC certified or from organic aquaculture but that this specific criterion doesn't work because of availability and public procurement doesn't seem to be able to influence the fish sector.
- DG ENV responded that, as for other criteria, we need to have a closer look at the legal feasibility of criteria in order to make the criteria text more precise. Regarding the available industry schemes, they are usually based on continuous improvement and thus very important in terms of the company policy; however, in public procurement it is required to certify that a product is indeed a good product and not only part of an overall company policy towards improvement. JRC said that all input is very welcome and that the MSC and ASC are well recognised schemes in use in Europe. The expression of the criterion requirements in mass is the most common approach taken in GPP schemes as costs may vary among countries. Work towards making explicit the consideration of organic aquaculture within the criteria set will be carried out.

#### **4.3 Seasonal produce**

- (general) A stakeholder mentioned the “innovative partnership” that is part of the public purchasing law in Europe and that could be useful to promote a systematic global approach to food service provision.
- (general) A stakeholder said that the life cycle of products should be taken into consideration.
- (general) A stakeholder stated that criteria should not be mutually exclusive and that an overall look is needed to make criteria complementary.
- (general) A stakeholder said that seasonality is more an aspect related to economic and social aspects to promote local produce and that argumentation should be centred on the potential environmental benefits.
- (details in tenders) A stakeholder informed that more detailed information on how seasonal produce (fruits and vegetables) are dealt with and details on how tenders incorporate requests for diversity in apples/pears will be sent to JRC. In their tenders, the stakeholder requests that contract caterers supply seasonal calendars that indicate the types of fruits and vegetables available for each season, where they are grown, not bought. The stakeholder

said that they have not faced any market availability issues. On the proposed criteria, the stakeholder requested that the requirements for non-refrigeration be withdrawn as some products need to be refrigerated to be kept fresh.

- (wording) Another stakeholder supported the proposal to delete the requirement for non-refrigeration as it may increase food waste. They also stated that the proposed wording may lead to misunderstandings as it could be read that only seasonal products should be supplied – new wording was proposed to state that seasonal produce should be included along with other food products as otherwise menus could be lacking variety.
- (wording) A stakeholder stated that there might be interpretation issues as to where the produce should be seasonal – where it's grown or bought (it should be where it's grown). This can explain some of the issues brought up on market availability. The stakeholder further informed that some greenhouses are using renewable energy and that should be looked at.
- (seasonal calendars) A stakeholder stated that in the Netherlands vegetable and fruit calendars are available and that will be sent over to JRC.
- (criteria structure) A stakeholder made a remark on having seasonality as a technical specification within food procurement. Within the procurement of catering, seasonality should be instead part of the menu planning as the locality chooses when it buys what. It is therefore not a technical specification but instead information about the procurement process. Setting seasonality and the supply on a certain food product in a technical specification can influence the purchase of a commodity that may not be available in a more or less large time horizon.
- JRC informed that all comments in written form and other inputs (documents to be sent) are very much appreciated and will support the work to be done in amending the criteria.

#### **4.4 Integrated production**

- (threshold) A stakeholder said that the Italian national GPP includes the same criterion and suggested increasing the required % and setting it as a technical specification. In addition, it was proposed that other third party certifications (as such ISO 14001) could be used as means of proof for this criterion.
- (general) A stakeholder informs that in Denmark and other Nordic countries this type of criterion is unknown and thus cannot share any experience on it. Another stakeholder confirmed that it is also the same for Austria. Moreover, they stated that some agro-foods systems are not covered by such certifications. They also disagreed with the conclusions of the second paragraph the rationale, "integrated production can be way forward since it is a combination of organic and conventional practices", as organic farming is certified and controlled but no EU wide certification exists for integrated production.
- (general) A stakeholder said that integrated production (IP) is referred to in a standard. The standard number details will be sent to JRC.
- (general) Another stakeholder informed that IP is unknown within the catering sector and a definition will be needed before setting a criterion on it.
- (general) A stakeholder stated that the discussion should not focus on the advantages and disadvantages of organic compared to conventional farming as this criterion aims to provide various means to decrease environmental impact and is a good idea.
- (general) A stakeholder informed that in the Netherlands a label exists that is equivalent to IP and can be used in tenders to verify the lower use of pesticides. The stakeholder agrees that broadening the possibilities to achieve lower environmental impacts, such as though the use of IP, can stimulate a more sustainable production.
- (terminology) Stakeholder asked whether "precision farming" is not a more widely used term than IP, as it seems that many countries have similar approaches but they don't call it

IP. Another stakeholder mentioned that we are moving toward integrated production and in Sweden a label is awarded to more sustainable practices such as a more rational use of pesticides in agro-production systems.

