Questionnaire Businesses and sectoral /business associations

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

This questionnaire is targeted at businesses and sectoral/business associations.

There are other questionnaires available, targeted at:

- 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
- Method/initiative owners https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/efe2a9a6-3f2c-fc54-5781-86dfe198ce72
- 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, suggesting 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 that the quality of the analysis on these issues is best.

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 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 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/eussd/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/eussd/smgp/pdf/2017_EY_finalrep_verification_public.pdf (document available only in English)

[6] F Final report on the assessment of different communication vehicles Ofr providing Environmental Footprint information, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eussd/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	I am giving my contribution as				
	Academic/research institution				
	Business association				
	Company/business organisation				
	Consumer organisation				
	EU citizen				
	Environmental organisation				
	Non-EU citizen				
	Non-governmental organisation (NGO)				
	Public authority				
	Trade union				
\mathbf{x}	Other				

*Please provide your full name.

150 character(s) maximum

Axel Steinsberg, Policy Advisor, Austrian Federal Economic Chamber, WKO, Department for Environment & Energy Policy

* Please provide your e-mail address.

axel.steinsberg@wko.at

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

150 character(s) maximum

Austrian Federal Economic Chamber, (WKO), Dept. for Environment and Energy Policy; public or mixed entity, created by law, whose purpose is to act in the public interest.

re are you based?
Afghanistan
Albania
Algeria
Andorra
Angola
Antigua and Barbuda
Argentina
Armenia
Australia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Bahamas
Bahrain
Bangladesh
Barbados
Belarus
Belgium
Belize
Benin
Bhutan
Bolivia
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Botswana
Brazil
Brunei Darussalam
Bulgaria
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Côte D'Ivoire
Cabo Verde
Cambodia
Cameroon
Canada
Central African Republic
Chad
Chile
China
Colombia
Comoros
Congo
Costa Rica

Croatia

	Egypt
	El Salvador
	Equatorial Guinea
	Eritrea
	Estonia
	Ethiopia
	Fiji
	Finland
	France
	Gabon
	Gambia
	Georgia
	Germany
	Ghana
	Greece
	Grenada
	Guatemala
	Guinea
0	Guinea Bissau
	Guyana
	Haiti
	Honduras
	Hungary
	Iceland
	India
	Indonesia
0	Iran
	Iraq
	Ireland
	Israel
0	Italy
0	Jamaica
0	Japan
0	Jordan
0	Kazakhstan
0	Kenya
	Kiribati
	5

Cuba

Cyprus

DenmarkDjiboutiDominica

Ecuador

Czech Republic

Dominican Republic

Democratic Republic of the Congo

- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Libya
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- North Korea
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines

	Poland
	Portugal
	Qatar
	Republic of Moldova
	Romania
\bigcirc	Russian Federation
\bigcirc	Rwanda
\bigcirc	Saint Kitts and Nevis
\bigcirc	Saint Lucia
\bigcirc	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
0	Samoa
\bigcirc	San Marino
\bigcirc	Sao Tome and Principe
	Saudi Arabia
	Senegal
	Serbia
	Seychelles
	Sierra Leone
	Singapore
	Slovakia
	Slovenia
	Solomon Islands
	Somalia
	South Africa
	South Korea
	South Sudan
0	Spain
	Sri Lanka
	Sudan
	Suriname
	Swaziland
	Sweden Switzerland
	Syrian Arab Republic Tajikistan
	Tanzania
	Thailand
	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
	Timor-Leste
0	
0	Tonga
	Trinidad and Tobago
	Tunisia
0	Turkey
0	
0	Tuvalu

Uganda
Ukraine
 United Arab Emirates
 United Kingdom
United States of America
Uruguay
 Uzbekistan
O Vanuatu
O Venezuela
Viet Nam
Yemen
O Zambia
Zimbabwe
*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.
in they option allonymous pasheatern
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
O No
Do not know
*Please provide your Register ID number. Click below to view the EU Transparency Register: http://ec.
europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/consultation/search.do?locale=en&reset=
300 character(s) maximum
Austrian Federal Economic Chamber (WKO): EU Transparency Register No 10405322962-08

