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Disclaimer

"The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the EC. It should also be noted that the legal evaluation of those practices is subject to the evolution of Commission practice and case-law of the Court of Justice".
The European Commission is initiating activities to increase the level of Green Public Procurement (GPP) in all Member States. A first step has been a study conducted by a Consortium of consultants to:

1. measure the current level of GPP across the 25 Member States of the EU, and
2. make available examples of environmental technical specifications for products and services identified as the most suitable for ‘greening’.

For the purpose of the study, GPP has been defined as follows: “Green Public Procurement is the approach by which Public Authorities integrate environmental criteria into all stages of their procurement process, thus encouraging the spread of environmental technologies and the development of environmentally sound products, by seeking and choosing outcomes and solutions that have the least possible impact on the environment throughout their whole life-cycle”. Hence, the concept of GPP as used in the study also covers situations in which the purchasing authority has the intention to buy a ‘green’ product (by stipulating for example environmental award criteria), without this guaranteeing also in all cases a ‘green’ outcome of the procurement procedure (if the environmental award criterion is not sufficiently important it may indeed be that a ‘neutral’ offer wins the contract).

The measurements have been performed on the basis of responses to 860 online questionnaires and by analysing the use of environmental criteria in more than 1000 tender documents. The findings can be categorised as follows: GPP performance of countries, barriers to GPP and differences in GPP by product.

The findings have been described extensively in an interim report that has been made public on http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/gpp/. A summary of the findings are as follows: **Performance by country**: The study highlighted that there are 7 countries (Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Sweden and UK: the ‘Green-7’) that consistently have more tenders with green criteria than the ‘Other-18’ and respondents from these countries rated their GPP activities more highly on the questionnaires. These ‘Green-7’ exhibit some or all of the following traits:
- Strong political drivers, national guidelines and programmes for GPP
- Public information resources via websites and eco-labels
− Use of innovative tools like life cycle thinking and green contract variants in procurement procedures
− Frequent implementation of environmental management systems (EMS) by purchasing authorities
− **Barriers**: The results regarding the four main barriers to GPP are:
  1. Green products would be more expensive
  2. Lack of environmental knowledge
  3. Lack of managerial and political support
  4. Lack of tools and information
  5. Lack of training
− **GPP by product**: Tenders for various product groups have been analysed to verify the use of environmental criteria. These criteria were then categorised as either ‘light green’ (1-3 clear environmental specifications) or ‘solid green’ (more than 3 clear environmental specifications).

The following table shows the spread of solid green criteria between the ‘Green-7’ and the entire 25 within each product group analysed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product group (examples)</th>
<th>% of solid green all 25</th>
<th>% solid green in ‘Green-7’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper, printed matter</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction work</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etcetera</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The in-depth analysis of over 1000 tender documents from all 25 Member States identified the need for further guidance, information, training and tools. Indeed, although many of the tenders, although initially marked as ‘green’ because of the inclusion of some environmental criteria, were not in fact fully compliant with these European Directives (lack of clear and transparent criteria, use of unlawful selection or award criteria, frequent confusion between selection and award criteria etc.).

In order to provide guidance, good practices have been gathered from the analysed tender documents.

− The consortium collated these good practices for 11 product groups, that were identified by the study as being suitable for *immediate* greening, based on the measurements in the study and on the basis of experience, practical know-how and analysis of the Take-5 Consortium.
The following 11 product groups have been selected. For these 11 product groups good and best practices have been identified.

1. Construction work
2. Transport: buses and bus services
3. Transport: passenger cars
4. Cleaning products/services
5. Clothing
6. Electricity
7. IT devices: computers and monitors
8. IT devices: printers and copiers
9. Food
10. Paper
11. Furniture

The environmental impact and possible green criteria for these product groups are further described in annex 1.

This information will be made publicly available via
http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/gpp/.

**Recommendations**: On the basis of the measurement study and frequent discussions with Commission Services and the ETAP High Level Group and two European GPP events (London, October 2005; Graz, April 2006), the following recommendations have been drafted by the Consortium:

Recommendations for organisations and individuals working on the national GPP action plans of the Member States:

1. Enable GPP by offering adequate information in the national language. An important step forward would be the creation of (linked) national and European GPP knowledge bases (naturally in the form of websites as they are accessible for everyone and can be updated easily). The European Commission has already initiated the European GPP knowledge base (which will contain the research on the 11 product groups conducted by the consortium).

2. Create training programs designed to increase GPP know-how, accompanied by a GPP communication plan. The training should consist of two levels (1) a general introduction to the concept of GPP and (2) detailed GPP courses at the
level of actual purchasing officers (including examples of concrete technical specifications). It is vital to stimulate the use of procurement instruments like life cycle costing, functional/outcome based specifications, use of eco-labels, requests for variants, weighted award criteria and contract conditions.

3. Ensure strong political and managerial support and synchronize this support with concrete measures in the form of target setting.

4. Stimulate the implementation of EMS by purchasing authorities, as this will stimulate and facilitate the uptake of green purchasing practices.

5. Perform national and European GPP benchmarking on the basis of analysing random tender documents (which has proven to be an efficient methodology). Combining this with target setting will make benchmarking an even stronger instrument.

6. Develop a national action or implementation plan on GPP that can be easily monitored, possibly through a step-by-step approach, gradually involving more organisations and expanding the green product portfolio. The concept of ‘low hanging fruit’ fits into this approach: copying and learning from other organisations and countries (especially from the ‘Green-7’) and starting with products that are easier to ‘green’, based on the selection of product and services groups identified as most “suitable” for greening by the Consortium.

Recommendations for purchasers and other stakeholders in the operational procurement process:

1. Ensure compliance with the European Directives on public procurement.
2. Exploit GPP networks, since knowledge, experience and information are widely available in Europe and in each individual Member State. Networks may also be used for creating opportunities for purchasing larger volumes, thus creating more purchasing power for greening.
3. Strive for a standard structure in the procurement/tender documentation with selection criteria, product specifications, award criteria and contract clauses, each with appropriate green aspects/information.
1 INTRODUCTION

The European Commission, the Directorate-General for the Environment (DG-ENV), commissioned a service contract to a consortium of five European organisations to “develop a measurement tool and measure the current level of green public procurement across the European Union (EU) and make available examples of environmental technical specifications for a series of product and service groups identified as most suitable for ‘greening’”.

According to the requirements of DG-ENV, the contract -or study- has been conducted in three stages between April 2005 and April 2006:

1. The definition stage: to reach consensus in Europe about what GPP is in practical terms for the purpose of the study.
2. The assessment stage: to map the status of GPP in the 25 Member States.
3. The recommendations stage: aimed at increasing the quantity and quality of GPP, i.e. by the identification of best practices.