- JRC said that in Spain/Andalusia, integrated production is a very common method of production although it may not be widely known as IP. Moreover, JRC responded that the background report has more detailed information on the definition of IP and on the availability of IP schemes within EU and highlighted the differences between IP and organic production and that they cannot be substituted one for the other.

#### 4.5 Animal welfare

- (general) One stakeholder stated that the evidence on setting animal welfare criteria have shown pros and cons in the respect to achievable environmental benefits. Moreover, procurement should be considered as a whole and the criteria should be set out so that criteria on animal welfare will not seem out of place. One way to increase animal welfare is thorough minimisation of livestock consumption and this seems to be lost within the criteria proposals. The connection between criteria also deserves further attention. A stakeholder responded that this criterion aims to promote the purchase of meat of higher quality in the case where it is chosen to be bought. At same time the menu planning criterion includes the aspect on reducing the livestock consumption. Both aspects tackle different points on the livestock consumption. Implicitly this leads to the conclusion that better quality meat should be bought in the smaller quantities.
- (market availability and meat reduction) One stakeholder said that they have not faced any problems to purchase organic eggs. However, for meat it's more problematic. Overall though the amount of meat has been reduced to keep within the available kitchen budget. Another stakeholder agreed that meat reduction, especially in hospital kitchens and kindergartens, is essential to keep budget and meeting the organic level requirements.
- (market availability) A stakeholder said that requiring all eggs to be organic is very challenging due to market availability, which might be different on European markets. The same applies to certified animal welfare meat products.
- (meat reduction as award criterion) One stakeholder said that reduction in meat consumption is missing from the award criteria. Its inclusion can be expected to increase better public health and also lead to a large reduction in environmental impacts. The reduction of livestock consumption is considered in the menu planning but it could also be part of an award criterion. Many opportunities are available to reduce meat consumption, as for example, to reduce meat-based dishes or have more vegetarian options (e.g. veggie days). JRC said that this relates more with the catering part of the criteria set and this possibility should be considered within the catering.
- (wording) One stakeholder said that the criterion needs to be more specific on the aspect of ambition levels in order to avoid receiving offers with distinct levels of ambition as this would make distinguishing between different offers more difficult.
- (health benefits of organic) A stakeholder mentioned a recent meta-study comparing organic and conventional meat and milk. Results show health benefits (e.g. increased omega 3) when using organic produce dairy/meat and this should be taken into account. JRC said that confusion between organic and free range should not be made as the requirements in organic products go beyond those for free range products.
- (biodiversity) One stakeholder mentioned that optional standards to defend biodiversity exist and could be taken into account to promote products from specific regions. Mountain

products were given as an example; they set requirements on high quality meat, dairy products, restriction on the use of antibiotics, etc.

- JRC answered that several of the aspects discussed are covered within the criteria set for catering. These will be later further discussed in the criterion for menu planning (as meat reduction and the veggie days). Organics are also not covered here and as this criterion specifically addresses that by stating that organics are out of the scope. For animal welfare standards (e.g. free range) there are labels available for verification.