*Organisation size

Micro (1 to 9 employees)
Small (10 to 49 employees)
Medium (50 to 249 employees)
Large (250 or more employees)
*Please specify the type of product your organisation produces or represents
Intermediate product (e.g. ingredient for a final product)
Final product (used as is)
Both intermediate and final products
Other (e.g. services)
Not applicable
*Please specify the sector(s) (multiple answers possible).
Agriculture
Apparel & footwear
Chemicals
Construction products
Electrical & electronics
Food and beverages
Materials (e.g. metals, plastics)
Retail & wholesale
Banking
Insurance
▼ Tourism
x Other
*Please specify other.
150 character(s) maximum
WKO represents 500,000 Austrian companies in industry, trade, small manufacturing, transport, banking & insurance, tourism, services & IT.
*Where are you active?
Cocal market
Regional market
National market
EU market
Worldwide market

*Does your company/organisation have at least one person with explicit responsibility for environmental concerns?
× Yes
No
- INU
*Are you a member of a sectoral association?
® Yes
O No

*How would you describe your commitment to environmental issues (you can choose several options, if
applicable)?
Environmental considerations are the main driver of the business (e.g. specialised in environmentally friendly products)
Environmental performance and remuneration policy are linked
The company knows the environmental performance of its products/ of the organisation, and strives to improve it
The company knows environmental issues in the supply chain and strives to improve them
The company gathers information on environmental performance
The company has an environmental policy
The company has an environmental management system
Environmental issues are not important for my company
Not applicable
*Environmental efforts in your company focus on
Products

B. Questionnaire on the Future use of Environmental Footprint

The company (e.g. production processes, catering, employee travel and commuting)

B.1. Input on the importance of environmental information

Both the products and the company

Not applicable

Not applicable

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	0	0	x	0	0
*There are too many labels on the environmental performance of products	0	0	x	0	0
*There are too many methods on measuring companies' environmental performance	©	0	X	•	•
*There are too many reporting initiatives on the environmental performance of companies	0	0	8	•	•
*Companies should apply environmental criteria when choosing their suppliers	0	x	0	0	0

* Companies should measure their environmental performance	©	x	©	0	0
* Not enough information is available on the environmental performance of products / organisations	0	0	0	®	•
* I prefer to work with financial institutions (e.g. banks) that have a good environmental reputation	0	0	8	•	•
* Investors and banks should apply environmental criteria when deciding where to invest	0	0	x	•	•
*I think consumers care more and more for environmental performance	0	0	$\overline{\mathbf{x}}$	0	0

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.)	0	x	0	0	0
*Production type (e.g. organic, covered by environmental management system)	0	x	0	0	0
*Information considering all environmental impacts of the product during its whole life cycle (resources, manufacturing, transport, use, waste or recycling, etc.)	0	0	*	0	•
* Information on a single relevant environmental issue (e.g. climate change)	0	0	x	0	•
*The most relevant environmental impacts for the product (those cumulatively contributing to 80% of the total impact	0	•	0	0	•
*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)	0	0	0	X)	•
*Information pointing to environmentally excellent products, so as to choose the best products (e.g. through ecolabels such as the EU Ecolabel)	0	0	8	0	•

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
*Please specify or give an example 300 character(s) maximum
We believe that consumers are aware of the fact that different labels provide for different ways to interpret them. The focus and added value of PEF and OEF should be self-comparison of a product or organisation in a time-line (versus a benchmark to compare "similar" products or companies).
*Did you file a complaint?
Yes
No 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
Comments (if you have an idea of what % of environmental claims are false, please add it here)
The evidence in the background document from 5 November 2018, page 14, that "three in ten citizens have come across exaggerated or misleading statements" is not convincing at all. Therefore, the focus on green claims in the context of PEF and OEF is not justified.
*Do you think that the availability of reliable, comparable environmental information would trigger more
growth on green markets?
O Yes
No No No No No
I don't know
*In your experience, do companies with a sound environmental strategy perform better economically?
x Yes
O No
O I don't know
*Do you think your clients would be ready to pay more for a green product if green claims were more reliable?
O Yes
x 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	
*Please specify other.	
150 character(s) maximum	
The whole list is relevant plus key sectors such as transport services, vehicles production and mobility infrastructure and services.	
*Do you experience growing demand from your customers for greener products?	
x Yes	
O No	
O Don't know	
*Please give examples of demands from your customers.	
300 character(s) maximum	
Customers expect more transparency and credibility of products, not better labels. Biofood and the origin of food is getting more important as well as energy efficiency of buildings, vehicles, household appliance etc.	es
-cic.	
*Are you able to satisfy the demand for greener products?	
You are able to satisfy the demand	
You have products that match this demand, but cannot provide them in sufficient quantities	
You do not have products that match this demand, but plan to introduce them	
You do not have products that match this demand, and do not plan to introduce them	
You do not see demand for greener products	
Not applicable	
*Which labels or certifications are you using? (multiple answers possible)	
X EU Ecolabel	
Tother ecolabels (e.g.Nordic Swan, Blue Angel, etc.)	
x EU Energy label	
Sustainable forestry (e.g. FSC)	
Sustainable fisheries (e.g. MSC)	
EU organic label	
-	