1.1 DEFINITION AND ASSESSMENT STAGES

The stages 1 and 2 were completed in October 2005. In cooperation with DG-ENV and the ETAP high level working group, GPP has been defined in practical terms for the purpose of the study as: “Green Public Procurement is the approach by which Public Authorities integrate environmental criteria into all stages of their procurement process, thus encouraging the spread of environmental technologies and the development of environmentally sound products, by seeking and choosing outcomes and solutions that have the least possible impact on the environment throughout their whole life-cycle”.

In stage 2 the status of GPP in Europe was measured by analysing over 1000 tender documents advertised on the EU TED database and by analysing the answers on 860 questionnaires from public bodies from all 25 member states. The findings of the measurements have been described in detail in an interim report (http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/gpp/pdf/report_facts.pdf). A summary of the findings has been included in this final report in chapter 2.
1.2 THIS REPORT

This report is the result of the third / recommendations stage and is at the same time the final report of the service contract. Results and conclusions of the European GPP event in Graz in April 2006 have also been included in this report. The report is targeted at policymakers and purchasing and sustainability executives of all public bodies in Europe. The report is a stand-alone document. For this purpose some parts of the interim report of stages 1 and 2 have been copied into this report. Still, reading the complete interim report will hugely increase the understanding of GPP in Europe.

In chapter 3 of this report the approach and findings of the third stage of the project are described. The practical information can be used directly by purchasers to ‘green’ their procurement process and the products they buy. The information is based on findings from stage 2, combined with information from public sources like eco-labelling schemes.

Chapter 4 comprises recommendations to support the development and implementation of national action plans.

During the work in the first two stages the Consortium worked in close cooperation with DG-ENV and with representatives of the ETAP high level working group and the designated GPP co-ordinators in each Member State. The consortium wants to express her gratitude for this cooperation.
2 STATUS OF GPP IN EUROPE

This chapter describes the status of GPP in Europe. The chapter is a summary of the interim report containing the full description of the findings. The status of GPP has been measured in the first stages of the study in two different and independent ways:

− By means of a questionnaire for purchasers of public organisations
− By analysing tender documents issued by public organisations.

This methodology doesn’t allow however to find out what the actual outcome of the procurement processes has been, in other words: whether the organisations at stake actually also bought a green product. For this verification a study with a different scope and magnitude is required.

2.1 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of the measurements have been categorised in three ways so as to allow them to form the basis for benchmarking as well as for defining actions in national plans:

− GPP performance of countries
− Differences in GPP by product groups
− Barriers to GPP.

The overall objective of the study is to find and communicate best practices and best methodologies and strategies in order to enable more GPP in Europe. Because of the relatively small number of tender documents analysed per country, the figures cannot be used for drawing statistical information. They give however a broad indication of existing tendencies in the field of GPP. For this reason, the study focussed on drawing some practical conclusions and identifying good practices.

2.1.1 Performance by country

The study highlighted that there are 7 countries (Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Sweden and UK) hereafter known as the ‘Green-7’, that are currently implementing more elements of GPP, meaning that they consistently have more tenders with green criteria than the ‘Other-18’ countries and that they rated themselves more highly on the questionnaires; see the two figures below.
Overview of analysed tenders and the found criteria.

‘No criteria’ means that no green specifications were found;

‘grey’ means that attempts for green specifications were found, but these would not lead to a green purchase;

‘light green’ means 1-3 clear specifications;

‘solid green’ means more than 3 specifications were found.

The Czech Republic, Estonia, Luxembourg, Malta, Cyprus, Slovakia, Greece, Slovenia and Portugal are excluded from the figure, because the number of received tender documents is below 30 and therefore it is not possible to provide reliable figures.
Positive answers per country to the question: “Are there environmental criteria taken into
account in your organisation when purchasing?”. Poland, Cyprus, Luxembourg, Slovenia and
Slovakia are excluded from this table due to a response of less than 30 questionnaires.

The ‘Green-7’ exhibit some or all of the following characteristics:

− Strong political drivers and/or national guidelines.
− National programmes: GPP has been the subject of a national programme and
  the issue has been addressed for a number of years.
− Information resources: all have GPP websites and information resources
  available (often containing product related criteria and specifications).
− Innovative procurement techniques: 60% of questionnaire respondents from the
  ‘Green-7’ are using the following tools: life cycle costs as an award criterion,
  functional specifications / request for environmental variants; compared with
  45% from the Other 18.
− Implementation of environmental management systems (EMS) by the
  purchasing organisation: 33% of the questionnaire respondents of the ‘Green-
  7’ stated that they had an EMS which addressed GPP compared with 13% from
  the other 18 countries. The implementation of EMS by public bodies would
  indeed provide the necessary managerial support to GPP.

2.1.2 Differences in GPP per product

Environmental specifications and criteria per product have been identified and
measured in the tender document analysis. The questionnaire also included some
questions related to product groups.
The following section summarises the types of environmental specifications and criteria found in the tenders:

**Unclear specifications and criteria:** A large number of tenders analysed – regardless of the product group – did contain references to the environment. However these criteria and references were not well defined and it would be unlikely that they would result in a greener purchase. An example of an unclear environmental specification would be a tender stating that: “packaging should be from environmental friendly material” (without further specifying which materials should be considered environmental friendly). This high level of unclear reference highlights a lack of training in this area which has been mentioned by 25% of respondents as one of the main barriers to GPP.

It is interesting to note that the results gained from the tender analysis differed from the answers given in the questionnaires. It is clear that organisations perceive that they are implementing GPP more than they are actually doing it: 67% of all questionnaire respondents perceive that they use environmental criteria when purchasing, while in reality only 36% of the tender documents of all 25 Member States actually contain environmental criteria. Only two ‘very green’ Member States (Sweden and Germany) include green specifications in just over 60% of the analysed tender documents.

**Well defined specifications and criteria:** These are environmental specifications and criteria which are clear and objective and will normally lead to actual green outcomes.

The table below shows three categories of environmental criteria with a separate column for the ‘Green-7’ countries. The meanings of the categories are:

- ‘not’ means that no green criteria were found that would lead to a greener product: so this includes unclear criteria.
- ‘light’ means that 1-3 clear criteria were found in the tender document. An example of a well-defined criterion is: “personal computers must fulfil the requirements for energy use as defined for the Energy Star label”.
- ‘solid green’ means more than 3 criteria were found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product group</th>
<th># tenders analysed</th>
<th>% not green</th>
<th>% light green</th>
<th>% solid green</th>
<th>% solid ‘Green-7’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewage- and refuse-disposal services, sanitation and environmental services</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport equipment</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office machinery</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction work</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and other manufactured goods</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical products, rubber, plastic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food products and beverages, Restaurant services</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural, engineering, construction, installation and related technical consultancy services</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning services</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical devices</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, printed matter, printing services</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Electrical) machinery and communication equipment</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and communication services</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, health and recreational services</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and related services</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks to the table:

− Some product groups are more suitable for greening than others. Professional services such as advertising, general management, research and auditing services seldom contain environmental criteria whereas furniture construction etc often do
− As could be expected the ‘Green-7’ have considerable higher ‘solid’ green figures on most product groups, which means that the other countries can learn form the ‘Green-7’.
− The different levels of GPP between certain products are considerable.

