

Questionnaire Method or initiative owners

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

This questionnaire is targeted at method/initiative owners.

There are other questionnaires available, targeted at:

- Business and sectoral/business associations - <https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/2e0b50c6-cb80-7c41-af6d-cf9e7fa4a501>
- NGOs - <https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/7e181850-5622-8de0-048b-0a4a03c71b29>
- Public administrations and international organisations - <https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/093d8fba-e2cd-8732-d2ce-5c273ae96ae5>
- Investors and financial institutions - <https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/cf4ab21c-e97a-d0cd-4490-94254d858870>

A public consultation on a product policy framework for the circular economy will also be available soon. It will also include a section on the future use of the Environmental Footprint method.

Introduction

In 2013, the European Commission adopted the Product and Organisation Environmental Footprint (PEF and OEF) methods, recommending public and private organisations to use them for measuring and communicating the life cycle environmental performance of products and organisations[1].

In adopting this Recommendation, the objective of the European Commission was to overcome the fragmentation of the internal market as regards different available methods for measuring environmental performance.

Based on the methods, the European Commission started a pilot phase in order to test:

- the development of product group and sector-specific calculation rules (Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules and Organisation Environmental Footprint Sector Rules) through a process open to any stakeholder;
- the development of benchmarks: this corresponds to the environmental performance of the average product/ organisation on the market and is the starting point for comparing between similar products and organisations;
- approaches to verify Environmental Footprint information;

- approaches to communicate Environmental Footprint information to consumers and to other company stakeholders (e.g. business partners, investors, NGOs, etc.).

The aim of the rules is to provide a clear set of instructions for calculating the Environmental Footprint profile that guarantees reproducibility and comparability between similar products (the benchmarking of organisations is more complicated and requires very specific situations in order to be meaningful). They are based on the principle of relevance: the rules pre-define the environmental issues that are most relevant for the given product group or sector and ensure the high quality of the analysis of these issues.

The pilot phase involved 24 product groups[2] and two sectors[3], with more than 260 leading companies and other stakeholders. Most of the pilots represented more than 2/3 of the EU market for the given product or sector. More than 2000 stakeholders followed the process and several of them took the opportunity to comment on milestone documents of the pilots.

A technical evaluation of the pilots has confirmed the importance of having clear product group and sector-specific rules. A comparison of environmental performance proved to be feasible for final products: it is possible to determine whether the performance of a product is better or worse than the average product on the market (benchmark)[4].

This became possible due to the agreements on technical issues reached during the pilot phase (e.g. modelling of cattle, packaging, end of life/ recycling/ recovery, etc.) and to the use of a single set of high quality secondary (average) data. As a further action to enhance access to the methods, these data are going to be made available for free to any user of the product group and sector-specific rules until 2020.

The testing of verification approaches suggested a combination between on-site and remote audits and a focus on data that have the most impact on the final results, which are mostly data owned by the companies[5].

A wide range of tests were also carried out by the pilot participants and the European Commission on how to communicate Environmental Footprint information. Many of the tests re-confirmed a high interest in environmental information in general, and Environmental Footprint information specifically. The issues to tackle include the difficult balance between complete and accurate information on the one hand and a need for simplicity and clarity on the other[6].

The European Commission is currently evaluating potential ways forward for the application of the PEF and OEF in existing or new policies. This public consultation aims to gather views on possible options for the further use of these methods and to collect evidence and opinions on underlying issues related to environmental information and green markets.

Potential policy options could include the integration of the Environmental Footprint methods into existing voluntary policies such as the EU Ecolabel and Green Public Procurement; or the development of a new, stand-alone instrument implementing the methods. The tool also has the potential to support the implementation of the Action Plan on Sustainable Finance. Among the potential applications, it is possible to envisage a role for the PEF and the OEF to help define a taxonomy for sustainable finance (i.e. a classification of sustainable economic activities)[7] and as a basis for developing low carbon benchmarks and positive carbon impact benchmarks[8].

More background on the environmental footprint can be found in the document below.

