

Public consultation on a potential legislative proposal on substantiating green claims

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The initiative responds to the priorities announced in the European Green Deal[1], and its associated Circular Economy Action Plan (CEAP)[2] and Farm to Fork Strategy[3].

The initiative will cover claims made on any of the environmental impacts covered by the Environmental Footprint methods and on claims on overall environmental performance. We consider as environmental claims any explicit environmental information on products (including services) or companies, including labels/ logos and text, in whichever form it is provided (e.g. website, brochure, on shelf, television, radio etc.)

This initiative will be developed in close coordination with other initiatives:

- the revision of EU consumer law to empower consumers for active participation in the green transition [5] (also announced in the CEAP);
- a sustainable product policy initiative, which will focus on making products fit for a climate-neutral, resource-efficient and circular economy (also announced in the CEAP);
- the action to create a sustainable labelling framework, announced in the Farm to Fork Strategy[6].

These initiatives will seek to establish between them a coherent policy framework to help the Union to make sustainable goods, services and business models the norm and to integrate environmental considerations in decision-making. This would push consumption, business transactions and investments in a more sustainable direction. They aim to reduce significantly the environmental footprint of products consumed in the Union and contribute to the overall policy objective of EU climate neutrality by 2050.

The aim of this consultation is to gather stakeholder opinions on policy options on substantiating environmental claims using the Environmental Footprint methods. Previous consultation activities will also be taken into account[7].

For more information on the Environmental Footprint methods, please refer to the background document.

If you have any questions, please contact the European Commission via env-environmental-footprint@ec.

Your voice matters and we are grateful to you for taking the time to complete this consultation.

[1] <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1588580774040&uri=CELEX:52019DC0640>

[2] <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM:2020:98:FIN>

[3] <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0381>

[4] The methods are available here: https://eplca.jrc.ec.europa.eu/permalink/PEF_method.pdf and https://eplca.jrc.ec.europa.eu/permalink/OEF_method.pdf. More information can also be found here: <https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eussd/smgp/index.htm>

[5] The inception impact assessment on empowering consumers for the green transition: <https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/12467-Empowering-the-consumer-for-the-green-transition> (feedback period is open until the 1st of September 2020)

[6] <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0381>

[7] https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eussd/smgp/pdf/EF_stakeholdercons19.pdf

About you

* Language of my contribution

- ☐ Bulgarian
- ☐ Croatian
- ☐ Czech
- ☐ Danish
- ☐ Dutch
- ☒ English
- ☐ Estonian
- ☐ Finnish
- ☐ French
- ☐ Gaelic
- ☐ German
- ☐ Greek
- ☐ Hungarian
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Latvian
- ☐ Lithuanian
- ☐ Maltese
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Portuguese

- ☐ Romanian
- ☐ Slovak
- ☐ Slovenian
- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Swedish

* 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
- ☐ Other

* First name

Jenny

* Surname

Svard

* Email (this won't be published)

jenny.svard@svensktnaringsliv.se

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Confederation of Swedish Enterprise

* Organisation size

- ☐ Micro (1 to 9 employees)

- ☐ Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ☒ Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ☐ Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

39912257528-48

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| ☐ Afghanistan | ☐ Djibouti | ☐ Libya | ☐ Saint Martin |
| ☐ Åland Islands | ☐ Dominica | ☐ Liechtenstein | ☐ Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| ☐ Albania | ☐ Dominican Republic | ☐ Lithuania | ☐ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| ☐ Algeria | ☐ Ecuador | ☐ Luxembourg | ☐ Samoa |
| ☐ American Samoa | ☐ Egypt | ☐ Macau | ☐ San Marino |
| ☐ Andorra | ☐ El Salvador | ☐ Madagascar | ☐ São Tomé and Príncipe |
| ☐ Angola | ☐ Equatorial Guinea | ☐ Malawi | ☐ Saudi Arabia |
| ☐ Anguilla | ☐ Eritrea | ☐ Malaysia | ☐ Senegal |
| ☐ Antarctica | ☐ Estonia | ☐ Maldives | ☐ Serbia |
| ☐ Antigua and Barbuda | ☐ Eswatini | ☐ Mali | ☐ Seychelles |
| ☐ Argentina | ☐ Ethiopia | ☐ Malta | ☐ Sierra Leone |
| ☐ Armenia | ☐ Falkland Islands | ☐ Marshall Islands | ☐ Singapore |
| ☐ Aruba | ☐ Faroe Islands | ☐ Martinique | ☐ Sint Maarten |
| ☐ Australia | ☐ Fiji | ☐ Mauritania | ☐ Slovakia |
| ☐ Austria | ☐ Finland | ☐ Mauritius | ☐ Slovenia |
| ☐ Azerbaijan | ☐ France | ☐ Mayotte | ☐ Solomon Islands |