2.1.3 Perceived barriers to GPP

The questionnaire provided the following results regarding the main barriers to GPP as perceived by public purchasers:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>‘Green-7’</th>
<th>Other 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception that environmentally friendlier products would be more expensive</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge about the environment and how to develop environmental criteria</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of management support (including money and time), strategic focus and organisational policy strongly promoting GPP</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of practical tools and information (e.g. handbooks, internet-tools)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training for public procurement officers</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks to the table:

- The perceived additional costs associated with greener products are seen as a strong barrier in all the countries (even though this is not necessarily the case).
- Lack of information and tools are also rated highly however in the ‘Green-7’ this was felt to be less of a barrier.
- The high percentage stating that lack of management support is a barrier shows that senior officials within the public sector across Europe do not have a high awareness of the importance of the GPP agenda: or their awareness is not explicit to their purchasing staff.

2.2 PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the measurement a number of preliminary conclusions and initial recommendations were presented and discussed in October 2005 at a European GPP event in London. The conclusions and recommendations were:

- Aspirational targets for GPP in Europe are feasible and can strongly lean on the current practice of the ‘Green-7’. Products that are currently being acquired with ‘solid green’ criteria can be considered as low hanging fruit. Objectives on these products can be adopted in the national GPP action plans.
- Purchasers state that a ‘lack of information’ and ‘lack of tools’ are important obstacles for GPP. However, the ‘Green-7’ did not rate these obstacles as high. Therefore it can be ascertained that communication, dissemination and practical training is extremely important if a country is to increase its level of GPP.
- An important step forward would be the creation of (linked) national and European GPP knowledge bases, naturally in the form of websites. These
websites should contain -or link to- all important GPP information (green criteria, specifications, best practice, eco-labels) on products and procurement procedures (buying green book, legal information, EU procurement regulations). The maintenance of the European website could be distributed over a number of Member States. The EC obviously could have a role in terms of coordinating and enabling this knowledge base.

- The measurements have uncovered a significant difference between the theory and the practice of ‘green’ purchasing; knowledge is available in a number of countries (particularly in the ‘Green-7’), but it is not always applied everywhere - ‘knowing green’ versus ‘doing green’ Thus exploring several communication channels in the national action plans is recommended, specifically including training programs. Promising channels are GPP Networks, GPP training and the Internet.

- Managerial support and political support have been mentioned as the third most important obstacle for GPP by more than 33% of respondents. This concern is equally distributed over all 25 Member States. Therefore GPP deserves strong national support in each Member State.

- The implementation of EMS by public bodies would be an important signal with respect to this support.

- Purchasers in Member States should be stimulated to use the criteria of eco-labels, even if they are not European labels or not from their own country.

- Benchmarking - both nationally and on the European level - is recommended as this will be a strong tool to measure progress and help steer action plans, thus increasing the levels of GPP. The experience of the consortium study demonstrates that analysing random tender documents is an efficient and effective benchmarking tool. In order to obtain objective European average figures an annual measurement by the EU would be appropriate. This would also be the yardstick for the national measurements. The yardstick might comprise:
  - GPP levels of ‘light green’ and ‘solid green’ in all Member States: thus also an average for all MS.
  - GPP levels per product group for most frequently purchased products, like the top 11 (and eventually all products groups).
3  STAGE THREE OF THE STUDY

The objective of the third stage of the study is to identify best practice and make this practice suitable for dissemination, in other words readily usable in the procurement process.

3.1 THE APPROACH OF STAGE THREE

In order to reach the above mentioned objective the following activities and analyses have been performed:

− The product groups suitable for greening have been identified. For this analysis information from the study and from various national GPP websites and eco-label schemes was used.
− The tender documents - and specifically those identified as ‘light and solid’ green - were analysed for their potential ability to be considered and identified as ‘best practice’.
− Organisations that claimed in the questionnaire to have best practice examples were approached and asked to make their examples available.
− The networks of the Take-5 consortium were used to identify examples outside the information that was gathered during the first and second stages of the study.
− The examples thus identified were then integrated and verified upon compliance with the European Directives on public procurement (Directives 2004/17/EC and 2004/18/EC).
− Some of these results were then structured into a GPP information database, which will be included in the European Commission green purchasing website.

3.2 FINDINGS OF STAGE THREE – DATABASE USER INSTRUCTIONS

Stage 3 is mainly concerned with the collection of good practice examples, included in a separate document called ‘GPP Europe 2006: examples and best practice’. One example -paper- has been included in this report as annex 2. The database will also be available on the European Commission's Green procurement website.

The first step of stage 3 was the selection of the product groups that were identified by the study as being suitable for immediate greening, based on the
measurements in the study and on the basis of experience, practical know-how and analysis of the Take-5 Consortium. The selection criteria for identifying the most suitable product groups were:

- The environmental impact of greening. In other words: what is the added value for the environment if greener versions of these products would be purchased by public bodies.
- The availability of green versions of these products in the market.
- The available examples (good and best practice) of public sector green purchasing of these products. The differences between scores on several product groups as measured in the ‘Green-7’ and the other MS, show that there is room for greening for these product groups, at least in the ‘Other-18’, but in most cases also in the ‘Green-7’.

The following 11 product groups have been selected. For these 11 product groups good and best practices have been identified.

1. Construction work
2. Transport: buses and bus services
3. Transport: passenger cars
4. Cleaning products/services
5. Clothing
6. Electricity
7. IT devices: computers and monitors
8. IT devices: printers and copiers
9. Food
10. Paper
11. Furniture

When consulting the database, it is important to take the following methodological aspects and user instructions into account:

**3.2.1 Scope and disclaimer**

The information included in the database and the environmental specifications and criteria mentioned in it may not be exhaustive or suitable for "copy and paste" in other purchasing procedures. Therefore it is important that users of the information always link to the original information sources, such as eco-labelling scheme websites or other environmental knowledge bases. Those sources are complete and dynamic and will be kept up to date, while the information linked to
this report is static. Furthermore, every procurement situation is different from the
other, so copying best practice information will not automatically lead to a new
best practice. Purchasers hold their own responsibility for their procurement
processes and for the tender documents’ texts.