[Background_EF.pdf](#)

[1] *European Commission Recommendation 2013/179/EU*, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32013H0179>

[2] *Batteries and accumulators, decorative paints, hot and cold water supply pipes, household detergents, intermediate paper product, IT equipment – storage, leather, metal sheets, footwear, photovoltaic electricity generation, thermal insulation, t-shirts, uninterruptible power supply, beer, dairy, feed for food-producing animals, olive oil, packed water, pasta, pet food and wine.*

[3] *Copper production and retail.*

[4] *See a detailed analysis in the document “Technical evaluation of the EU Environmental Footprint pilot phase*, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eusssd/smgp/pdf/HD_pilot_eval_final.pdf (document available only in English)

[5] *Final report on the testing of verification approaches during the Environmental Footprint pilot phase*, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eusssd/smgp/pdf/2017_EY_finalrep_verification_public.pdf (document available only in English)

[6] *F Final report on the assessment of different communication vehicles of providing Environmental Footprint information*, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eusssd/smgp/pdf/2018_pilotphase_commreport.pdf

[7] *See the proposal for a Regulation on the establishment of a framework to facilitate sustainable investment*, COM(2018) 353 final

[8] *See the proposal for a Regulation amending Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 on low carbon benchmarks and positive carbon impact benchmarks*, COM(2018) 355 final

A. Information on the respondent

* I am giving my contribution as

Business association

* Please provide your full name.

150 character(s) maximum

Christian Donath

* Please provide your e-mail address.

donath@eco-platform.org

If responding on behalf of an organisation, association, authority, company, or body, please provide the name.

150 character(s) maximum

ECO Platform AISBL

* Where are you based?

Belgium

* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this targeted consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only your type, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

Respondents should not include personal data in documents submitted in the context of the consultation if they opt for anonymous publication.

Please note that, whatever option chosen, your answers may be subject to a request for public access to documents under Regulation (EC) N°1049/2001. Please also read the specific privacy statement referred to on the consultation webpage.

Please also read the specific privacy statement which can be downloaded below.

[Consultations_ps_en.pdf](#)

* Is your organisation or institution registered in the EU Transparency Register? (relevant for companies, industry organisations, NGOs, consumer groups, research organisations and other).

- Yes
 No
 Do not know

* Organisation size

Micro (1 to 9 employees)

* Which category best describes you or the organisation you represent?

- Standardisation body
 Other business-led method/ initiative owner
 Investor-led method/ initiative owner
 Other public administration led method/ initiative owner
 Multi-stakeholder led method/initiative owner
 Other

* You are active on...

- Local level
 Regional level
 National level
 EU-wide level
 International level

* Please specify if you are active in specific sectors (several answers possible)

- Agriculture
 Apparel & footwear
 Chemicals

- Construction products
- Electrical & electronics
- Food and beverages
- Materials (e.g. metals, plastics)
- Retail & wholesale
- Banking
- Insurance
- Tourism
- Other

* Please specify the type of the method/initiative (several answers possible).

- Life Cycle Assessment based
- Non-LCA
- Multi-criteria
- Single indicator
- Organisation-level reporting
- Product-related information
- Label
- Focussed on best in class products/ organisations
- Environmental product declaration
- Company rating scheme
- Certification
- Other

B. Questionnaire on the Future use of Environmental Footprint

B.1. Input on the importance of environmental information

To what extent do you agree with the following statements in terms of environmental information on products and organisations?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
* There are too many methods on the environmental performance of products	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* There are too many labels on the environmental performance of products	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* There are too many methods on measuring companies' environmental performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* There are too many reporting initiatives on the environmental performance of companies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* Companies should apply environmental criteria when choosing their suppliers	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Companies should measure their environmental performance	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Not enough information is available on the environmental performance of products / organisations	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Investors and banks should apply environmental criteria when deciding where to invest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* I think consumers care more and more for environmental performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What importance do you give to the following types of environmental information on products?

	Very important	Quite important	Less important	Not important	No opinion
* Information directly linked to the product (e.g. environmental impacts of ingredients, packaging, energy use etc.)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Production type (e.g. organic, covered by environmental management system)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Information considering all environmental impacts of the product during its whole life cycle (resources, manufacturing, transport, use, waste or recycling, etc.)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Information on a single relevant environmental issue (e.g. climate change)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The most relevant environmental impacts for the product (those cumulatively contributing to 80% of the total impact)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Information on the environmental performance of the product in comparison to the performance of the average product on the EU market (e.g. better, average, worse)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Information pointing to environmentally excellent products, so as to choose the best products (e.g. through ecolabels such as the EU Ecolabel)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

B.2. Input on experience with environmental information

Misleading green claims

* Did you ever encounter a label or environmental information that you would qualify as misleading?

- Yes
- No

* In my experience...

