



# Revision of the EU school scheme

## Presentation of stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment

Civil Dialogue Group – Milk – 22 October 2021

Giulia MEDICO and Gaëtan DUBOIS, AGRI.G.3

# OUTLINE OF THE PRESENTATION

1. Introduction: the review of the EU school review in 2023
2. The combined evaluation roadmap / inception impact assessment published for stakeholders' feedback
3. Feedback received by stakeholders: who and what
4. Next steps

# 1. Context for the review of the EU school scheme: Farm to Fork Strategy – Action 25



Brussels, 20.5.2020  
COM(2020) 381 final

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN  
PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL  
COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS

A Farm to Fork Strategy  
for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food system

## PROMOTE SUSTAINABLE FOOD CONSUMPTION, FACILITATING THE SHIFT TOWARDS HEALTHY, SUSTAINABLE DIETS

Review of the **EU school scheme** legal framework with a view to refocus the scheme on healthy and sustainable food

2023

### 2.4. Promoting sustainable food consumption and facilitating the shift to healthy, sustainable diets


Current **food consumption** patterns are unsustainable from both health and environmental points of view. While in the EU, average intakes of energy, red meat<sup>33</sup>, sugars, salt and fats continue to exceed recommendations, consumption of whole-grain cereals, fruit and vegetables, legumes and nuts is insufficient<sup>34</sup>.

Reversing the rise in overweight and obesity rates across the EU by 2030 is critical. Moving to a more plant-based diet with less red and processed meat and with more fruits and vegetables will reduce not only risks of life-threatening diseases, but also the environmental impact of the food system<sup>35</sup>. It is estimated that in the EU in 2017 over 950,000 deaths (one out of five) and over 16 million lost healthy life years were attributable to unhealthy diets, mainly cardiovascular diseases and cancers<sup>36</sup>. The EU's 'beating cancer' plan includes the promotion of healthy diets as part of the actions for cancer prevention.

To improve the **availability and price** of sustainable food and to promote healthy and sustainable diets in institutional catering, the Commission will determine the best way of setting minimum mandatory criteria for sustainable food procurement. This will help cities, regions and public authorities to play their part by sourcing sustainable food for schools, hospitals and public institutions and it will also boost sustainable farming systems, such as organic farming. The Commission will lead by example and reinforce sustainability standards in the catering contract for its canteens. It will also review the EU school scheme to enhance its contribution to sustainable food consumption and in particular to strengthen educational messages on the importance of healthy nutrition, sustainable food production and reducing food waste.

[https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:ea0f9f73-9ab2-11ea-9d2d-01aa75ed71a1.0001.02/DOC\\_1&format=PDF](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:ea0f9f73-9ab2-11ea-9d2d-01aa75ed71a1.0001.02/DOC_1&format=PDF)

# 1. Planned timeline for the review of the EU school scheme



## 2. The combined evaluation roadmap and inception impact assessment published for stakeholders' feedback

### Review of the EU school fruit, vegetables and milk scheme

Have your say > Published initiatives > Review of the EU school fruit, vegetables and milk scheme

#### In preparation

#### Roadmap

Feedback period  
29 June 2021 - 27 July 2021

FEEDBACK: CLOSED

UPCOMING

#### Public consultation

Consultation period  
First quarter 2022

FEEDBACK: UPCOMING

#### Commission adoption

Planned for  
Fourth quarter 2023

FEEDBACK: UPCOMING

### About this initiative

**Summary**  
The EU school scheme supports the supply of fruit, vegetables, milk and certain milk products to children together with educational activities teaching them about agriculture and developing healthy eating habits. The Commission will review the EU school scheme as well as the measures fixing this EU aid, building on the lessons learnt from its implementation since 2017. The review will contribute to promoting sustainable food consumption, in line with the Farm to Fork Strategy.