#### 4.6 Fair trade products

- (range of products) A stakeholder said that the new inclusion of Fair Trade is very positive. However, it is limited to a certain number of products. The Fair Trade International (FLO) may assist on the identification of the country of origin for which food products may be requested to be fair trade certified. The stakeholder said that organic should be also within the scope since often products are both fairly traded and organic and they should be rewarded more.
- (range of products) A stakeholder suggested having a criterion (perhaps award) to promote products of protected/traditional origin as the linked labels not only safeguard traditions but also tackle environmental aspects. JRC responded that this needs to be discussed with DG ENV as it is a policy oriented issue.
- (wording) A stakeholder suggested changing the wording to “fairly traded” instead of “fair trade” because it’s more inclusive. The criteria text should be more specific and specify the meaning of “sustainable” because this will have an impact on product availability. On market availability, if sustainable products are mentioned, the target of 50% could be achieved in only a relatively small number of countries, but it will be very difficult to achieve 20% for the whole of Europe. Two other stakeholders supported this comment.
- (wording) A stakeholder requested making clear the wording and that it should be “fairly traded” and not the “fair trade” brand. They also requested rewording the mention of organics in the criterion text.
- (market availability) A stakeholder mentioned that, for market availability, this aspect is relatively unproblematic and they also commented on the possibility of having products that are organic and fairly traded.
- (general & organic and fairly traded) A stakeholder gave the example of requirements in their tenders (requirements are set on 100% for coffee, tea, sugar) to request more ambitious levels for the criteria set. They also mentioned on the difficulties encountered when requiring simultaneously organic and fair-trade due to double counting. In respect to vending machines it was mentioned that setting requirements for 100% fair-trade is possible. Another stakeholder supported the two remarks and stated that at least coffee and tea should be 100% fairly traded and that a more extended list of products should be considered.
- (organic and fairly traded) A stakeholder gave the example of the use of 100% organic fair-trade coffee in retirement homes and hospitals in their area. Also bananas are highly used and there are no problems with availability. As an example of good waste management, they stated that organic coffee grounds are used to growing substrate of mushrooms that can also be certified as organic.
- (criterion type) A stakeholder asked if it is possible to combine technical and award criteria. A remark was made on the fact that greenwashing and over-valuing certain marketing schemes by certain companies should be avoided.

- (criterion type) A stakeholder asked if fair trade could be included as a contract performance clause instead. JRC answered that a contract performance clause could assist on the verification. DG ENV said that the contents of the contract performance clauses are in fact an issue to discuss, but it would be appropriate to discuss it at a later stage after the review of the full set of criteria.
- (criterion type) A stakeholder stated that fair trade should be part of a contract performance clause or an award criterion but not a technical specification. However, legal aspects have to be taken into account. They further added that technical and award criteria addressing the same criteria areas can be combined. They proposed to have 100% organic (for coffee) as a technical criterion and fair trade as an award criterion.
- (labels) A stakeholder raised the question of if the label from the Rain Forest Alliance can be considered to comply with this requirement for fairly traded products. This is despite the fact that the label is awarded to products when only 30% of all volume is fairly traded. JRC and DG ENV consider that this topic needs further investigation. However, due to the large availability of labels on fairly traded products the stakeholder suggested that the request on fairly traded can be settled to the higher levels available in the market.
- (national targets) A stakeholder asked whether national targets are an option to take into account when setting requirements on fairly traded products. JRC answered that GPP is developed for the EU28 and then procurers adapt it to their own area's specificities and the breaking down into different countries is not intended. DG ENV added that criteria are being developed for the use of individual public authorities with no proposals made for specific national targets (except from the overall 50 % GPP target set in 2008)
- JRC thanked for the input on the practical examples and answered that the questions raised on the contract performance clauses will be further considered in light of legal issues and the need to have a more general contract performance clause tackling verification for several criteria.

#### **4.7 Packaging**

- (wording) A stakeholder said that it is better to talk about "biomass" when addressing fibres as otherwise it seems that you're only talking about paper/cardboard and not taking into account bioplastics. Further it was requested to further clarify what is meant with "or equivalent", as it seems that the ASTM is the only equivalent scheme because the EN standard is very specific and stringent. It was questioned if the requirement on recycled content is an alternative to bio based.
- (labels) A stakeholder said that it would be good to mention reusable systems as there are several such approaches currently in use. Further it was mentioned that besides FSC for fiber packaging, there are other certification schemes that should also be taken into account.
- (application & single use packaging) A stakeholder said the criteria are difficult to apply for contract catering. It is doable for central kitchens but difficult at a client's premises. Also there are laws enforcing the use of single use products (e.g. olive oil in single servings in Spain). For reusable systems, it sometimes depends on the supplier and not the tendering process.
- (general) A stakeholder said packaging is an important aspect for food waste. There is no single solution that fits all and they were not sure how that can be translated to a criterion as food packaging should meet the needs of the user.