- ... most of the environmental claims are false
- ... many environmental claims are false
- ... some environmental claims are false
- ... environmental claims are correct
- I don't have an opinion

* Do you think that the availability of reliable, comparable environmental information would trigger more growth on green markets?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

* In your experience, do companies with a sound environmental strategy perform better economically?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

* In your opinion, which sectors have the highest potential of growth for products with better environmental performance? (multiple answers possible)

- Agriculture
- Apparel & footwear
- Banking
- Chemicals
- Construction products
- Electrical & electronics
- Forestry
- Food and beverages
- Insurance
- Materials (e.g. metals, plastics)
- Retail & wholesale
- Tourism
- Other

* Do you experience growing demand to apply the method/ initiative?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

* How many companies or products are using your method/ initiative?

150 character(s) maximum

789 (status 14. Dec 2018)
The list of product EPD / companies is available on our website:
<https://www.eco-platform.org/list-of-all-eco-epd.html>

* Please give a range of cost of applying the method, stating basic conditions (e.g. simple product, large organisations, etc.)

300 character(s) maximum

Pricing for verification of EPD depends on each participating EPD Program Operator (PO). For the use of the ECO EPD logo, as indication of recognized quality, the POs are charged 100€/yr for first five EPD of manufacturer, EPD 6-9 cost 50€/yr, any further 5€/yr.

* Indicate whether the answer to the question above should be kept confidential.

- Yes, keep answer confidential.
 No

* For what purposes is your method/ initiative used in practice? (multiple answers possible)

- Internal performance tracking
 Communication purposes (on environmental credentials of products or organisations)
 Enhancing good reputation
 Get access to investors
 Participate in rankings
 Other
 Don't know

B.3. Use of the Product and Organisation Environmental Footprint methods (PEF and OEF)

* Please select the statement(s) that applies to you. (multiple answers possible)

- I (or my organisation) was member of one of the Technical Secretariats developing Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules or Organisation Environmental Footprint Sector Rules during the EU Environmental Footprint Pilot phase
 I (or my organisation) followed the EU Environmental Footprint pilot phase as a stakeholder
 I am aware of the EU Environmental Footprint pilot phase but was not involved
 I know about Life Cycle Assessment
 I am not aware of this work

* Did you consider to apply PEF or OEF as a basis of your method/initiative?

- Yes
 No
 Don't know

The Product Environmental Footprint method has new features respectively to traditional Life Cycle Assessment. Please tell us to what extent you consider these useful or not.

	Very useful	Quite useful	Neutral	Less useful	Not useful at all
* Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules pre-identify most relevant environmental impacts, processes and life cycle stages for the product group	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Primary data gathering is focussed on a limited number of specific processes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Data quality requirements vary based on environmental relevance and access to data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules list secondary data to be used	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Secondary data are available for free to users of Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The environmental performance of the average product on the market (representative product/ benchmark) is stated in the Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* It is possible to compare the Environmental Footprint profile of the product with the benchmark	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

B.4. Input on the potential use of the Product and Organisation Environmental Footprint (PEF and OEF) methods for providing environmental information

Who should have an important role in ensuring the availability of reliable environmental information on products and organisations?

	Very important	Quite important	Less important	Not important	No opinion
* European Union	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Member States (countries)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* NGOs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Private sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How important do you rate the following elements for providing reliable, comparable and comprehensive environmental information?

	Very important	Quite important	Less important	Not important	No opinion

* Product group and sector-specific calculation rules (e.g. how to calculate the environmental performance of clothing)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Availability of a benchmark (performance of the average product) per product group	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Availability of a metric that allows to compare companies' environmental performance within a sector	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Clear rules on how to develop product group and sector-specific calculation rules	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Requiring the gathering of primary data for specifically defined processes that are most relevant from an environmental point of view and where primary data can be accessed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Availability of common, free average (secondary) data	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Calculation tools enabling non-experts to carry out the analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Use of a solid verification system	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Who should develop EU-wide product group and sector-specific rules?

	Best	Good	Less appropriate	Worse	No opinion
* The private sector, with input from stakeholders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The private sector, supervised by the European Commission and with input from stakeholders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Standardisation organisations (e.g. European Committee for Standardisation), based on EU rules	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The European Commission, with input from the private sector and other stakeholders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Who should bear the cost of providing free average (secondary) data to use in Environmental Footprint measurement?

	Best	Good	Less appropriate	Worse	No opinion

* The European Commission	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The private sector	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Co-funded by the European Commission and the private sector	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* It is not important to provide free secondary data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What actions related to the Product Environmental Footprint method (PEF) would be effective to trigger the uses of environmental information you consider important?