3.2.2 Structure of the information contained in the database

The information per product group has been structured in such a way as to support
a step by step approach to greening the procurement process:

1. The key to the information is the product group as this is the starting point for
   all procurement.
2. The first step in the procurement process is to establish the need for the
   product, so from the point of view of the environment information about the
   need is supplied. What green aspects should be taken into account when
   discussing the need for the specific product? Are there alternative ways to
   meet the need that have less impact?
3. Then, for each product general impact information has been provided, to give
   purchasers a basic understanding of the potential environmental impacts of the
   product. This basic understanding is certainly valuable for all concerned with
   the product in the organisation.
4. The next step is to develop the green specifications for the product, for which
   web-sources and eco-label sources have been supplied. Especially in this step
   it is vital to go to the original sources and not rely on the static information in
   the report ‘GPP Europe 2006: examples and best practice’.
5. Finally the purchaser is supported by examples with green criteria. These
   criteria have been copied from a number of sources including web-sites, eco-
   label schemes and tender documents.

3.2.3 Compliance with European Directives

The measurement in the second stage of the study (which was about measuring
the level of GPP in EU 25) focussed in the first place on identifying
environmental elements in the collected tender documents. All tenders containing
environmental elements were analysed and included in the report. However, when
analysing in stage 3 in more in-depth all tenders considered ‘green’, it became
clear that in many cases, the ‘environmental’ references were not in all aspects
fully compliant with public procurement legislation. This was even the case for
the tenders of the ‘Green 7’. Although many useful specifications have been identified, it has been very difficult to identify ‘perfect green’ tendering procedures. This again highlights that there is a considerable need for training, not only of Green public procurement, but also about public procurement in general. Green public procurement should be usefully integrated into general public procurement training.

A recurring example of non compliance with the Directives is that EMS are often requested either as selection or award criteria. This is not allowed because the public procurement directives request that there must be a link between selection and award criteria on the one hand and the object or service or work purchased on the other hand. EMS concern the global environmental performance of a company or organisation, and not just the ‘green’ aspects of the products or services produced by it. Therefore it would be disproportionate to request from bidders that they operate a full EMS, whereas it may not be absolutely necessary to operate an EMS to manufacture or sell ‘green’ products. However, in certain cases, and only in services or works contracts, it may be admitted for a purchasing authority to request from the bidders that they demonstrate their ability to take the necessary environmental management measures during the performance of the contract. In such case, bidders who implement an EMS and are in the possession of an EMS certificate can use this certificate to act as proof of fulfilling this specific environmental selection criterion. In all cases, contracting authorities should recognize equivalent ways of proving this capacity.

Another recurring mistake in GPP is the lack of transparency as regards the way in which the tenders will be assessed against the award criteria set forth (lack of weighing and often also lack of clear award criteria).

Another frequent mistake is that tender documents refer to national eco-labelling schemes, without recognizing equivalent specifications or eco-labelling schemes. Although often these practices will have led to purchasers buying environmentally sound products, they cannot be promoted as best practice because of the lack of legal compliance (see annex 3 for an overview of ‘do’s and don’ts’ within the legal framework of GPP).

3.2.4 Integrated tender documentation

Another general observation is, that the structure of tender documents varies considerably, and that some documents are rather confusing, containing ‘scattered green elements’: It is often hard to identify what are the selection criteria
(obligatory requirements related to the financial and technical capacity of the bidders) and what are the weighted award criteria (which relate to the bids themselves and against which the bids are compared one against the other in order to choose the one presenting best value for money). It also seems that public purchasers often mix up these criteria.

As a conclusion, general training on tendering and composing clear tender documents should be offered to public purchasers: it is necessary to familiarize the purchasers with the logical “flow” of a public sector procurement procedure:

1. The identification of the need
2. The description of the subject matter of the tendering procedure
3. The definition of clear and transparent minimum specifications
4. The inclusion of clear and transparent weighted award criteria which allow for an objective comparison of bids
5. The non negotiable contract performance clauses that need to be complied with after the award of the contract.

If properly prepared and supported by environmental advisers GPP would benefit hugely from such training.

3.2.5 Additional examples

In addition to the analysis of the collected tender documents (for the purpose of the survey), a number of examples of tendering procedures with green outcomes has also been identified by the Take-5 Consortium. The examples have been selected on the basis of their successful green outcome and not just on the basis of green criteria in tender documents in the procurement process. This selection has been added to the study in order to illustrate which practices will lead to effective real green purchases. Green specifications of these products have been added to the information database, although they don’t originate from the measurements in stage 2 of the study.

3.2.6 National websites / information sources

A number of national websites with green specifications and national eco-labels have been analysed. Information from this analysis has been included in the information database.

This activity cannot and should not be considered as the integration of all available environmental information in Europe because this was not within the
scope of the study. The collected information comprises mainly general information on the product groups and links to national websites and eco-labels for more details. Purchasers should always consult these national information sources for up-to-date and detailed information.

An important result from the analysis of eco-labelling schemes is that the information from these schemes has often not been structured in a way which is useful for the public procurement process. In other words, the procurement process demands ‘green’ information on specifications, on award criteria and on contract clauses. Yet the information in eco-labels is often not structured this way. Furthermore eco-labels often comprise information, that cannot be used directly as criteria in a public procurement process (like social criteria). This observation has been confirmed on a number of occasions during the GPP event in Graz.

3.2.7 How to make use of eco-labelling criteria and other ‘open’ sources?

The best practices that will be disseminated via the EU website for GPP (initially via the report ‘GPP Europe 2006: examples and best practice’), include the use of product-specific environmental criteria, which have been composed on the basis of this study, and are freely accessible to any interested party.

In several Member States, GPP guiding systems on the Internet have been prepared which include ‘ready-to-use’ green specifications and criteria. There are also many eco-labelling schemes which contain environmental information that is freely accessible to anyone who wants to use it.

European Directive 2004/18/EC is clear about the use of such eco-labels in article 23(6):

Where contracting authorities lay down environmental characteristics in terms of performance or functional requirements as referred to in paragraph 3(b) they may use the detailed specifications, or, if necessary, parts thereof, as defined by European or (multi-) national eco-labels, or by and any other eco-label, provided that:

– those specifications are appropriate to define the characteristics of the supplies or services that are the object of the contract,
– the requirements for the label are drawn up on the basis of scientific information,
the eco-labels are adopted using a procedure in which all stakeholders, such as government bodies, consumers, manufacturers, distributors and environmental organisations can participate, and

they are accessible to all interested parties.

Some remarks regarding the use of eco-labelling criteria in GPP:

− One can only refer to the product-related criteria of an eco-labelling scheme, because the directives do not regard criteria related to for instance the environmental performance of a company or an EMS as relevant to the product (see also annex 3, footnote 5).