- (general) A stakeholder asked if the chemicals in the packaging are taken into account, in line with the foreseen regulation of this in food contact packaging. JRC answered that this matter relates more to food safety aspects and thus under the attention of other directorates in the European Commission.
- (general) A stakeholder said that they agree with the general approach but further steps could be taken in the future such as the analysis of packaging waste generation together with food waste. Stakeholder suggested to analyse eventual benefits to request packaging with the mark green dot.
- (general) A stakeholder made a remark to the difficulty to assess such criterion and further said that the overall goal is to reduce packaging overall.
- (general and returnable packaging) A stakeholder said that the requirement should be aligned with the waste hierarchy and tailored based on the facilities available to collect these waste streams. These comments were supported by another stakeholder. A remark was made on the fact that for returnable packaging, additional impact related to transport should be considered and such packaging may not always have environmental benefits.
- (single use packaging) A stakeholder informed that single serving packaging is, in some cases, obligatory for food safety reasons to avoid cross contamination. Bio—based packaging is available, however, to be used for single serving food products.
- (single use packaging) A stakeholder raised the points that single use packaging has advantages and disadvantages in terms of environmental aspects and that it has a comparatively lower environmental impact throughout the supply chain when compared to e.g. the production stage. The stakeholder said that a criterion requesting recyclable materials (e.g. aluminium) in primary packaging is missing and further added that instead of setting a requirement on the recycled content that is not easily identified, a material's recyclability should be considered. These comments were supported by another stakeholder.
- (single use packaging) A stakeholder agreed that single unit packaging has advantages, it avoids food waste and also has other benefits such as helping provide balanced dietary options. The requirement seems to be confusing and allowing leeway on the justification to provide to use single in favour of bulk packaging. A remark was made that for certain products the use of packaging from sustainable sources/recycled/biodegradable is not appropriate.
- (single use packaging) A stakeholder concurred that using individual portions helps avoid food waste and also is required for food safety reasons. From a procurer's perspective, it is difficult to decide on the type of packaging that should be requested and, thus, it is up to the supplier to decide on the type of packaging to supply (lunches are ready-made and packaged). The supplier takes back the single serving packaging and provides proof that this packaging was sent to be recycled.
- JRC took note of the overall positive feedback towards this proposal and requested the stakeholders to provide specific written input on how to make the criteria more workable.

#### **4.8 Sustainable palm oil**

- (general and verification) One stakeholder said that although this is a very important aspect and in use by many procurers, the verification is difficult and procurers feel that they are not able to perform an adequate verification. The targets, for the moment, seem to be very high

and, thus, an alternative approach could focus on avoiding palm oil altogether and, if not possible, requesting certified palm oil.

- (general) A stakeholder said that they appreciated seeing this new criterion proposal and remarked that it should be more clearly stated in the rationale that palm oil has a large impact on rain forest depletion and the certification schemes should be analysed in more depth.
- (general) To counter the argument from one stakeholder on the availability on the market of certified palm oil, JRC stated that this is not a pass or fail criterion but an award criterion aiming to award points to tenderers.
- (general) A stakeholder informed that this requirement seems not to be in line with the Spanish regulation that does not allow palm oil to be used for cooking and the national strategy against obesity.
- (thresholds) Other stakeholder agreed with the previous statement and suggested changing the requirements to request that a certain number of units are palm oil-free and the remainder are certified. The ingredient label can be used as a mean of verification for no presence of palm oil. Another stakeholder said that this type of verification is not easy and thus the requirement should be set in requesting no palm oil products.
- (wording) A stakeholder requested a clarification of the criterion text. JRC responded that the requirement was that 20% of all the units purchased containing palm oil are certified as containing palm oil from a sustainable source. However, the wording will be revised to avoid misinterpretations.
- (proposed change) A stakeholder said that the current phrasing is very difficult to verify. The proposed targets are very high and avoiding palm oil will be very difficult because it is widely used. They suggested to award points if the contract caterer provides documents proving that the palm oil in their products is from sustainable sources. Two other stakeholders supported this recommendation. One stakeholder said that avoiding palm oil may not be the way to go due to the inherent social impacts and it is not necessarily better. Certifications should be the way to move forward and help producers be more sustainable. A stakeholder responded that some national policies are directing their efforts in avoiding palm oil in food products due to health concerns.
- JRC clarified that this criterion focuses on palm oil as an ingredient in food products (e.g. the ones in vending machine) since it seems that it is not used for cooking in Europe. Written input on the market availability of certified products was requested from stakeholders to build up on this proposal.

#### **4.9 Other schemes of sustainable production**

- No specific comments were raised by stakeholders on this topic. DG ENV remarked that procurer input on what kind of information/means of proof are being asked for tender evaluation is essential, especially on aspects such as organics, integrated production, menu planning, and what has to be checked when the service is being delivered. This is because it has been noticed that there are discrepancies between what is promised by tenderers and what is delivered at the end and the GPP criteria should take measures to help procurers avoid that.