**Topic**  
Agriculture and rural development

**Type of act**  
Proposal for a regulation

**Category**  
REFIT


### Roadmap

FEEDBACK: CLOSED

**Type**  
Inception impact assessment  
[More about roadmaps](#)


**Feedback period**  
29 June 2021 - 27 July 2021 (midnight Brussels time)

[View feedback received >](#)



[https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/12970-Review-of-the-EU-school-fruit-vegetables-and-milk-scheme\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/12970-Review-of-the-EU-school-fruit-vegetables-and-milk-scheme_en)

## 2. The combined evaluation roadmap and inception impact assessment



## 2. The combined evaluation roadmap and inception impact assessment

### Context, Evaluation, Problem definition and Subsidiarity check

#### Context

- CAP reform
- Farm to Fork Strategy
- Beating Cancer plan
- Organic Action Plan
- European Child Guarantee

#### Evaluation

- Effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, added value
- Identify unnecessary administrative burden linked to the design or implementation of the EU scheme and the scope for simplification
- External independent analysis + synthesis country evaluations
- 27 MSs + UK until 2020

#### Problems to be tackled:

- Coverage / target group
- Scope of eligible products
- Distribution model
- Educational measures
- Governance
- Budget use

to be further developed with evaluation and consultation

#### Basis EU intervention & Subsidiarity check:

- Common Agricultural Policy: Articles 42 and 43 of Treaty
- EU-wide problem (decline or stagnation consumption & growing incidence of child overweight and obesity)
- Regulation for homogeneous approach + flexibility
- Review: coherence and performance

## 2. the combined evaluation roadmap and inception impact assessment

### B. Objectives and Policy options

**Objectives:** contribution to sustainable food consumption – strengthening educational messages – healthy nutrition – sustainable food systems – reducing food waste + efficiency/performance of the scheme

**Preliminary set of elements to be considered and combined into different policy options:**

#### Coverage:

- Age brackets / school level
- More inclusive approach (≠ patterns of overweight/obesity and access to healthy and sustainable food)

#### Educational measures:

- Scope and level of implementation
- Minimum share of budget
- Content & priority topics

#### Scope of eligible products:

- Sustainability objectives
- Food based dietary guidelines and nutritional recommendations
- Eligibility criteria or conditions, e.g. share of organic products

#### Scheme implementation:

- Set quantified targets;
- Monitoring, good practices
- Performance criteria for budget allocation

#### Distribution model:

- Possibilities to enlarge (breakfast initiatives and/or distribution of regular school meals)
- Food packaging and food waste issues

#### Governance:

- Involvement of ≠ public authorities (agriculture, education, health, social and environment);
- Economic & social partners

#### Simplification:

- Management/control/monitoring/evaluation
- Improve efficiency/performance

**The impact assessment will explore the options and identify a preferred option or a policy mix.**

## 2. the combined evaluation roadmap and inception impact assessment

### C. Preliminary Assessment of Expected Impacts

#### **Economic impacts:**

- Direct impacts on:
  - Children & families;
  - Producers and supply chain (SMEs?);
- Short/medium term:
  - Increase both consumers' demand for, and food business operators' supply of, nutritious and sustainable food
  - virtuous cycle increasing the relative competitiveness of sustainable food products as part of healthy diets;
- Long term:
  - Reduce health and environmental related costs and benefits of a shift in diets

#### **Social impacts:**

- Employment/added value/growth in rural areas (local sourcing)
- Consumer's health and quality of life
- Social inclusion
- Education: increased knowledge on food/nutrition/health + agri-environnement
- Reconnecting children with cultural value of food, agriculture, reduce waste

#### **Environmental impacts:**

- Reduce impacts from food systems
- Food waste / Food packaging
- Boost demand for organic products and contribute to practices that promote circularity and animal welfare

#### **Fundamental rights impacts:**

- Right of the child & European Child Guarantee
- Consumer and environmental protection
- Equal access to healthy and nutritious food

#### **Simplification / administrative burden impacts:**

- Evaluation will underpin concrete areas and actions for simplification for public authorities and beneficiaries
- management, payment and control ...
- Offsetting possible additional costs

## 2. the combined evaluation roadmap and inception impact assessment

### D. Evidence base, Data collection and Better Regulation Instruments

#### Evidence and data collection:

- Implementation:
  - Member States strategies
  - Member States annual monitoring reports + evaluations
- Consumption statistics and trends:
  - Fruit & Vegetables - EUROSTAT;
  - Milk and dairy products...
- Health and diets:
  - Knowledge gateway – JRC
  - WHO
  - OECD
- Sustainability

#### Consultation strategy:

- Mapping of stakeholders
- Scope of consultation (both backward and forward looking questions)
- Envisaged activities:
  - Online public consultation
  - Public conference
  - Eurobarometer survey
  - Meeting with stakeholders
  - Discussions with Member States
- After the public consultation closure, publication of a factual summary report of results
- A synopsis report with results of all consultation activities as annex to the impact assessment report

### 3. Stakeholders' feedback on the combined evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment


WHO?