− When seeking to describe a certain product, a public purchaser may decide to refer to all relevant criteria of all existing eco-labels covering this product, on the condition that they fulfil the above mentioned requirements given in the EU procurement directive. Another solution is to refer only to one eco-label, but then recognition must be stated that products complying with equivalent criteria, with or without them being covered by an eco-label, will be accepted.

− Preferably one should refer to all product related environmental criteria in an eco-label criteria document and not to part of them, in order to have a well-balanced green product: a purchaser would not naturally know the effect of leaving certain criteria out.

− The eco-label should preferably also be used/recognized as proof of the fact that the right product has been delivered: The eco-label itself is evidence of meeting the individual criteria set (thus encouraging companies to get the eco-label). Other equivalent means of proof should be allowed (for instance documentation verified by an independent third party).

3.2.8 Results of the analysis

Although the objective of the 3rd stage of the study was to identify straightforward ‘100% best practice green procurement processes’ this appeared not to be feasible due to the fact that none of the analysed tenders complied with the following (cumulative) requirements for such a ‘best practice green procurement process’:

− The European Directives on public procurement: for example requiring ‘ISO 14001’ or an ‘EMS’ is not in accordance with the Directives.
− **Solid green product criteria**, describing all relevant environmental specifications of the product: for example just requiring the return of packaging material is not considered ‘solid green’.

− **Clear award criteria**, which make it predictable for suppliers to estimate the potential of winning a contract by offering ‘light green’ or ‘solid green’ alternatives

− **Inclusion of the Life cycle cost** of the product or service in the award criteria: as the Life cycle cost in principle demonstrates the economic advantage of buying green products and services, by including not only the purchase price, but also the costs incurred for the use phase of the product and of its disposal.

Thus the ambition of the 3rd stage of the study had to be adjusted: all ‘good practices’ have been gathered and have been completed with comments, clarifications and alternatives.

### 3.2.9 Overall conclusion

The overall conclusion to be drawn from the previously mentioned methodological aspects of the 3rd stage of the study is that the information database resulting from the GPP study is the first step - or pilot - towards a genuine European GPP knowledge base.

This pilot information database aims:

− To give an overview of product groups that are suitable for greening
− To supply important green criteria per product group, without having the ambition to be complete or completely detailed nor up to date
− To widely illustrate GPP in order to make it clear that it can be implemented right now and without barriers
− To give a variety of practical solutions for purchasers for a variety of products, without being exhaustive
− To give, where feasible, certain levels of greening in combination with the green specifications, so that organisations can reflect their green ambition in their procurement process.
− To give guidance on what can /should be done at each procurement stage including the contract drafting stage
4 RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains the final recommendations from the Consortium to the stakeholders of GPP in Europe: the European Commission, Member States, and Public bodies in the Member States. The preliminary recommendations as described in paragraph 2.2 have been used as well as new material gathered in the 3rd stage of the study. The recommendations have been clustered for Policy Makers to support the drafting of national action plan as well as for Management and Operational Staff (purchasing and environmental) to support the actual green procurement process.

4.1 POLICY MAKERS

When initiating or updating national action plans for GPP or when initiating supporting actions for GPP at the European level it should be well taken into account that

GPP is already a proven concept.

Thus the recommendations for policy makers are:

− **Get GPP on the political agenda:** Political and managerial support have been mentioned as the third most important obstacle for GPP by more than 33% of respondents. This concern is equally distributed over all 25 Member States. Therefore GPP deserves strong national support in each Member State in the form of a national GPP policy. Several communication channels should be explored in the national action plans spreading the national (and European) GPP policy. GPP in Europe can be brought to a higher average level just by copying policies (also partially) from one country to the other, thus reducing the barriers -mentioned in this study- as perceived by purchasers.

− **Set targets:** Aspirational targets for GPP in Europe are feasible and can strongly lean on the current practice of the ‘Green-7’ countries. Products that are currently being acquired with ‘solid green’ criteria can be considered as low hanging fruit. Targets or objectives can be formulated in a number of ways:

  − National GPP action plans could focus on certain product groups and set targets and due dates for these products. These targets could be raised through the years.
− National GPP action plans could focus on certain types of public organisations -like hospitals- and set targets and due dates for implementing GPP.
− Also a differentiation to region or geographical area is possible, for example implementing GPP in all organisations in a certain province.
− A combination of aspects may be feasible as well.

− **Knowledge base**: An important step forward would be the creation of a European GPP knowledge base, consisting of (linked) national knowledge bases, naturally in the form of websites. These websites should contain -or link to- all important information (green criteria, specifications, best practice, eco-labels) on products and procurement procedures (buying green book, legal information, EU procurement regulations). The EC would obviously have a leading role in terms of coordinating and enabling this knowledge base. The knowledge base is most important to make GPP easy for purchasers.

− **Enable and stimulate training**: Training has been mentioned by purchasers as an important barrier to GPP. Policy makers should create the opportunities for and stimulate national training programs.

− **European consensus on information**: While extending the GPP knowledge base from the study to a genuine European version, creation of consensus is vital for its success. Furthermore -keeping in mind purchasers all over Europe- user friendliness and simplicity of the information are critical success factors.

− **Synchronisation of eco-label information**: The criteria developed for eco-labels (European and national) should be synchronized with the public procurement process, or at least eco-labels should contain a section specifically for GPP, thus creating a clear and legally correct working environment for purchasers.

− **Benchmarking**: In combination with national action plans, benchmarking -both nationally and on the European level- is recommended as it will be a strong tool to measure and help steering these action plans, thus increasing the levels of GPP. Experience in the study demonstrates that analysing tender documents is an efficient and effective benchmarking tool. In order to obtain objective European average figures an annual measurement by the EU would be appropriate. This would be the yardstick for the national measurements.
4.2 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL STAFF

The study demonstrates that purchasers actually ‘do’ GPP quite often in the ‘Green-7’, but also in all other countries. This means that

GPP is proven practice.

Therefore recommendations for management and operational staff are:

− **Professionalism** is the key to GPP with a focus on:
  − compliance with the European Directives on public procurement, and
  − integrating green criteria and aspects into the whole procurement process.

Both deserve the utmost attention of all purchasers and should be considered as the responsibility of each individual public purchaser.

− **Communicate**: Once policies have resulted in national action plans it is important to inform all those whom it will affect, i.e. understanding that procurement is not the sole responsibility only of the purchaser, but the user, specifier and budget holder should be involved as well. Thus communication is an important operational task. Promising channels are GPP Networks, GPP training and the Internet. This communication applies for the whole public sector, thus supporting purchasing staff when they are implementing and ‘doing’ GPP in their organisations.

− **Managerial support**: As indicated above, political and managerial support has been mentioned as the third most important obstacle for GPP by more than 33% of respondents. The implementation of EMS by public bodies would be an important instrument and signal with respect to managerial support.