## 5. EU GPP criteria set for Catering Services

### 5.1 Staff training

- (training duration) A stakeholder remarked that the training duration of 16 hours proposed seems not to be enough for complex issues such as menu planning. For example, for cleaning contracts, which seem not to be as complex, 25 hours are required as a minimum. The stakeholder said that the criterion seems adequate and it is very important to periodically (annually) retrain staff.
- (staff receiving training and duration) The wording "all other staff" in the text was asked to be clarified, to which JRC responded that it refers to all non-new staff. It was also added that relevant staff should be trained only on the relevant issues to the tasks to be carried out. The stakeholder highlighted the difficulty to achieve the requested 16 hours of training within 4 weeks because some staff work part-time. The recommendation is to have a training program that includes an initial training with some modules to be completed within 3 to 6 months from the start of a person's contract.
- (staff receiving training) A stakeholder mentioned that in food waste, teachers and people looking after children during meal times should contribute and, as such, they also need to be trained on how they can help prevent food waste. They should also be considered in the category "all other staff".
- (contract changes) DG ENV mentioned the need to work on the wording to capture the case when a contract caterer changes but the staff stays the same. Stakeholders were also asked for feedback on the staff training requirements proposed to capture this situation.
- (staff receiving training) A stakeholder mentioned the case of monitors who look after children during meal times and only work 10 hours per week – they might not need to go through the full training (e.g. no need to train on purchasing consumables). The criterion wording should be amended to reflect that situation and that specific training is needed for specific staff.
- (trainers) A stakeholder raised the question on who is training the trainees. This criterion is set up for a market that does not exist yet as there is a lack of competent trainers and this should be somehow addressed. JRC requested procurers to share their experience with this type of issue. The stakeholder mentioned that a search on the market for specific training skills can assist with that.
- (proposal for new requirement) A stakeholder raised the point that the eventual inclusion of a requirement on eco-driving training should be considered. JRC mentioned that this is being considered to be more appropriate for another EU GPP project– transport.
- (cleaning agents and water) A stakeholder suggested making a reference to cleaning agents and water use in this criterion, but also said to be uncertain about that falling under the scope of this product group. JRC said that these aspects are covered in another EU GPP project – cleaning services; however, some aspects can be taken into consideration for the cleaning activities in kitchens.
- (study on food waste) One stakeholder mentioned a study publically available on food waste in schools. The results show a positive influence on food waste mitigation when external monitors came for the lunch hour.

- (guidelines) A stakeholder requested a clarification on the practical implementation of the guidelines. Guidance notes could accompany the guidelines and they would be particularly relevant for newer member states where GPP is less developed.
- DG ENV requested feedback on how training is carried out and also how it is incorporated within tenders. Is the tender specifying that the company should train staff or is it the public institution that trains people, or both depending on the case?
- (staff receiving training) A stakeholder committed to sharing their experience on tenders requiring the staff who provide specific training for catering services. Another stakeholder said that this training aspect was not found as feasible to require in tenders and tenderers and procurers need to cooperate on this.
- (training duration) A stakeholder mentioned that a training program of 5 full weeks was necessary to train staff in kindergartens, employed by the city, to switch the kitchen to organic. This training program was also successfully used to incorporate unemployed people.
- JRC said that aspects covered by this criterion seem to be considered relevant but effort needs to be made on re-wording it for clarification and to specify that only relevant staff should be trained. More input was also requested on the number of hours proposed for training and examples from contract catering companies on topics covered in staff training.

## **5.2 Environmental management measures and practices**

- (compliance by SMEs) A stakeholder shared the experience stating that, within their procurement activities, EMAS/ISO14001 or equivalent are requested. Big companies don't have any problems with this requirement and offer the proper documentation to prove it. For smaller companies, it is very difficult to prove the "or equivalent" because the third party certification is expensive; they tend to provide random documents. Two other stakeholders confirmed this and stated that this criterion is very difficult to comply with for SMEs.
- JRC answered to they are aware of the limitations and will further investigate the feasibility for smaller companies.

## **5.3 Food procurement**

- JRC stated that this requirement refers to the list of criteria included under "Food procurement" discussed in the morning session and the comments received will be taken into consideration also for this part of the criteria set – "Catering Services".

## **5.4 Menu planning**

- (general, various) One stakeholder commented on the food waste part of the criterion stating that testing new foods is part of the curriculum for schools and children's preferences for meals are not likely to vary a lot. They also suggested that weekly vegetarian menus should be at the core level too and the ambition level should be set higher. The stakeholder presented the example of their local kitchens where vegetarian menus are offered on a daily basis apart of the weekly veggie day. On the % of meat content in meals, the stakeholder stated that is very difficult to have a clear nutritional answer from dietary specialists on the meat content to be made available in dishes. As an alternative to meat, other equivalent proteins can be used and it is already the case in some canteens.