☐ Bahamas	☐ French Guiana	☐ Mexico	☐ Somalia
☐ Bahrain	☐ French Polynesia	☐ Micronesia	☐ South Africa
☐ Bangladesh	☐ French Southern and Antarctic Lands	☐ Moldova	☐ South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
☐ Barbados	☐ Gabon	☐ Monaco	☐ South Korea
☐ Belarus	☐ Georgia	☐ Mongolia	☐ South Sudan
☐ Belgium	☐ Germany	☐ Montenegro	☐ Spain
☐ Belize	☐ Ghana	☐ Montserrat	☐ Sri Lanka
☐ Benin	☐ Gibraltar	☐ Morocco	☐ Sudan
☐ Bermuda	☐ Greece	☐ Mozambique	☐ Suriname
☐ Bhutan	☐ Greenland	☐ Myanmar /Burma	☐ Svalbard and Jan Mayen
☐ Bolivia	☐ Grenada	☐ Namibia	☒ Sweden
☐ Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	☐ Guadeloupe	☐ Nauru	☐ Switzerland
☐ Bosnia and Herzegovina	☐ Guam	☐ Nepal	☐ Syria
☐ Botswana	☐ Guatemala	☐ Netherlands	☐ Taiwan
☐ Bouvet Island	☐ Guernsey	☐ New Caledonia	☐ Tajikistan
☐ Brazil	☐ Guinea	☐ New Zealand	☐ Tanzania
☐ British Indian Ocean Territory	☐ Guinea-Bissau	☐ Nicaragua	☐ Thailand
☐ British Virgin Islands	☐ Guyana	☐ Niger	☐ The Gambia
☐ Brunei	☐ Haiti	☐ Nigeria	☐ Timor-Leste
☐ Bulgaria	☐ Heard Island and McDonald Islands	☐ Niue	☐ Togo
☐ Burkina Faso	☐ Honduras	☐ Norfolk Island	☐ Tokelau
☐ Burundi	☐ Hong Kong	☐ Northern Mariana Islands	☐ Tonga

◉ Cambodia	◉ Hungary	◉ North Korea	◉ Trinidad and Tobago
◉ Cameroon	◉ Iceland	◉ North Macedonia	◉ Tunisia
◉ Canada	◉ India	◉ Norway	◉ Turkey
◉ Cape Verde	◉ Indonesia	◉ Oman	◉ Turkmenistan
◉ Cayman Islands	◉ Iran	◉ Pakistan	◉ Turks and Caicos Islands
◉ Central African Republic	◉ Iraq	◉ Palau	◉ Tuvalu
◉ Chad	◉ Ireland	◉ Palestine	◉ Uganda
◉ Chile	◉ Isle of Man	◉ Panama	◉ Ukraine
◉ China	◉ Israel	◉ Papua New Guinea	◉ United Arab Emirates
◉ Christmas Island	◉ Italy	◉ Paraguay	◉ United Kingdom
◉ Clipperton	◉ Jamaica	◉ Peru	◉ United States
◉ Cocos (Keeling) Islands	◉ Japan	◉ Philippines	◉ United States Minor Outlying Islands
◉ Colombia	◉ Jersey	◉ Pitcairn Islands	◉ Uruguay
◉ Comoros	◉ Jordan	◉ Poland	◉ US Virgin Islands
◉ Congo	◉ Kazakhstan	◉ Portugal	◉ Uzbekistan
◉ Cook Islands	◉ Kenya	◉ Puerto Rico	◉ Vanuatu
◉ Costa Rica	◉ Kiribati	◉ Qatar	◉ Vatican City
◉ Côte d'Ivoire	◉ Kosovo	◉ Réunion	◉ Venezuela
◉ Croatia	◉ Kuwait	◉ Romania	◉ Vietnam
◉ Cuba	◉ Kyrgyzstan	◉ Russia	◉ Wallis and Futuna
◉ Curaçao	◉ Laos	◉ Rwanda	◉ Western Sahara
◉ Cyprus	◉ Latvia	◉ Saint Barthélemy	◉ Yemen