73 CONTRIBUTIONS (+ 2 AD HOC OUTSIDE WEB)

#### By category of respondent



#### By country



Contributions available in the Europa webpage, Have your say:

[https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/12971-Review-of-the-EU-school-fruit-vegetables-and-milk-scheme-EU-aid/feedback\\_en?p\\_id=25977074](https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/12971-Review-of-the-EU-school-fruit-vegetables-and-milk-scheme-EU-aid/feedback_en?p_id=25977074)

Two contributions outside the web page: Freshfel + French public authorities (permanent representation) – not counted under the statistics but taken into account in the comments

### 3. Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment

#### WHO?

#### Health: 2 NGOs + 1 academia

- European Public Health Alliance • European Heart Network (BE)
- CNR (National Research Council)-SIPREC (Society for Cardiovascular Prevention) (IT)

#### Environment: 2 NGOs

- Greenpeace France (FR) • Green REV Institute (PL)

#### Nutrition/Vegetarian: 5 NGOs

- Association végétarienne de France, • V-entrepreneurs (FR), • 2x Voedingscentrum – Dutch nutrition centre (NL), • European vegetarian union (DE), and • ProVeg C.I.C. (UK)

#### Animal Welfare/Protection 11 NGOs + 1 consultancy

- Four Paws/Vier Pfoten, • Compassion in World Farming Brussels, • Humane Society International, • Eurogroup for Animals (BE), • ALI - Aquatic Life Institute, • PAZ – Paris Animaux Zoopolis, • L214 – Ethique et Animaux (FR), • LAV – Anti vivisection league (IT), • Essere animali – Being Animal (IT), • Animal protection (DK), and • Fundacja Międzynarodowy Ruch na Rzecz Zwierząt Viva! - Animal movement foundation Viva (PL); • Animal Law Europe (BE)

#### Citizens

11 PL, 3 FR, 2 HR, 2 AT, 1 ES + 1 UK

No feedback by Education/Schools/ Children rights

#### Agriculture

- **7 farmers' organisations and chambers**
  - Copa-Cogeca, • MTK - Central Union of Agri Prod. (FI); • 2x AT Chamber of Agri (AT), • Cia-Agricoltori – IT confed. of Farmers (IT), • Nat. Chamber of Agri (HU), • Fed. of the Açores (PT)
- **6 Fruit & Veg organisations**
  - PROFEL - European Association of Fruit and Vegetable Processing Industries, • Polish Fruit Growers' Association (PL), • Danish Horticulture (DK), • ASPROCAN – Association of Banana Producer Organisations in the Canary Islands (ES), • INTERFEL- Interprofessionnel Fruits et légumes frais (FR); • GroentenFruit Huis (Fresh Produce Centre) (NL)
- **3 Dairy organisations**
  - EDA - European Dairy Association, • Eucolait – European Association of Dairy Trade; • Nederlandse Zuivel Organisatie (Dutch Dairy Association (NL)
- **3 Organic organisations/businesses**
  - IFOAM - International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements - Europe (BE), • DE Organic Processing and Trade Association Europe (DE), • Bio Netherlands (NL)
- **2 Whole Grain** • Whole Grain Initiative, • NBC (NL)
- **3 Plant-based organisations/businesses**
  - European Alliance for Plant-based Foods (BE), • Oatly (SE), • Växtbaserat Sverige - Plant-food Sweden (SE).

#### 2 Catering/Supply organisations

- Federazione Italiana Ristorazione/Federation of catering (IT), • LPL82 - Barquette & Cie (FR);

#### Public authorities

3 nat./reg. + 2 loc.