- (wording) One stakeholder requested for the wording on the requirement for a "weekly vegetarian offer" to be clarified and either explicitly refer to a one day per week offer of a veggie meal or to an everyday offer of a vegetarian option. Both options are supported by the stakeholder. In addition, a request for tap water to be provided as an alternative to bottled water should be included.
- (wording) A stakeholder requested the clarification of the vegetarian option (for instance, if vegan options are included). It was further remarked that price policies may help promoting the veggie option and educate people. Also perhaps some information on the environmental impact of dishes could be included in addition to nutritional value.
- (additional point) One stakeholder raised the concern on the current use of the same parts of animals in menus (e.g. chicken breast), leaving the possibility for the creation of waste in the supply chain. A recommendation to use every part of the animal in menus can prevent that.
- (additional point) A stakeholder suggested that information helping choose the best option could also fit well on the menu planning criterion.
- (ambition level for veggie option) One stakeholder stated that they agree with more ambitious requirements on the vegetarian offer, suggesting more than only a daily vegetarian offer. This stakeholder's experience also showed that when food waste is measured, it immediately starts to be reduced, thus it was suggested to include the measuring of food waste in the minimisation plan.
- (ambition level for veggie option) Another stakeholder also agreed that more than one veggie offer every day should be required and suggested the wording to refer to "plant based" meals. A concern was raised on replacing red meat by other animal protein due to animal welfare concerns.
- (nutritional values) One stakeholder highlighted the difficulties of measuring the % of meat content in food products containing processed meat. The point was raised on the relevance for green public procurement of the nutritional values of menus. The regulation on food information to consumers stipulates that requirements linked allergen information is left up to the members states, thus this requirement goes beyond the current EU law. Further, a stakeholder reiterated their disagreement with the requirement on the provision of nutritional information, stating that it will be a huge administrative burden to fulfil this requirement for contract caterers. DG ENV said this information is available in the EC canteens and customers with food allergies rely on this information.
- (menu plan provision) A stakeholder suggested that the provision of the menu plan to the procurer weeks in advance would assist in controlling the meat content of meals.
- (collaborative management) One stakeholder informed that collaborative participatory management is also a current practice and parents go to the school canteen to try the food being given to children for tastiness and quality. Another stakeholder disagreed with the possibility of such an action to be incorporated in tenders because caterers follow a standard protocol for obtain a balanced menu and the children's parents are not necessarily informed about nutritional issues. Menu planning is tailor made in function of the customer group as, for instance, age.
- (training) A stakeholder remarked training is needed to appropriately deal with leftovers. JRC answered that this aspect is covered in the criterion for staff training.
- JRC summed up the main points indicating that the wording needs to be amended for clarity and other specific comments will be taken, as far as possible, into account for the second

criteria proposal. A main discussion point was the menu planning and special attention will be paid to it during revision. However, the structure proposed (meat, seasonality, food waste and information to consumer) seems to have general consensus as the basis for building the menu planning criterion. DG ENV requested stakeholders to share any good practices for the food waste criteria. DG ENV also requested further input regarding the possibility of having menu planning as an award criterion instead of a technical specification or a combination of both, to reward tenderers who make an effort to have a good plan.