− **Do what you know**: GPP is proven practice and most purchasers know what it is. Information is available as well as examples. The challenge is to use all the building blocks and turn concept into practice: ‘knowing green’ versus ‘doing green’.

− **Training**: Purchasers state that a ‘lack of information’ and ‘lack of tools’ are important obstacles for GPP. However, the ‘Green-7’ did not rate these obstacles as high. Therefore it can be ascertained that communication, dissemination and practical training are **extremely** important to increase the level of GPP.
– **Use eco-labels:** Prior to the existence of an European GPP knowledge base purchasers in Member States should be stimulated to use the criteria of eco-labels, even if they are not European labels or not from their own country. As said before Eco-labels should be used carefully, taking legal aspects well into account.
## ANNEX 1: PRODUCT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Product Group</th>
<th>Environmental impact</th>
<th>Availability green criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Construction work           | - In general, for buildings, the biggest impact is in the use phase from: energy use for electricity, space heating and cooling, water heating  
- Extraction of raw material from renewable and non-renewable resources  
- Processing of materials: energy and (harmful) chemicals are needed  
- Harmful emissions to air/water during construction  
- Noise during construction  
- Paints and varnishes are used  
- Transport of material to construction site  
- Disposal of materials during construction and when demolishing the building | - Several sources (websites, studies, etc.)                                                                                                               |
| 2  | Transport: buses and bus services | - Emission of greenhouse gases  
- Emission of among others CO, NO<sub>x</sub> and particulates with a detrimental impact on air quality  
- Extraction of raw material from renewable and non-renewable resources  
- Use of fossil fuels from limited sources  
- Noise emissions  
- Disposal of materials when demolishing the vehicles | - Several websites  
- EU wide emission standards  
- Criteria for specific buses by Blaue Engel                                                                                                       |
| 3  | Transport: passenger cars   | *Same as for buses and bus services*                                                                                                                                                                                  | - Several websites  
- EU wide emission standards                                                                                                                            |
| 4  | Cleaning products/services  | - Use of substances hazardous to the (aquatic) environment and human health  
- Air pollution through use of volatile organic compounds (VOCs)  
- Bioaccumulation from non- and poorly biodegradable chemicals  
- Use of resources for packaging  
- Waste from packaging | - Several websites  
- Several eco-labels                                                                                                                                       |
| 5  | Clothing                    | Impacts from growing cotton:  
- Water and soil contamination through use of pesticides and fertilizers resulting in eutrophication, acidification and ecotoxicity  
- Soil erosion, loss of biodiversity  
Other:  
- Use of non-renewable resources for synthetic fibres | - Several websites  
- Several eco-labels                                                                                                                                        |
| 6  | Electricity                 | - Emission of greenhouse gases  
- Emission of among others CO, NO<sub>x</sub> and particulates                                                                                           | - Several websites  
- Several eco-labels                                                                                                                                        |
|   | with a detrimental impact on air quality  
|   | - Polluting impacts of extracting fossil fuels (oil spills, gas leaks)  
|   | - Water pollution from coal mining  
|   | - Nuclear wastes are a serious environmental and health issue  
|   | - Use of fossil fuels from limited sources  
|   | - Wastewater discharges from power plants can have an impact on surface water habitats (e.g. through contamination such as suspended solids, temperature, etc).  
|   | - Some solid wastes from fossil fuel power stations are likely to be hazardous in nature, for example ash and oily waste.  
| 7 | IT devices: computers and monitors  
|   | - Energy use in use phase  
|   | - Use of non-renewable natural resources  
|   | - Use of harmful chemicals for flame retardants, PVC and other harmful substances  
|   | - Disposal of hazardous material  
|   | - Use of resources for packaging  
|   | - Waste from packaging  
|   | - Several websites  
|   | - Several eco-labels  
| 8 | IT devices: printers, copiers  
|   | - Same as for computers and monitors  
|   | - Several websites  
|   | - Several eco-labels  
| 9 | Food  
|   | - Water and soil contamination through use of pesticides and fertilizers resulting in eutrophication, acidification and ecotoxity  
|   | - Soil erosion, loss of biodiversity  
|   | - Use of genetically modified organisms (GMO) has been discussed extensively. A communis opinio has not been reached yet, though some regulation exists.  
|   | - Use of energy for processing food and transportation  
|   | - Use of resources for packaging  
|   | - Waste from packaging  
|   | - Several sources (websites, studies, etc.)  
|   | - Several eco-labels  
| 10 | Paper  
|   | - Air emissions of sulphur and greenhouse gases  
|   | - Emissions to water of chlorine compounds and organic waste  
|   | - Energy consumption  
|   | - Use of fibres from primary forests  
|   | - Use of metal complex dye stuffs or pigments  
|   | - Several eco-labels  
| 11 | Furniture  
|   | - Use of material from renewable and non-renewable resources  
|   | - Use of chemicals for paints  
|   | - Several eco-labels  
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ANNEX 2: EXAMPLE GPP INFORMATION PAPER

Needs analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Measures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- avoiding printing and make as much as possible use of electronic documents and electronic filing protocols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- install multifunctional devices or printers with duplex function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- centralise printing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- use Corporate Stationery as electronic templates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- make users aware of the amounts of papers used and the possible savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production</th>
<th>In the production phase the following environmental aspects are relevant for paper:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Air emissions of sulphur and greenhouse gases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emissions to water of chlorine compounds and organic wastes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Energy consumption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of virgin fibres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of metal complex dye stuffs or pigments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Packaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>In this phase the delivery of paper is relevant. By centralising demands, the environmental impacts due to transport can be reduced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The need for paper can be reduced by the management measures mentioned in the section on needs analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste</th>
<th>Packaging.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper can be easily recycled when a separate collection system is operating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost aspects

| Life cycle costs | Depending on the local situation costs for collection of waste paper and recycling/disposal should be taken into account. |

Examples of existing eco-labelling schemes (non exhaustive list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nordic Swan</td>
<td><a href="http://www.svanen.nu">www.svanen.nu</a></td>
<td>Swedish, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieukeur</td>
<td><a href="http://www.milieukeur.nl">www.milieukeur.nl</a></td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Eco-label</td>
<td><a href="http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/ecolabel/index_en.htm">http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/ecolabel/index_en.htm</a> &gt; Product Groups &gt; Copying and graphic paper &gt; The revised criteria</td>
<td>Spanish, Danish, German, Greek, English, French, Italian, Dutch, Portuguese, Finnish, Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaue Engel</td>
<td><a href="http://www.blauer-engel.de">www.blauer-engel.de</a></td>
<td>German, English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevant criteria for green public procurement