X Fair trade
Company-specific claim
Other
Not applicable
Please specify other.
150 character(s) maximum
Austrian Scheme "Ökoprofit", Austrian Ecolabel "Österreichisches Umweltzeichen"

*Which environmental performance measurement methods do you apply? (Examples of environmental performance measurement methods include Life Cycle Assessment based on ISO 14044, Greenhouse Gas Protocol, water footprint, Global Reporting Initiative indicators, Eco-Management and Audit Scheme indicators, etc.)

300 character(s) maximum

WKO applies a Corporate Carbon Footprint in its sustainability report. This report is based on GRI guidelines. Furthermore an Austrian eco-efficiency programme named "Ökoprofit", is being applied by WKO. It is a kind of national Environmental Management and Auditing Scheme.

*In which environmental initiatives do you participate? (Examples of environmental initiatives include Carbon Disclosure Project, Global Reporting Initiative, The Sustainability Consortium, Sustainable Apparel Coalition, etc.). Please mention *not applicable* in case not relevant for your situation.

300 character(s) maximum

As an interest representation, WKO is involved into the criteria development of the Austrian Ecolabel synchronised with EU Ecolabel. Participation in EU issues such as PEF, EMAS or Ecolabel or Energylabel or the implementation of the NFI Directive is business as usual for WKO.

*Could you state the costs for your business of applying these methods and using these initiatives? Please mention *not applicable* in case not relevant for your situation.

150 character(s) maximum

"Ökoprofit" costs are around 10 000 euro. Other costs, such as sustainable copy and printing paper, waste management, thermal insulation of the building in 2009, green event management, energy efficiency of office equipment, are much higher for WKO as a 1000 employees' organisation.

- *What is the reason to apply the methods and/or using initiatives?
 - My clients are interested
 - It helps me improve the environmental performance of the product or organisation
 - To better manage my suppliers
 - To reduce costs
 - To show my commitment towards stakeholders
 - I expect that the market of greener products in my sector will grow
 - Other
 - Not applicable
- *Please specify other.

150 character(s) maximum

Another important aspect is being a role model for WKO members and delivering evidence to the public, that WKO takes environmental issues seriously, both for WKO-own office and services as well as for WKO interest representation work.

*Do your clients ask questions about the labelled products? (e.g. what aspects the labels cover)

O No
O I don't know
Doesn't apply to my case
*Do you require environmental information from your suppliers?
Yes, I require specific certification/ label/ method
Yes, I require environmental information, but I don't specify what should be the content
No
Not applicable
*Please specify the required specific certification/label/method.
150 character(s) maximum
Important required labels are: Ecolabel, Energylabel, Green IT, FSC, Fairtrade. Information in the supply chain may be helpfu but obligation not appropriate.
*Which of the statements apply to you as SME? (multiple answers possible)
Clients ask environmental data from me
We produce products with environmental features (e.g. eco-labelled, "A" energy class products, organic
label, recyclable, reused, cradle-to-cradle)
We plan to produce products with environmental features
Not applicable
*Do you think your clients are satisfied with the environmental information you provide?
x Yes
Partially
No
I don't provide information
Taon't provide information
Please explain what would clients like to see in your opinion.
300 character(s) maximum
WKO members appreciate the role model of their interest representation. The WKO sustainability report (on the year 2016: https://www.wko.at/service/oe/wkoe-nachhaltigkeitsbericht-2016.pdf) is public, based on GRI standards and connected to the business report.
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 apply the PEF or OEF method?