## **5.5 Waste sorting and disposal**

- (general) A stakeholder mentioned that the reduction of the number of meal options will reduce food waste. Another stakeholder mentioned that food waste prevention should be a priority to donations of food.
- (formulation) One stakeholder said that innovative waste disposal systems (e.g. use for biogas production) could be incorporated into the criterion text as a preferred option when compared to the usual disposal ways.
- (criterion scope) A stakeholder proposed that the criterion text should be extended to the disposal facilities by requesting that waste should be brought to the correct waste stream facilities.
- (criterion scope) A stakeholder stated that food donation is the responsibility of the procurer rather than that of the contract catering company. The stakeholder recommended that this aspect remains outside the criterion scope.
- (reporting frequency) One stakeholder raised concerns about the frequency set (in the contract performance clause) for the service provider to report to the contracting authority on the waste generated. The stakeholder proposed that this should be done on an annual basis. They also would like to see in the criterion text a statement on the fact that disposal is not always the responsibility of the tenderers and this aspect should be reflected in the report obligations. Such a clause should also be part of the respective section of the report. They also raised concerns on the fact that sorting should be done where space allows as sometimes space is limited in kitchens.
- (alignment with circular economy package) One stakeholder stated that this proposal should be cross checked with the circular economy package. Specifically the point about organic waste should be taken into account for the criterion formulation. Another stakeholder mentioned that the circular economy package on food waste may be incorporated within the requirements. JRC responded that they will cross-check for alignment and the possibility to complement the criterion text.
- (wording) One stakeholder suggested splitting the criterion in two parts – one for production and one for consumption. JRC reminded that the criterion text specifically refers to the waste generated at the client sites. The stakeholder said that food waste management may be the responsibility of the contract caterers but also outside their responsibility – and in this case the responsibility is on the contracting authority. They also stated that donation of leftovers should not be considered as waste and this view was corroborated by another stakeholder.
- JRC answered that the different aspects mentioned on food waste will be analysed on how they can be covered in the menu planning (e.g. food donation) or even as an award criteria. Further, it was added that, in order to cover all the differences in waste management options, the criterion was formulated by specifically referring that this shall be done according to the local or national waste management practices and facilities.

## 5.6 Consumable goods

- (thresholds) A stakeholder mentioned their experience with tender requirements of 100% ecolabelled toilet paper and paper towels. Due to market availability, the requirements for the amounts of cleaning products (including detergents and hand soaps, hard surface cleaning, dishwashers and detergents) should also be more ambitious. The stakeholder mentioned that they set requirements for 100% in their tenders. Another stakeholder shared their national experience on procuring 100% of cleaning products with lower environmental impact, as well as for paper products, and that they do not face any problems with market availability. They recommend increasing the thresholds for this requirement. Another stakeholder supported this view and stated that they have never had issues with ecolabelled cleaning product availability.
- (units of thresholds) A stakeholder asked for a clarification on why the request for paper products is by number of units whereas disposable tableware is expressed by weight. JRC responded that the units to express paper and reusable tableware differ to align with the current practice on purchasing and waste rejection. However, the possibility of harmonising the units can be investigated.
- (market availability) A stakeholder mentioned there might be an issue with availability in some markets and more information on that will be provided to JRC. They also commented on the practical angle of the use of reusable cutlery, which limits the need for dishwashing facilities. Another stakeholder also commented that the costs and time for cleaning is sometimes too high when reusable tableware is used.
- (compostable items) A stakeholder stated that the use of reusable tableware may not be a good option, due to the need for extra dishwashing facilities, water and detergents. This makes compostable items more attractive due, not only to food safety, but also because of savings of energy/water.
- (facilities for compostable products) DG ENV remarked that the use of compostable items only seems to be appropriate when there is a separate waste stream able to receive and treat these products for compost. A stakeholder stated that biodegradable compostable plastics are accepted where there is technology to treat them, which is generally more advanced than the general waste system. The countries able to deal with these streams are among others, Italy, Germany, Belgium and France.
- (general) A stakeholder said a method to carry out monetisation of externalities could be useful to support a decision on trade-offs between use-single consumable goods and reusable ones. JRC said that they are working on that but still some time will be needed before it can be used.
- (reusable and single use goods) A stakeholder asked if scientific data could backup whether reusable items are better than single-use items. Another stakeholder mentioned that this complex issue and consumable goods are important aspects to take into account as the waste hierarchy, and reusable utensils, may play an important role on waste reduction. Here, waste prevention (e.g. by using reusable goods) is among the leading options for solid waste management. JRC mentioned that making a decision between using reusable and single use goods is complex and an example was cited by JRC of an LCA study on the use of reusable and non-reusable cups. The results of the study show that the origin of electricity is the main driver for the environmental impacts and, thus, reusable may be, in some cases, preferable within Europe due to the growing percentage of renewable energy sources within the energy mix. In addition, such a comparison (between non-reusable versus reusable) faces some scientific limitations due to trade-offs on environmental impacts categories and it is very difficult, due to LCA methodological limitations, to decide whether the use of more energy or water (used for cleaning) is preferable to the creation and treatment of urban solid waste (from e.g. non-reusable cups). JRC further added that this criterion on consumable goods

looks at the products and aims to request the use of ecolabelled products, as they are recognised as having a lower environmental impact, so with this criterion the reduction of the impact is geared toward the pre-consumption stage. The issues on resource savings during the consumption stage and post-consumption stage are aimed to be addressed in other criteria – staff training and solid waste management, respectively.