- ☐ Czechia
- ☐ Lebanon
- ☐ Saint Helena
Ascension and
Tristan da
Cunha
- ☐ Zambia
- ☐ Democratic
Republic of the
Congo
- ☐ Lesotho
- ☐ Saint Kitts and
Nevis
- ☐ Zimbabwe
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Liberia
- ☐ Saint Lucia

*** Publication privacy settings**

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

☐ **Anonymous**

Only your type of respondent, 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.

☒ I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

*** Please indicate if you are**

- ☐ a standardisation body
- ☐ an environmental label/ initiative/ methodology owner
- ☐ a life cycle assessment consultant
- ☐ a life cycle data provider
- ☐ a life cycle assessment software provider
- ☐ a researcher/ research organisation active in life cycle assessment
- ☒ none of the above

*** Please specify the type of product your organisation produces or represents:**

- ☐ intermediate product (a product that requires further processing before it can be sold to the final consumer, e.g. ingredient or component for a final product);
- ☐ final product (used as it is);
- ☐ both intermediate and final products;

- ☒ other (e.g. services)

* Please specify:

150 character(s) maximum

The Confederation represents the broad business community in Sweden, including the whole value chain.

* Please indicate if you are/were involved in:

- ☐ the Environmental Footprint pilot phase (2013-2018)
- ☐ the Environmental Footprint transition phase (starting in 2019)
- ☐ Both the pilot and transition phase
- ☒ I was not involved

* Please indicate your level of knowledge of the Environmental Footprint methods (the Product and Organisation Environmental Footprint method, PEF and OEF):

- ☒ I am aware of these methods
- ☐ I am using/ used these methods
- ☐ I am aware of life cycle assessment (LCA)
- ☐ I am using/ used LCA
- ☐ I am not aware of any of the above

* I wish to reply to...

- ☐ questions for the general public
- ☒ questions for experts

Questions to experts

1. What is your opinion on the following statements on environmental information on **products and services**?

	I don't agree at all	I somewhat disagree	I somewhat agree	I fully agree	I don't know
* There are too many methods for measuring the environmental performance of products	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* There are too many labels on the environmental performance of products	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* Not enough information is available on the environmental performance of products	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

* The proliferation of methods to quantify the environmental performance of products hinders the cross-border trade of green products	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* Different requirements imposed by national legislation or private initiatives on environmental information on products (including labelling) increases the costs for companies when trading cross-border (as they need to comply with different methods in each country)	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* The proliferation of methods on the environmental performance of products/ could hinder fair competition between companies	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

2. What is your opinion on the following statements on environmental information on **organisations (companies)**?

	I don't agree at all	I somewhat disagree	I somewhat agree	I fully agree	I don't know
* There are too many methods to quantify organisations' (including companies') environmental performance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* There are too many reporting initiatives on the environmental performance of organisations (including companies)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Not enough information is available on the environmental performance of organisations (including companies)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Having multiple methods and initiatives makes it more difficult to understand the environmental performance of organisations (including companies)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* The proliferation of methods and initiatives on the environmental performance of organisations (including companies) doesn't allow market actors to decide for greener options (e.g. investments, choice of suppliers, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

* Different requirements imposed by national legislation or private initiatives on environmental reporting increases the costs for companies when trading cross-border (as they need to comply with different methods in each country)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* The proliferation of methods on the environmental performance of organisations could hinder fair competition between companies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Questions on policy options

There are more than 200 environmental labels active in the EU, and more than 450 active worldwide[1]; there are more than 80 widely used reporting initiatives and methods for carbon emissions only[2]. Some of these methods and initiatives are reliable, some not; they are variable in the issues they cover.