- Fed. Min. of Agri (DE) • Min of Env., and Consumer Protection of North Rhine-Westphalia (DE) • FR perm rep • service public - Région Bruxelles Capitale (BE) • gemeente Westland (NL).

# Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/ inception impact assessment

## CONTEXT

### POSITIVE REMARKS ON THE REVIEW

- Great opportunity to align with ambitious targets in Green Deal, Farm2Fork, Beating Cancer, EU Child Guarantee and also Organic Action Plan;
- Fully agree with objectives to reconnect children with agriculture and teach about healthy eating habits

### POSITIVE REMARKS ON THE SCHEME

- Positive experience; excellent scheme at national level;
- Wide outreach and simple, free of charge access to healthy and sustainable nutrition for all children regardless of their status;
- Key action to develop healthy eating habits

*DE Public authorities*

### CRITICAL REMARKS

- School milk and dairy products
  - associated with cancer risks,
  - not viable for animals,
  - not sustainable,
  - may counter objectives to reduce overweight/obesity,
  - detrimental on fair competition (alternatives)

*Animal Welfare/Vegetarian or Vegan NGOs*

### OTHER

- Whole grain may mitigate risks of childhood obesity

**!!! NON-EXHAUSTIVE SUMMARY (for this and following slides):  
full feedback in Europa “have your say” webpage !!!**

# Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/ inception impact assessment

## WHICH BENEFICIARIES?

### ALL CHILDREN

- **No children left behind:** all kind of schools, from nurseries to upper secondary, all age brackets, in all countries

### BUDGET

- Budget stability or increase to reach everybody
- May earmark part of budget for groups in need

### NOT ONLY IN SCHOOLS

- Consider **extending to families** or, occasionally, a basket could be brought home
- Consider **sports clubs and extra-school activities** (3-18 years), **university students, leisure centers and summer camps**

### POSSIBLE TARGETING

- All children first...**then possibility to target groups more in need**
- Member States best placed to set target criteria
- For **given areas and not groups of children** within classes, to avoid stigma and for easier implementation
- Very important to **reach the most vulnerable groups**
- More **attention to children with lower socio-economic conditions**
- For **children with less access to healthy, sustainable diets**

vs

### AGAINST TARGETING

- To **avoid increased administrative/control costs**
- To **avoid discrimination**

# Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment

## WHICH PRODUCTS?

### KEEP FRUIT, VEGETABLES & MILK PRODUCTS

- **Milk products essential for healthy and balanced diet**
- In recent pandemic, with children at home, marked increase in milk consumption (shows value for families)
- For varied and healthy diet and for maintaining EU production and stimulating rural activity

⇒ *Dairy stakeholders + Farmers' associations + FR public authorities (ad-hoc contribution)*

### REMOVE MILK PRODUCTS

- **No EU aid for milk products**, and more broadly, animal products
- **Negative environmental impact**
- **No public health reason**, as overconsumption of animal proteins in children's diets and alternative sources of calcium exist

### OR LIMITS/CONDITIONS FOR MILK PRODUCTS

- No milk products from intensive farm systems
- **Only organic**
- Only from **high-welfare systems** such as organic and agro-ecology and preferably from **cow-calf systems**
- Future-proof the scheme with **EU animal welfare label** under consideration

⇒ *Citizens + Animal Welfare, Vegetarian, Env NGOs*

# Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment

## WHICH PRODUCTS?

### ADD PLANT-BASED PRODUCTS

- **Reduce share of dairy** by offering plant-based alternatives
- **Replace dairy products with plant-based drinks** or low carbon and nutritionally rich alternatives (soya, almonds, broccoli..)
- **Integrate plant-based foods** for equity and education
- Plant-based products included **in a mandatory way**
- **Priority to fortified plant-based drinks**

⇒ *Animal Welfare, Vegetarian NGOs + Plant-based businesses*

### ADD WHOLE GRAINS

- **Important for healthy** and sustainable diet
  - Children should discover **new products** not always popular
- ⇒ *Whole grain initiative, NBC, European Public Health Organisation, French authorities*

### CAUTION ON PLANT-BASED PRODUCTS

- **Not nutritionally equivalent to dairy** (calcium, zinc, vitamin B12 and thiamine)
- Replacing dairy products in a healthy and nutrient compensating way **does not result in a significant decrease of environmental footprint**
- **Need for prior examination by health authorities**