Eco-label criteria can be used to set up technical specifications and award criteria. One can only use those criteria which relate to the product; criteria related to the production process can also be included on the condition that they are relevant for the product, meaning that they contribute to its - not necessarily visible - ‘green’ characteristics. For paper, such relevant criteria are for instance those related to:

- The origin of the fibre raw material
- The used chemicals
- The emissions to water and air caused by the production process

Possible examples of criteria to be used in tender documents

The examples in this section are taken from tender documents which were collected for a study to assess the level of green public procurement in the European Union. The examples have been commented on by the research group concerning the environmental focus and the correct use of criteria, in accordance with public procurement law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level: Light green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Technical specifications** | Supply of:
  - Sanitary recycled tissue paper |
- Recycled Paper: 100 % from waste paper
- Elementary Chlorine Free Paper (ECF)
- Packaging in recycled cardboard boxes
- Recycled envelopes
- Liquid paper without trichloroethane
- Glue stick without solvents

Remarks by the research group about the environmental focus and purchasing criteria

Strong elements:
- Request for reduction/elimination of hazardous substances
- Request for recycled packaging material

2  Level: Light green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Photo copier paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Technical specifications

2. Technical specifications and quantity
   Cod.0412 Package of 500 sheets DIN A-4 ecological type (production ECF Elementary Chlorine Free), (…) packaged with recycled cardboard boxes.
   Cod. 0413 Package of 500 sheets DIN A-3 ecological type (production ECF Elementary Chlorine Free), (…) packaged with recycled cardboard boxes.

3. Certifications
   When suppliers present their offers, they must submit certificates concerning technical specifications of paper (…).

Remarks by the research group about the environmental focus and purchasing criteria

Strong elements:
- Introduction of criteria for packaging.

Consideration of how the supplier should prove that the product fulfils the criteria by submitting certificates.

3  Level: solid

|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Technical specifications

1. Paper and cardboard: 100% from waste paper (exclusive secondary fibres), marked with the eco-label for environmental protection after RAL UZ 14/56 (German eco-labelling scheme Blaue Engel) or fulfilling the criteria of the eco-label (self-declaration of the bidder). (See annex 1)

Annex 1:
Declaration of the cardboard manufacturer

We, the company ___________________________ in __________________________ declares as cardboard manufacturer the following:

The recycling cardboard with the trade name__________________________, which can be supplied by us: is produced from 100% waste paper □ and fulfils the criteria of the eco-label and after RAL-UZ 56 (Blaue Engel).
We are entitled by a valid RAL contract to use the eco-label symbol for this paper.

2. (For some products)
Additionally to be imprinted on the front or back cover in font size 12p:
- the eco-label (if entitled) as well as the text: "made of 100% waste paper - saves energy, raw materials and waste".
- "made of 100% waste paper - saves energy, raw materials and waste fees". (please mark the applicable option)

**Contract clauses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the packaging environmentally friendly, recyclable materials have to be used. From environmental perspective a pallet packing with pallet cover and wraps is preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disposal of the packaging</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The disposal of the packaging is according to the last publication of the (German) packaging regulation. Pallets/one-way pallets/pallet covers/wraps or any foil wrapping have to be taken back at delivery of the products upon requests of the customer. The disposal of the packaging remaining with the contracting authority has to be compensated with a granted lump sum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks by the research group about the environmental focus and purchasing criteria**

**Strong elements:**
Reference to Blaue Engel and recognition of products complying with these criteria without bearing the label.

**4 Level: solid**

**Product**

- Envelopes

**Technical specifications**

- Green criteria:
  - The envelopes are from unbleached paper or bleached without chlorine, free of substances that are detrimental for health and the primary fibres (new fibres) are from environmentally sustainable managed forests and plantations and not from primeval forests.
  - Adhesive on the basis of water or ethanol.
  - Inner printing on water basis.

The bidders with an eco-label type I (this means a label, European or national, which has been granted either by a government agency or by an independent agency which has been recognised by the government) can use that label as a proof that their product fulfils the ecological specifications. If not, the bidders must add to their offer all documents (analysis by a certified laboratory which is recognised by an independent agency, etc.) which prove that their products fulfil the required specifications. For more details annex.

**Annex**

**PAPER**

**Proportion of primary fibres:**
- The new fibres must come from forests which are managed in such a way that
the principles and measures are applied which are aimed at ensuring a sustainable forest management.
- The origin of all new fibres which are used, must be indicated.
- In Europe the principles and measures mentioned above must at least correspond to those of the Pan-European operational guidelines for sustainable forest management, such as agreed upon at the ministerial conference of Lisbon concerning the protection of the forests in Europe (2-4 June 1998). Outside Europe they must correspond to at least the principles for forest management of the UNCED (Rio the Janeiro, June 1992) and, when these apply, to the criteria or guidelines for sustainable forest management which have been determined as a component of several international and regional initiatives (ITTO, Montreal case, Tarapoto case, Dry-Zone Africa-initiative of UNEP/FAO).

Remark:
Appraisal and control: The applicant must indicate type, quantity and origin of the fibres which are used for the production of pulp and paper. The origin of new fibres must be indicated sufficiently accurate, so that possibly can be checked if the new fibres come from sustainable managed forests. There where new fibres from forests are used, the applicant must submit the correct certificate as well as documentation for the confirmation from which appears that the certification system assesses the aforesaid principles and measures for sustainable forest management correctly. For new fibres from forests which are not certified as coming from sustainable managed forests, the applicant must submit the declarations concerned, charter, code of conduct or declaration, in which is confirmed that the aforesaid requirements are met.

Bleacher:
- Unbleached or without chlorine bleached paper (TCF = Totally Chlorine Free or ECF = Elementary Chlorine Free).

Composition:
- Formaldehyde: maximum. 1 mg/dm² paper
- No glyoxal.
- The pulp may not contain optical bleaching agents nor ethyleendiamino tetra acid (EDTA) or di-ethyleentriamino penta acid (DTPA).
- Paper must be free of synthetic polymers, glues, coatings or dyes which are known as being carcinogenic, pathogenic or toxic for the reproduction according to the directive 67/548/EC.
- Pigments and the dyes may not contain components of copper, lead, chrome, nickel or aluminium and can no more than 20 ppm cadmium or 4 ppm mercury, lead or chrome.
- Recyclables: The product must be produced in such a way that it is recyclable after use. The reduction of added substances simplifies the recycling

GLUE
- Solvents on the basis of water or ethanol (alcohol)
- Proportion of volatile organic compound (VOC) must be lower than 5%.

INTERIOR
The envelopes may not have a printed interior or it has to be water based.