The questions below explore measures to enhance the reliability and bring more harmonisation of environmental information on products and organisations (including companies).

[1] Source: analysis based on ecolabelindex.com data

[2] Company GHG emissions reporting – a study on methods and initiatives, EC, 2010

3. The list below lists different options to tackle the proliferation of methods and labels and misleading claims. What is your opinion on the options below in view of the objective to provide reliable, comparable and verifiable information for **products** (goods and services) offered on the EU market?

	I don't agree at all	I somewhat disagree	I somewhat agree	I fully agree	I don't know
* The current situation is satisfactory: market actors can prove environmental claims through the method of their choice, and Member States' competent authorities can prohibit misleading claims towards consumers (e.g. claims that are not specific, clear, accurate and substantiated) under the general clauses of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive 2005/29/EC on a case-by-case basis	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Market actors can prove environmental claims with the method of their choice, but they should comply with certain minimum requirements in order to avoid greenwashing	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

* Market operators can prove environmental claims with the method of their choice, if methods, labels or initiatives integrate the Environmental Footprint methods (e.g. labelling scheme setting criteria by hotspots identified by running a Product Environmental Footprint (PEF) study; a product declaration scheme implementing a Product Environmental Footprint Category Rule	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* If market actors decide to make an environmental claim on a product related to the impacts covered by the PEF method, they have to prove their environmental claims through the PEF method (including any developed Product Environmental Footprint Category Rule), whenever claims are related to the impacts covered by the method	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* If market actors decide to make an environmental claim on a product related to the impacts covered by the PEF method, they have to use a EU logo or label based on the PEF method	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

If other, please specify:

200 character(s) maximum

Harmonization is generally a good approach. As a first step a voluntary approach of the use of PEF is needed. International alignment important. Specific sector prerequisites need to be considered.

4. In your opinion, using the PEF method to substantiate green claims on products...

	I don't agree at all	I somewhat disagree	I somewhat agree	I fully agree	I don't know
* will make environmental claims more reliable	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* will make environmental claims more comparable	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* will make environmental claims more verifiable	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* will help actors along the supply chain to share environmental performance information	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

* will provide a level playing field for competing based on environmental performance for all products sold on the EU market	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* will help market actors (e.g. consumers, business partners, public authorities) to make informed, greener purchasing choices	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* will reduce costs for companies	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* will decrease costs for public administrations as certain tasks would be performed at EU level (e.g. preparatory work, criteria setting)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* will increase prices for green products	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
other	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

If other, please specify:

200 character(s) maximum

Environmental info must be reliable, specific, verifiable, comparable, useful and based on shared methodologies. PEF however is not yet fully developed and will be complex to use for many products.

5. In your opinion, using the PEF method to substantiate green claims on products...

	I don't agree at all	I somewhat disagree	I somewhat agree	I fully agree	I don't know
* should be complementary to existing "best-in-class" labels (ISO 14024 type I labels such as the EU Ecolabel, Blue Angel, Nordic Swan etc., awarded to products and services meeting high environmental standards throughout their life-cycle) by making visible the environmental impacts of products not covered by the schemes or providing additional environmental information on them	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* should be used as a basis for identifying criteria for existing "best-in-class" labels	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* PEFCR benchmarks should be used as thresholds for accessing existing "best-in-class" labels	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* should not be required if the product is already covered by an existing "best-in-class" label	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

other	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
-------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

If other, please specify:

PEF is not enough developed for all products to be used to set criteria for best in class labels. PEFCR should only be used as a threshold for best in class labels if PEF is relevant to the label.

6. The list below sets out options to tackle the proliferation of methods and initiatives, and misleading claims. Please express your opinion on the options below in view of the objective to provide reliable, comparable and verifiable information for **organisations** (including companies) active on the EU market?