X Yes

	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagre
*Demonstrating market leadership	0	0	(X)	0	0
*We expect EU policies related to the methods	0	0	0	(X)	0
*We support having a common method for measuring environmental performance	0	0	(X)	0	0
*We wanted to understand differences with other approaches we use	0	x	0	0	0
*We expect that it will improve the company's reputation	0	(X)	0	0	0
*We expect environmental improvements based on the exercise	0	(X)	0	0	0
*We expect cost reductions based on the exercise	0	0	0	(X)	0
Other	©	0	0	0	0
ase specify other. Character(s) maximum					
y not? (multiple answers possible) Waiting for the revised methods after the E There are no Product Environmental Footp my product/ sector Waiting for policies applying the methods Will apply only if required by legislation Already apply other method				vironmental Fo	ootprint fo

Yes, PEFYes, OEF

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	0	0	x)	0	0
* Primary data gathering is focussed on a limited number of specific processes	0	0	X	0	0
* Data quality requirements vary based on environmental relevance and access to data	0	0	(X)	0	0
* Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules list secondary data to be used	0	x	0	0	0
*Secondary data are available for free to users of Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules	0	x	0	0	0
*The environmental performance of the average product on the market (representative product/ benchmark) is stated in the Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules	0	0	0	X)	0
* It is possible to compare the Environmental Footprint profile of the product with the benchmark	0	0	0	0	(X)

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	0	<u>x</u>)	0	0	0
* Member States (countries)	0	0	(X)	0	0
*NGOs	0	0	0	(X)	0
* Private sector	<u>x</u>	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0

Please	specify	other.

7	50 character(s) maximum

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)	0	8	0	0	•
*Availability of a benchmark (performance of the average product) per product group	0	0	0	x)	0
*Availability of a metric that allows to compare companies' environmental performance within a sector	0	0	0	<u>x</u>)	0
*Clear rules on how to develop product group and sector-specific calculation rules	0	x	0	0	0
*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	0	•	0	0	0
* Availability of common, free average (secondary) data	0	(X)	0	0	0
*Calculation tools enabling non-experts to carry out the analysis	®	0	0	0	0
*Use of a solid verification system	0	0	(X)	0	0

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	(X)	0	0	0	0
*The private sector, supervised by the European Commission and with input from stakeholders	0	x	0	0	0
*Standardisation organisations (e.g. European Committee for Standardisation), based on EU rules	0	0	0	(8)	0
*The European Commission, with input from the private sector and other stakeholders	0	0	0	(X)	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0

		Best	Good	appropriate	Worse	opinion
*The European Commission		(X)	0	0	0	0
*The private sector		0	0	0	(x)	0
*Co-funded by the European Commission and the private sector	d	0	0	0	•	0
* It is not important to provide free secondary of	data	0	0	x	0	0
hat actions related to the Product Environme uses of environmental information you consi		•	•	PEF) would b	e effective to	trigger
		ective	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	d	X)	0	0	0	0
*Delegate the management of a voluntary Environmental Footprint scheme to a 3rd party	(0	0	0	<u>x</u>)	0
*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)	(•	0	0	$\overline{\mathbf{x}}$	0
* Prescribe the use of the PEF for measuring and communicating life cycle environmental performance	(0	0	0	$\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$	0
*Use the PEF in the development of EU Ecolabel criteria	(0	0	x	0	0
*Use PEF benchmarks (performance of the average product) as thresholds to access the EU Ecolabel scheme	(0	©	0	x)	0

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

Less

No

Please specify other.

measurement?

300 character(s) maximum

*Use PEF information to demonstrate compliance with the EU Taxonomy of Sustainable Investments.	©	•	0	0	•
*Use PEF for defining Green Public Procurement criteria	0	0	0	(<u>x</u>)	0
*Use PEF benchmarks as thresholds for accessing Green Public Procurement	0	0	0	(X)	0
*Use PEF information to check the accuracy of environmental claims when applying the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive	0	•	•	x)	•
* 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)	•	•	©	x)	•
*Create an EU repository of PEF results for products (participation voluntary or mandatory depending on the policy)	0	0	0	(x)	0
Other	(X)	0	0	0	0

Please specify other.