Remark:
- Paper with the label FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) or PEFC fulfils the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remarks by the research group about the environmental focus and purchasing criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Strong elements:**
Criteria are clear, also mentioned how to prove compliance with the criteria.
ANNEX 3: ‘DO’S AND DON’TS’ OF GPP

As a result of the analysis of the tender documents and further to discussions held during the session on “the legal framework for GPP” during the Graz Conference early April 2006, it became clear that certain legal issues continue to be experienced as problematic by a considerable number of public purchasers. Those issues concern the use of specifications or criteria related to environmental management systems\(^1\) (EMS), to environmental management measures\(^2\) (emm), to eco-labels, and to production processes.

The following table describes the approach developed at the Graz conference 3.-4.4.2006 in the Session “G - Legal framework of GPP: do’s and don’ts”, by the facilitator Ari Nissinen, and commented by the audience.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection criteria</th>
<th>DO = You can present requirement or award criteria connected to:</th>
<th>DON’T = Do not present requirement or award criteria connected to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specified EMM to be organized during the contract</td>
<td>Specified environmental management measures (emm) in service or works contracts(^3)</td>
<td>EMS in supply contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of eco-labelling schemes (but exclude those of EMS and emm(^6))</td>
<td>Criteria of eco-labelling schemes (but exclude those of EMS and emm(^5))</td>
<td>Bearing an eco-label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production processes, i.e. related to the production of organic food or to the production of electricity by renewables</td>
<td>Production processes, i.e. related to the production of electricity by renewables or to the production of organic food</td>
<td>Only one or few environmental aspects of the production processes, which evidently don’t focus on the most important environmental impacts of the production(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important environmental impacts of other production processes(^4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical specifications</th>
<th>DO = You can present requirement or award criteria connected to:</th>
<th>DON’T = Do not present requirement or award criteria connected to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of eco-labelling schemes (but exclude those of EMS and emm(^5))</td>
<td>Criteria of eco-labelling schemes (but exclude those of EMS and emm(^6))</td>
<td>Bearing an eco-label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production processes, i.e. related to the production of electricity by renewables or to the production of organic food</td>
<td>Production processes, i.e. related to the production of electricity by renewables or to the production of organic food</td>
<td>Only one or few environmental aspects of the production processes, which evidently don’t focus on the most important environmental impacts of the production(^3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award criteria</th>
<th>DO = You can present requirement or award criteria connected to:</th>
<th>DON’T = Do not present requirement or award criteria connected to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of eco-labelling schemes (but exclude those of EMS and emm(^5))</td>
<td>Criteria of eco-labelling schemes (but exclude those of EMS and emm(^6))</td>
<td>Bearing an eco-label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production processes, i.e. related to the production of electricity by renewables or to the production of organic food</td>
<td>Production processes, i.e. related to the production of electricity by renewables or to the production of organic food</td>
<td>Only one or few environmental aspects of the production processes, which evidently don’t focus on the most important environmental impacts of the production(^3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract clauses</th>
<th>DO = You can present requirement or award criteria connected to:</th>
<th>DON’T = Do not present requirement or award criteria connected to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specified EMM to be organized during the contract</td>
<td>Specified EMM to be organized during the contract</td>
<td>Specified EMM to be organized during the contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footnotes to the table

1) E.g. according to ISO 14001 or EMAS or equivalent environmental management systems and schemes.

2) ‘Environmental management measures’ (emm) are specific measures related to the management of the environment, which the contracting authority can ask its contractor to fulfil during the performance of a contract: any contractor should normally be in a position to take such measures, without it being necessary to run a full and formal environmental management scheme e.g. for cleaning services: the cleaning staff has been trained to choose the correct cleaning agents and use the correct amounts. For construction works: arrangements for the separation of waste, the staff has been trained to do this right, and there is surveillance of proper separation.

3) You can accept an EMS (certificate) as a means of proof/verification of the ability of the bidders to perform certain environmental management measures.

4) In annex VI of Directive 2004/18/EC (see also section below: ‘Relevant points in Directive 2004/18/EC about the use of production-process-criteria’) is written that technical specifications can mean ‘production processes and methods’. In addition, in the EC handbook on environmental public procurement is stated: “However, since all technical specifications should bear a link to the subject matter of the contract, you can only include those requirements which are related to the manufacturing of the product and contribute to its characteristics, without necessarily being visible.”

5) Each award criterion should be “linked to the subject-matter of the public contract in question” (see Article 53 of Directive 2004/18 in section below: ‘Relevant points in Directive 2004/18/EC about the use of production-process-criteria’).

There is one judgement of the EU Court of Justice (Case C-448/01), indicating that electricity from renewable energy sources can be used as an award criterion. It shows that the production process can have a link to the final product, but at the same time it must be recognized that the case of electricity is special, as there is a directive about promoting the use of renewable energy sources for electricity production. Similarly, organic production can evidently be used as an award criterion, as there is a directive about organic production.
6) When referring to the criteria of an eco-labelling scheme, contracting authorities should exclude all references to EMS and emm because such requirements do not bear the necessary link with the subject matter of the contract. This is possible by stating for instance: “Please note that possible eco-label criteria about environmental management systems (EMS) and measures (emm) are not considered in the technical specifications or award criteria.”

For service and works contracts however, it is possible to include environmental management measures in the selection criteria or in the contract performance clauses.

**Relevant points in Directive 2004/18/EC about the use of production-process-criteria**

**Technical specifications**
(29) …Contracting authorities that wish to define environmental requirements for the technical specifications of a given contract may lay down the environmental characteristics, such as a given production method, and/or specific environmental effects of product groups or services. …

**Article 23, 6:**
Where contracting authorities lay down environmental characteristics in terms of performance or functional requirements … they may use the detailed specifications, or, if necessary, parts thereof, as defined …by… any other eco-label, provided that:
- those specifications are appropriate to define the characteristics of the supplies or services that are the object of the contract, …

**ANNEX VI**
1. (b) ‘technical specification’, in the case of public supply or service contracts, means a specification in a document defining the required characteristics of a product or a service, such as quality levels, environmental performance levels, design for all requirements (including accessibility for disabled persons) and conformity assessment, performance, use of the product, safety or dimensions, including requirements relevant to the product as regards the name under which the product is sold, terminology, symbols, testing and test methods, packaging, marking and labelling, user instructions, production processes and methods and conformity assessment procedures;
**Award criteria**

**Article 53, 1:**

1. Without prejudice to national laws, regulations or administrative provisions concerning the remuneration of certain services, the criteria on which the contracting authorities shall base the award of public contracts shall be either:

   (a) when the award is made to the tender most economically advantageous from the point of view of the contracting authority, *various criteria linked to the subject-matter of the public contract in question*, for example, quality, price, technical merit, aesthetic and functional characteristics, environmental characteristics, running costs, cost-effectiveness, after-sales service and technical assistance, delivery date and delivery period or period of completion, or

   (b) the lowest price only.