	I don't agree at all	I somewhat disagree	I somewhat agree	I fully agree	I don't know
* The current situation is satisfactory: market actors can prove environmental claims or report on their environmental performance through the method of their choice; and Member States' competent authorities can prohibit misleading claims towards consumers (e.g. claims that are not specific, clear, accurate and substantiated) under the general clauses of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive 2005/29/EC on a case-by-case basis)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Market actors can prove their environmental claims or report on their environmental performance using approaches promoted under the Non-financial reporting directive (e.g. UN Global Compact, ISO 26000; please note that a review of the directive is ongoing)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Market actors have to prove their environmental claims or report on their environmental performance using the Organisation Environmental Footprint (OEF) method (including any developed Organisation Environmental Footprint Sector Rule), whenever they are related to the impacts covered by the method	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* If market actors decide to make an environmental claim on the company, related to the impacts covered by the OEF method they have to use a specific reporting format based on the OEF method	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

* If market actors decide to make an environmental claim on the company, related to the impacts covered by the OEF method, they have to integrate results into their financial report	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

If other, please specify:

200 character(s) maximum

7. In your opinion, using the OEF method to substantiate green claims on organisations (including companies)...

	I don't agree at all	I somewhat disagree	I somewhat agree	I fully agree	I don't know
* will make environmental claims more reliable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* will make environmental claims more comparable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* will make environmental claims more verifiable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* will help actors along the supply chain to share environmental performance information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* will provide a level playing field for competing based on environmental performance for all products sold on the EU market	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* will help market actors to make informed, greener purchasing choices (e.g. choice of suppliers, investment decisions)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* will be appropriate to inform sustainable finance tools (e.g. input to sustainability ratings, indicators for non-financial reporting)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* will reduce costs for companies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* will decrease costs for public administrations as certain tasks would be performed at EU level (e.g. preparatory work, OEFSR development)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* is appropriate for reporting on environmental performance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
-------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

If other, please specify:

200 character(s) maximum

8. Please express your opinion on the effectiveness of options for EU action on substantiating green claims on **products** via the Product Environmental Footprint method. We consider a measure effective in case it contributes to reducing the proliferation of methods and initiatives, and it contributes to reducing misleading claims.

Please note that below options are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

	Not effective at all	Somewhat ineffective	Somewhat effective	Very effective	I don't know
* Revise the 2013 Commission Recommendation , which recommends the use of the Environmental Footprint methods to measure and communicate life cycle environmental performance	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Establish new EU legislation (for instance, EU regulation) putting in place a voluntary scheme for making product-related green claims based on the Product Environmental Footprint method	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Establish new EU legislation (for instance, EU regulation) requiring companies to substantiate green claims based on the PEF method. Claims will have to use Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules (PEFCRs), if they exist; if they don't, the PEF method applies. The requirement would apply to claims that are covered by the method	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Provide stronger protection against greenwashing (i.e. claims on environmental qualities of products or services that are exaggerated, too vague, false or impossible to prove) through EU consumer law (in this case, only claims towards consumers are covered)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Other	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
-------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

Please specify other:

200 character(s) maximum

It is too early to introduce legal requirements for substantiating green claims based on PEF. Current legislation is sufficient to prevent greenwashing, but need more surveillance and enforcement.

9. Please express your opinion on the effectiveness of options for EU action on substantiating green claims on organisations (including companies) via the Organisation Environmental Footprint method.

Please note that below options are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

	Not effective at all	Somewhat ineffective	Somewhat effective	Very effective	I don't know
* Revise the 2013 Commission Recommendation , which recommends the use of the Environmental Footprint methods to measure and communicate life cycle environmental performance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Reinforce requirements on providing environmental information on companies via the revision of the Non-financial reporting directive (in such a case, only company-level claims are covered)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Establish new EU legislation (for instance, EU regulation) putting in place a voluntary scheme for making company-related green claims based on the OEF method	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Establish new EU legislation (for instance, EU regulation) requiring companies to substantiate green claims based on the OEF method. Claims would have to be based on Organisation Environmental Footprint Sector Rules (OEFSRs), if they exist – if they don't, the OEF method applies. The requirement would apply to claims that are covered by the method	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

* Provide stronger protection against greenwashing (i.e. claims on environmental qualities of companies that are exaggerated, too vague, false or impossible to prove) through EU consumer law (in this case, only claims towards consumers are covered)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please specify other:

200 character(s) maximum

- * 10. How much is the company currently spending on using environmental labels/ logos, methods and initiatives related to their products? (if you are not a company, please write "not applicable")

100 character(s) maximum

Not applicable

- * 11. Please indicate the number of labels/ logos, methods and initiatives used (if you are not a company, please write "not applicable"):

100 character(s) maximum

Not applicable

- * 12. If the PEF method were required to substantiate environmental claims, would you expect the cost related to using environmental labels/ logos, method and initiatives to

- ☐ Be significantly higher
- ☒ Be somewhat higher
- ☐ Stay the same
- ☐ Be somewhat lower
- ☐ Be significantly lower
- ☐ I don't know

- * 13. How much is the company currently spending on using environmental methods and initiatives related to the company (e.g. reporting initiatives, method for calculating the carbon/ environmental performance of the company, investor questionnaires) (if you are not a company, please write "not applicable")?

100 character(s) maximum

Not applicable

- * 14. Please indicate the number of methods and initiatives used (if you are not a company, please write "not applicable"):

100 character(s) maximum

Not applicable

- * 15. If the OEF method were required to substantiate environmental claims, would you expect the cost related to using environmental method and initiatives to

- ☐ Be significantly higher
- ☐ Be somewhat higher
- ☐ Be somewhat lower
- ☐ Be significantly lower
- ☒ I don't know

16. If the Commission proposes requirements on substantiating voluntary green claims via the Environmental Footprint methods, the initiative should:

	Not effective at all	Somewhat ineffective	Somewhat effective	Very effective	I don't know
* Not establish any requirement on how the information is communicated	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Establish general principles on the way the information is communicated (e.g. transparency, availability & accessibility, reliability, completeness, comparability and clarity)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Define minimum content of the information to be communicated (for instance overall environmental performance, listing the most relevant impacts, information on third party verification)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Define a common EU label/logo based on the PEF method	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Define a common reporting format based on the OEF method	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

A calculation based on the PEF/ OEF methods gives quantitative information on the performance of the product or organisation. This result is not comparable to results of other products/ companies (for instance, product X has a lower impact than product Y). This is due to the fact that the PEF/ OEF methods leave some methodological and data choices to the user. These choices are available to enable the application of the PEF/ OEF methods to any product or organisation.

Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules (PEFCRs) define a benchmark, which corresponds to the environmental performance of the average product on the EU market. The benchmark is defined per environmental impact and for environmental overall performance (single score). In this case, it is possible to compare the performance of a specific product to the benchmark of the same product category. PEFCRs also identify which are the most relevant environmental impacts, life cycle stages (e.g. manufacturing or use) and processes (e.g. production of ingredients – wheat grain) for the product category.

Similarly, OEFSRs identify the most relevant environmental impacts, life cycle stages and processes for the product portfolio of the organisation. OEFSRs currently do not contain benchmarks, but may define comparable indicators (e.g. results divided per total revenue).

Tests on how to communicate Environmental Footprint information were carried out [during the pilot phase](#) and through a [subsequent study](#).

17. If market actors communicate on their PEF profile based on a PEFCR, the following minimum content should be available:

	Not relevant at all	Low priority	Somewhat relevant	High priority	I don't know
* Single score on a 3-point scale (e.g. average corresponding to the benchmark, better and worse)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Single score on a 5 level scale (e.g. classes of performance on an A-E scale)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Single score on a 5 level scale, where top performance is reserved to products awarded with an EU Ecolabel	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* List the three most relevant impact categories (e.g. climate change, land use, water use)	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* Provide the performance on the three most relevant impact categories (e.g. better than average on climate change, average on water use, worse than average on eutrophication – freshwater)	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* Percentage by which performance is better or worse than average on the single score	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Absolute results (e.g. 15t CO2 equivalents on climate change)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Other	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
-------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

If other, please specify:

200 character(s) maximum

A 3-level scale is too coarse, risks to mislead the consumer, 5-level scale is better. Different needs for B2B, B2C communication. Ecolabel should not only be available for top performance in PEF.