300 character(s) maximum

PEF could be useful only voluntarily B2B and in dialogue with stakeholders, when any involved party fully understands the PEF methodology. There is no "one size fits all". Business secrets are to be protected.

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	•	x)	•	•	•
*Delegate the management of a voluntary Environmental Footprint scheme to a 3rd party	0	•	•	x)	0
*Use OEF indicators in the EU Eco- Management and Audit scheme (EMAS) reporting	0	0	x)	0	0

*Promote more harmonised reporting based on (but not limited to) the OEF for the environmental pillar of non-financial reporting	©	©	©	x)	0
*Provide an EU registry of OEF results for companies (participation voluntary or mandatory depending on the policy)	0	0	©	$\hat{\mathbf{x}}$	0
*Create an EU rating scheme for environmental performance of companies, based on (but not limited to) the OEF	0	0	0	x)	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0

Please specify other.

obb briarabler (5) rriaxirriari	300	character	(S)	maximur	7
---------------------------------	-----	-----------	-----	---------	---

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

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

Please specify other.

300 character(s) maximum

Not only micro companies but all enterprises should be exempted from legislative requirements.

Please specify who should develop these calculation tools?

	Best	Good	Less appropriate	Worse	No opinion
*The European Commission	<u>x</u>	0	0	0	0
*Public administrations, coordinated by the European Commission	0	0	0	<u>x</u>	0
*Sectoral/trade associations	0	x	0	0	0
*Individual businesses (free market of tools)	(x)	0	0	0	0
Other	x	0	0	0	0

Please specify other

150 character(s) maximum

EU Commission in cooperation with interested business sectors like until now

character(s) maximum					
No: other labels f.e. on biofood (in Austria f.e. "Ja! N high standing, that other labels - at least in Austria -		n quality of me	at (in Austria:	"AMA-Gütesio	egel) have s
at communication requirements related to disconfor products?	environmenta	al informatior	n would be n	nost effective	in your
ion for products?	Very effective	Effective	Slightly effective	Not effective at all	No opinion
*Defining and monitoring compliance with communication principles	0	0	0	x	0
*Fines for breaching communication principles	0	0	0	®	0
*Prescribe minimum information content, without prescribing the format	0	0	0	x	0
*Prescribe a format for communicating to consumers (to use e.g. on a label, on-shelf information, online etc.)	0	0	0	x)	0
*Prescribe a format for communicating to business partners	0	0	0	x	0
*Encourage to transfer PEF information along the supply chain (e.g. through barcodes)	0	0	x	0	0
*Mandatory verification (communicating information is voluntary, verification is mandatory)	0	0	0	x	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0

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

Yes, based on importance for capital markets (e.g. market capitalisation of a sector) and/or financial

Yes, based on a combination of factors (environmental impact and importance for the EU economy)

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

Yes, based on potential environmental impactYes, based on importance for the EU economy

The decision should be left to industry

I don't know/ no opinion

stability

Yes
No

I am not sure

	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree	Don'i know /No opinio
*No need for verification, self- declarations are sufficient	0	0	0	x	0
* Member States should be responsible for monitoring that the information communicated complies with the requirements	(X)	•	•	•	0
* An independent third party (whose costs are covered by who is producing the information) should verify the information meets requirements before it is communicated	8	•	•	•	0
Only directly on the product (e.g. on a Near the product (e.g. on shelf, leaflet Only online (e.g. linked to the product On or near the product and online Other	label) provided with	the product)	icts be available	e?	

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	0	0	0	x	0
*Prescribe a reporting format	0	0	0	(X)	0

	Other	0	0	0	(X)	0
Ple	ease specify other.					
30	0 character(s) maximum					
	OEF for self-surveillance and self-monitoring in a ce	rtain timeline				
	ease provide any further comments, explanat rove the availability and comparability of envi			example oth	ner measures	s to

Click here to upload a position paper.

The maximum file size is 1 MB