⇒ *Dairy stakeholders + Farmers' associations + FR public authorities*

### ADD ALGAE

⇒ *Aquatic Life Institute*

### ADD NUTS

- But already possible

# Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment

## WHAT CRITERIA OR CONDITIONS ON THE PRODUCTS?

### GO FOR ORGANIC

- **At least 25% organic** in future scheme, as per Organic Action Plan. A **higher share (50 to 100%)** would show that the Commission is serious on Farm to Fork goals
- Aim at **% of organic similar or higher of those already established** in certain Member States. E.g. in public mass catering in Italy, at least 50% of fruits and vegetables; 100% for milk, yoghurt and fruit juices.
- **Differentiate EU and non-EU organic**

⇒ *Organic & Farmers' organisations*

### IF DAIRY then go for ORGANIC:

- **If milk** products end up being eligible, **only organic**
- Only sourced only from high-welfare systems such as organic and preferably from cow-calf systems

⇒ *Environmental NGOs*

### NOT ONLY ORGANIC AND NOT MANDATORY

- Organic should **not be the only criterion for sustainability**; **regional and seasonal** count more, especially if organic products are important
- Consider also **quality products** recognised at national level
- Organic as an **option and not as an obligation**: procedures would be more **cumbersome for applicants/administration + costly** so number or size of portions would be reduced
- Concerns that **organic target could counter shift to more plant-based diet** if fortified plant-based foods can't be labelled organic

⇒ *Farmers' organisations, DE-BE authorities, Plant-based business*

# Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment

## WHAT CRITERIA OR CONDITIONS ON THE PRODUCTS?

### SEASONAL - FRESH vs PROCESSED

- **focus on fresh products**, and children should be aware that products **are not available all year round**;
- **Caution with** more flexibility on **added salt, fat, sugar** as this may favour processed products over fresh

vs

- **healthy processed products** can play an important part in the scheme and help reduce food waste due to extended shelf life and easy portion control

⇒ *Farmers' organisations ... vs processing industries*

### PACKAGING

- **Sustainable** packaging,
- **No individual** packaging

⇒ *Farmers' org., Supply company*

### NUTRITIONAL PROFILE & HEALTH FIRST

- Apply **nutrient profiling** to determine which processed fruit/vegetables and which milk products, according to their level of salt, saturated fat, sugar, may be distributed
- **Focus on healthiest products** and add sustainability criteria on top of health criteria; 'organic' and sustainable are not necessarily the same, nor is 'organic' equivalent to health

⇒ *Health and nutrition NGOs*

### EU-NATIONAL-LOCAL ORIGIN

- Consider **mandatory supply of EU products**, if can be guaranteed; quality criteria adapted to EU production
- **Preference to local**;
- **Cultural products** from the region and/or short supply chains
- Better incentives to **local and sustainable products** ....
- Ensure **fair price** for producers / **reward** for producers

⇒ *Farmers' organisations, Supply company*

# Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment

## DISTRIBUTION: HOW AND BY WHOM?

### IN OR OUT OF REGULAR SCHOOL MEALS

- Distribution of vegetables outside **regular school meals** might be a challenge
- F&V may be allowed to form **part of prepared dishes** (easier for children/adolescents to eat vegetables)
- Review existing restrictions and support distribution as **breakfast, lunch if consistent** with recommendations of national health/nutrition authorities

vs

- **Not part of regular school meals** to avoid control burden and deadweight (replace products that are distributed anyway)

⇒ *Farmers' organisations, FR authorities vs DE authorities*

### SUPPLIERS – PUBLIC PROCUREMENT

- **short supply chains**;
- **reasonable price**, interesting enough to participate
- ensure **fair price for producers / reward for producers**
- **favour producer organisations/associations** that agree directly with responsible for distribution/delivery to schools
- do **not favour large organisations**
- better **incentives to local and sustainable products** ....