18. In case market actors communicate on their PEF profile for a product for which there is no PEFCR available (calculations are based on the PEF method), the initiative shall

	Not relevant at all	Low priority	Somewhat relevant	High priority	I don't know
* Prohibit the use of absolute values to avoid that consumers or other stakeholders are misled into comparing performances of similar products	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Allow the use of absolute values with specific conditions (e.g. a clear communication that results are not comparable)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Prohibit the communication of % of improvement on the same product to avoid that products with high improvement figures are unfairly judged as better respectively to where only incremental improvements are possible	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Allow the communication of % of improvement on the same product with specific conditions (e.g. that absolute values are displayed alongside with the % of improvement)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Allow statements on the environmental performance of the product (e.g. "Did you know that the materials used for the upper part of a shoe are responsible for 41% of its impact on climate change? Our shoes are made of recycled materials, reducing greenhouse gas emissions.")	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Allow information on what contributes most to the environmental impacts of the product (e.g. 60% of impacts come from growing ingredients; 15% from manufacturing, 15% from transport, 5% from the use of the product and 5% from disposal)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Other	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
-------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

If other, please specify:

200 character(s) maximum

Communication of % improvement will unfairly benefit products with a low performance level from start, needs to be combined with absolute values. Statements enable comm. of selected parts, misleading.

19. If market actors communicate their OEF profile, calculated based on an OEFSR, the following minimum content should be available:

	Not relevant at all	Low priority	Somewhat relevant	High priority	I don't know
* Scope of the analysis (e.g. which business units are included in the analysis)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Characterised results per impact category (results for the full life cycle, per impact category, e.g. climate change)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Characterised results per impact category, divided by turnover	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Normalised results per impact category (characterised results divided by normalisation factors defined based on yearly emissions of an average global citizen)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Weighted results and single score (weights applied to each impact category and the sum of impacts in points. Weights were defined based on expert judgement, consider planetary boundaries and the robustness of indicators);	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Single score divided by turnover	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Most relevant impacts, processes and life cycle stages (based on OEFSR)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Results on additional environmental information required/ recommended by OEFSR	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Information on verification	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Link to full report	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

If other, please specify:

200 character(s) maximum

20. If market actors communicate their OEF profile, calculated based on OEF but in absence of an existing OEFSR, the following minimum content should be available:

	Not relevant at all	Low priority	Somewhat relevant	High priority	I don't know
* Scope of the analysis (e.g. which business units are included in the analysis)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Statement on the comparability of information, to avoid that users of the information are misled into comparing performances where this is not possible	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Characterised results per impact category (results for the full life cycle, per impact category, e.g. climate change)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Characterised results per impact category, divided by turnover	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Normalised results per impact category (characterised results divided by normalisation factors defined based on yearly emissions of an average global citizen)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Weighted results and single score (weights applied to each impact category and the sum of impacts in points. Weights were defined based on expert judgement, consider planetary boundaries and the robustness of indicators);	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Single score divided by turnover	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Most relevant impacts, processes and life cycle stages as calculated based on the OEF	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Results on additional environmental information deemed relevant by the user of the method	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Information on verification	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Link to full report	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

* Please specify other:

200 character(s) maximum

Verification consists in a conformity assessment process carried out by verifier(s) to demonstrate whether the EF study, used to substantiate the environmental claim, has been carried out in compliance with the most updated version of the PEF or OEF method.

Validation is a confirmation by the verifier(s), that the information and data included in the EF study, EF report and the communication vehicles are reliable, credible and correct.

21. Verification should be done by:

	Not appropriate at all	Less appropriate	Appropriate	Best solution	I don't know
* Bodies appointed at national level	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* A verification body at EU level	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Independent certification/verification organisations obtaining accreditation for this specific task	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Please specify other:

200 character(s) maximum

Central body at EU-level verifying all PEFs will not be effective. National body risks hampering the inner market. Best solution, an independent cert./ver.org operating in accordance with ISO14025.