- JRC summed up the discussion saying that it seems that market availability is not an issue and thus the possibilities for setting higher thresholds will be analysed. Stakeholders were requested to give input on the situations requiring the use of non-reusable consumable goods (e.g. cups, cutlery, and plates). This will help amending the criteria by aligning it with current practices.

## 5.7 Equipment

- (general) A stakeholder remarked that the circular economy package could be useful for developing such a criterion on equipment. The criterion is a good start but more work has to be done. The length of a contract also has an influence, as for short contracts companies tend to invest in low cost equipment due to the low return profits. A requirement for companies to buy high quality equipment even for shorter contracts should be in place. A requirement for regular servicing should also be considered, as it makes equipment last longer. The stakeholder further added that Energy Star doesn't tell you much about the performance of the equipment. Moreover, informed that some work has been done on analysing the common basis between principles from energy star and from eco-design directive. The stakeholder said that some companies provide carbon footprint from their products and this can be considered within the criterion because so far not all equipment has been studied and, if a company makes environmental choices overall this should be rewarded. Besides that, training is a key issue because a lot of energy in the kitchen is lost due to poor staff training. Price is a major issue for this type of equipment and the stakeholder mentioned that the proposal seems to not lead to a significant increase of costs for the contract caterer. The adequacy of the functionality of the equipment to the needs of the customer should also not also be neglected.
- (general) A stakeholder mentioned energy use and efficiency and that public authorities should use good efficiency products.
- (equipment lifetime) A stakeholder said that they agree with the general approach but, in the scope of the circular economy package, the life of the equipment should be considered as well as the origin of energy, specifically renewable energy.
- (limitations) A stakeholder said that the contract caterer may face some space limitations, or even be impeded in bringing new equipment, when working at the client premises. JRC added that when a caterer is not responsible for providing new equipment this criterion does not apply. The stakeholder said that on some occasions the caterer has to renew the equipment during the execution of the contract and at the end the equipment is given to the client.
- (contract length) Another stakeholder said that the length of the contracts is too short (2-3 years) to buy high quality equipment to pay back investment. Stakeholder said that this in itself can be an obstacle to innovation in technology.
- (water consumption) A stakeholder mentioned that the criterion lacks a reference to water consumption, especially for dishwashers.
- (carbon calculator tools) A stakeholder informed that the carbon calculator tool, produced by the Carbon Trust, provides the energy consumption by meal, among other information. This tool is in the public domain but lacks energy efficiency indexes.

- JRC said that they welcome information on methodologies and how well they are known among procurers. Stakeholders were requested to provide information on the different ways in use by caterers in the management of pieces of equipment. JRC will also see how to eventually implement the origin of electricity as a requirement for GPP. This analysis will take into account the eventual existing legal constraints for catering services.

## 5.8 Vehicle fleet and planning of food delivery

- (relevance for food procurement) One stakeholder raised the point that this criterion may also be relevant for the procurement of food. Another stakeholder added that heavy vehicles such as trucks should also be taken into account because they are used to deliver food. The stakeholder mentioned the existence of a mobility plans in the case of specific cities. DG ENV said that this would be covered in more detail in the transport GPP criteria that is currently being developed by JRC-IPTS.
- (logistics) A stakeholder shared the opinion that the efficiency of the transport logistics should be awarded more than the types of vehicles used. As an example of a possible indicator, a stakeholder mentioned an Environmental Product Declaration where the reference unit is set to be CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per mileage.
- (logistics and planning) Another stakeholder stated that logistics are very important but that in some situations trucks are owned by the wholesale companies so it might difficult to set requirements for low environmental impact vehicles. Another stakeholder highlighted the importance of an optimisation of logistics as well as route planning.
- (alignment between GPPs criteria) Another stakeholder said that it would be useful for procurement purposes if the criteria align between different GPPs (e.g. transport and catering)
- JRC said that they would like to know to which extent the criteria for the transport GPP being revised are relevant to specificities in the catering sector. It should be kept in mind that perhaps catering services shouldn't be as stringent.

## 6. Conclusions, next steps and meeting closure

JRC-IPTS and DG ENV thanked the participants for their constructive and valuable contributions and closed the meeting.

The next steps for JRC will be to analyse all the comments received (during the meeting and written feedback) and incorporate them into a new technical report that will include an updated criteria proposal.