	Very effective	Effective	Slightly effective	Not effective at all	No opinion
* The European Commission encourages the use of the Environmental Footprint methods for measuring and communicating environmental information on a voluntary basis	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Delegate the management of a voluntary Environmental Footprint scheme to a 3rd party	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Prescribe the use of the PEF in case communicating environmental information (it is not mandatory to communicate environmental information, but if communicated, the information has to rely on the PEF method)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Prescribe the use of the PEF for measuring and communicating life cycle environmental performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Use the PEF in the development of EU Ecolabel criteria	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Use PEF benchmarks (performance of the average product) as thresholds to access the EU Ecolabel scheme	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Use PEF information to demonstrate compliance with the EU Taxonomy of Sustainable Investments.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Use PEF for defining Green Public Procurement criteria	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Use PEF benchmarks as thresholds for accessing Green Public Procurement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* Use PEF information to check the accuracy of environmental claims when applying the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Provide requirements on how to communicate on the Environmental Footprint (it is not mandatory to communicate environmental information, but if communicated, these have to comply with specific requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Create an EU repository of PEF results for products (participation voluntary or mandatory depending on the policy)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What actions related to the Organisation Environmental Footprint method (OEF) would be effective to trigger the uses of environmental information you consider important?

	Very effective	Effective	Slightly effective	Not effective at all	No opinion
* The European Commission encourages the use of the Environmental Footprint methods for measuring and communicating environmental information on a voluntary basis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Delegate the management of a voluntary Environmental Footprint scheme to a 3rd party	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Use OEF indicators in the EU Eco-Management and Audit scheme (EMAS) reporting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Promote more harmonised reporting based on (but not limited to) the OEF for the environmental pillar of non-financial reporting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Provide an EU registry of OEF results for companies (participation voluntary or mandatory depending on the policy)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Create an EU rating scheme for environmental performance of companies, based on (but not limited to) the OEF	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>				

* Do you think there should be specific provisions for SMEs? (multiple answers possible)

- Micro companies should be exempted from legislative requirements
- Calculation tools for non-experts should be available
- No specific provisions are necessary
- Other

* Do you think that the European Commission should work on specific strategic sectors?

- Yes, based on potential environmental impact
- Yes, based on importance for the EU economy
- Yes, based on importance for capital markets (e.g. market capitalisation of a sector) and/or financial stability
- Yes, based on a combination of factors (environmental impact and importance for the EU economy)
- The decision should be left to industry
- I don't know/ no opinion

* Do you think that the scope of the EU Ecolabel should be extended to food, feed and drinks?

- Yes
- No
- I am not sure

* Please explain your choice.

300 character(s) maximum

ECO Platform is focused on construction and building-related products.

What communication requirements related to environmental information would be most effective in your opinion for products?

	Very effective	Effective	Slightly effective	Not effective at all	No opinion
* Defining and monitoring compliance with communication principles	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Fines for breaching communication principles	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Prescribe minimum information content, without prescribing the format	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Prescribe a format for communicating to consumers (to use e.g. on a label, on-shelf information, online etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Prescribe a format for communicating to business partners	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Encourage to transfer PEF information along the supply chain (e.g. through barcodes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* Mandatory verification (communicating information is voluntary, verification is mandatory)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Which of the following approaches to verification should be used with reference to information produced based on PEF/OEF methods?

	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree	Don't know /No opinion
* No need for verification, self-declarations are sufficient	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Member States should be responsible for monitoring that the information communicated complies with the requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* An independent third party (whose costs are covered by who is producing the information) should verify the information meets requirements before it is communicated	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* Where should Product Environmental Footprint information on products be available?

- Only directly on the product (e.g. on a label)
- Near the product (e.g. on shelf, leaflet provided with the product)
- Only online (e.g. linked to the product with a QR code or barcode)
- On or near the product and online
- Other
- No opinion

What communication requirements would be most effective in your opinion for organisations (e.g. companies)?

	Very effective	Effective	Slightly effective	Not effective at all	No opinion
* Prescribe minimum information content, without prescribing the format	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Prescribe a reporting format	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Please provide any further comments, explanations or suggestions (for example other measures to improve the availability and comparability of environmental information).

Verification should be based on ISO 14025 and verifiers registered in Program Operators, in charge of ensuring the quality of the verification process.

In addition, for construction products EN 15804 should be considered.

Further explanations can be found in our uploaded Position Paper.

[Click here to upload a position paper.](#)

The maximum file size is 1 MB

faefccf7-2a90-4835-bd95-4d157b56e58a/Letter_PEF-Survey_ECO-Platform_20181214_signed.pdf

Contact

PEFstakeholderconsultation@gmail.com