22. What is your view on the following statements regarding enforcement?

	I don't agree at all	A somewhat disagree	I somewhat agree	I fully agree	I don't know
* For all environmental claims subject to the requirements of this initiative, including labels, economic operators shall submit an application to an EU or national competent authority before using the claim on the market (ex ante check)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Competent authorities shall ensure an ex-post enforcement (for instance, check that claims comply with requirements, whether they were appropriately verified, informing the public, treating complaints, monitoring misleading claims and complaints on misleading claims)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

* The use of an environmental claim, including of a label, shall be notified to the competent authorities who would ensure an ex-post enforcement (for instance, checking that the claims comply with the requirements, informing the public, treating complaints, monitoring complaints on misleading claims)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
A mechanism of administrative cooperation shall be put in place between the different competent authorities	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* The economic operators making environmental claims, including using a label, shall communicate the results of the Environmental Footprint study to an EU or national competent authority	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

23. The authorities competent to ensure compliance of environmental claims with the Environmental Footprint methods should be:

	I don't agree at all	I somewhat disagree	I somewhat agree	I fully agree	I don't know
* Consumer law enforcement bodies	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Environmental enforcement bodies	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Technical bodies specialised in LCA / EF methods	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Specific competent authorities at national level	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* A pan-European entity	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other national/ regional public entities	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please specify other:

200 character(s) maximum

Ensure compliance will be needed for env. claims both to B2B and B2C. We believe that an existing national authority with the most relevant competence for the task should be appointed.

* 24. In order to ensure reliable, comparable and verifiable information on the environmental footprint of products and organisations, the following actions related to data should be envisaged:



Create an EU life cycle inventory secondary database, including the necessary data to allow for the implementation of the Environmental Footprint methods

- ☐ A network/dataspace of different national databases with EF-compliant data should be set up
- ☐ A network/dataspace of different national databases and private databases with EF-compliant data should be set up
- ☒ Other

If other, please specify:

200 character(s) maximum

Create an EU life cycle inventory secondary database in cooperation with national databases with EF-compliant data. Crucial that national data as well as industries can contribute to the database.

25. In order to support SMEs to substantiate their environmental claims based on the EF methods, the following measures would be needed

	I don't agree at all	A somewhat disagree	I somewhat agree	I fully agree	I don't know
* Training to SMEs on how to measure their environmental footprint	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* EU funds (e.g. LIFE, COSME) enabling projects that include the assessment of the environmental footprint based on PEF/ OEF	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Free access to secondary datasets	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* Free online calculators or other tools available online or offline for calculating environmental footprint	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
* Simple online calculators or other tools available online for calculating environmental footprint	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

If other, please specify:

Thank you for spending time completing this questionnaire. Your answers are valuable in helping to understand stakeholders' views on this issue. If you wish to

expand on any of your answers or to add comments or information on other aspects relevant to green claims in Europe, please do so in the box below:

1500 character(s) maximum

We have only focused only on the questions with a product focus and have not taken the organisation dimension into account at this stage.

As a general comment we wish to highlight the different needs of information about green claims in B2B and B2C. Companies also need to be able to decide how to communicate their environmental claims depending on product type and customer.

Environmental information must be reliable, specific, verifiable, comparable, useful and based on shared methodologies. PEF however is not yet fully developed for all products and will in many cases be complex to use. As a first step a voluntary approach of the use of PEF is needed. It is too early to introduce legal requirements for substantiating green claims based on PEF. Specific sector prerequisites need to be considered.

PEF is not yet enough developed for all products to be used to set criteria for best in class labels. A 3-level scale in communication is too coarse and risks to mislead the consumer, a 5-level scale is better. Ecolabel should not only be available for top performance in PEF.

A central body at EU-level verifying all PEFs will not be effective, a national body risks hampering the inner market. Best solution, an independent certification/verification organization operating in accordance with ISO 14025.

Create an EU life cycle inventory secondary database in cooperation with a network/dataspace of national databases with EF-compliant data.

If you would like to upload a document, please select below.

If you chose that your contribution is anonymous, please make sure that there are no data identifying you or the organisation you represent in the file.

If you would like us to keep the document confidential, please says so in the document.

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Background Documents

BG

CS

DA

DE

EL

EN

ES

ET

FI

FR

HR

HU

IT

LT

LV

MT

NL

PL

PT

RO

SK

SL

SV

Contact

[Contact Form](#)