⇒ *Farmers' organisations*

- consider mechanisms to transition the scheme into an instrument to fund **healthy and sustainable public food procurement** in schools
- support more **sustainable procurement policies** for public institutions, such as setting **minimum sustainability criteria** requirements

⇒ *Health organization and Animal Welfare NGO*

# Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment

## WHAT EDUCATIONAL MEASURES?

### DESIGN AND SET-UP

- Sourcing of products and educational elements should be **combined into one consistent activity**
- Material should be **science-based**, validated by **independent** sources, not be influenced by commercial interest or contain indirect marketing or advertising
- **Hands-on activities** should be promoted
- Education for **school** and **kitchen staff, children** and their **parents**

⇒ *NGOs, Organic organisations*

### BUDGET

- A **minimum share of the budget** should be set and the expected level of quality should be defined
- vs
- **No compulsory share of EU budget:** increase administrative costs, and in many cases school curriculum already provides nutrition education measures

⇒ *Farm organisations, supply companies vs DE authorities*

### THEMES

- Sustainability, environmental impact and impact on **animal welfare** of different diets should be part of educational activities
- Educational measures should promote the uptake of healthy, **sustainable, primarily plant-based**, diets
- Greater emphasis on **food production/preparation** and impacts for **secondary level students**
- **Healthy eating habits** should be the priority for most educational measures; more could be done about **European agriculture** and its characteristics in the Member States
- Organic farming should be communicated as the only legally defined farming method for sustainable agriculture (and not be confused with “fresh”)

⇒ *NGOs and farm organisations*

# Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment

## WHAT ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION?

### BUDGET

- need for a **strong budget**, that should not decrease even if it not fully used in all Member States, to reach at least a stable number of children;
- **steep increase** necessary to reach more children, involve as many schools as possible, and ensure schools regularly distribute products;
- **gradually increase** the budget and **raise co-financing rates for schools in economically deprived areas** where vegetable/fruit intake is low;
- ensure national strategies **make full use of budget**;
- poor implementation in the last two years linked to exceptional COVID restrictions so **budget can be increased in the future**;
- in the event of a crisis affecting the implementation of the scheme, **allow redirecting funds to other schemes** meeting the same objectives: fruit and vegetables cheques to disadvantaged families).

⇒ *Farm organisations, Health organisations, Public authorities, F&V business*

### SIMPLIFICATION

- **Simplification and reducing administrative burden** are key; administrative simplification essential;
- suggestions to remove deadlines for submitting aid applications (left to the Member States), review system of reduction of payment after deadlines, increase flexibility in transfers and reallocation of budget, allow remote checks also after the pandemic,
- **more stability in national rules** and security for applicants, particularly on duration of approval;
- if not simple scheme, schools will not join.

⇒ *Farm organisations, Public Auth., Supply business*

### OTHER

- **advance payments**;
- at national level, **grassroots participation** could boost the impact of the scheme;
- consider **sharing best practices**.

⇒ *Public Auth., Supply business*

# Stakeholders' feedback on the evaluation roadmap/inception impact assessment

## ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS, CONSULTATION STRATEGY

### ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS

- very successful programme reaching large parts of children population but expectations should not be too high;
- the environmental impacts of animal production must be taken into consideration when evaluating whether or not to include dairy products;
- assess long-term economic impact of dairy promotion through comparative analysis of competitive advantages (is discrimination between producers justified/ proportionate);
- assess activities related to milk consumption under article 10, 14 and 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU (religious freedom of communities who do not consume products sourced from animals).

⇒ *Public auth., NGOs*

### CONSULTATION STRATEGY

- animal protection, environmental, consumer and food NGOs are not listed as stakeholders

⇒ *NGO*

### OTHER

- vending machines in schools have food high in fat, sugar, salt and calories. A clause in new tenders could ask for at least 50% of products in medium to small size, low in saturated fat (and without trans fats), low-salt, low-calorie, and no added sugar;

⇒ *Academic*

## 4. Next steps

- Feedback will be taken into account in impact assessment
- Thank you for helping us to gather data and evidence to underpin the evaluation and impact assessment
- Public consultation in Q1 2022, based on questionnaire ⇒ 12 weeks followed by conference, for wide participation
- Questions? [AGRI-SCHOOL-SCHEME@ec.europa.eu](mailto:AGRI-SCHOOL-SCHEME@ec.europa.eu)

**THANK YOU**