

Date: .....

## STANDARD FORMAT FOR TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

Full title: **Study on the application of rules on voluntary origin labelling of foods and on the mandatory indication of country of origin or place of provenance of meat used as an ingredient.**

Lead Official/s & Unit: Alexandra Nikolakopoulou and Jacques Humières, Unit E4 – Nutrition, food composition and information, DG SANCO

DG Co-chef de file: **Unit 01 and Unit 02, DG SANCO**

### 1. PURPOSE OF THE CONTRACT

This contract aims to perform a study to provide input for the Commission to assess the impact of different options of implementing voluntary origin labelling rules and to draft a report on the mandatory indication of country of origin or place of provenance of meat as ingredient.

#### 1.1 Context of the study work

Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the provision of food information to consumers<sup>1</sup> ("the Regulation") introduces a set of provisions on origin labelling of foods. In particular: it frames the voluntary origin indications; it provides for the mandatory indication of country of origin or place of provenance of unprocessed meat of pigs, poultry, sheep and goats; it requires the Commission to produce reports to examine the feasibility of mandatory origin labeling for other categories of foods.

##### Voluntary origin indications

With respect to voluntary labelling of origin of a food, the Regulation (Article 26 (3)) establishes the rule that where the country of origin or place of provenance of the food is given and it is different from the one of its primary ingredient, the country of origin or place of provenance of the primary ingredient must also be given. The Regulation also provides for the possibility to simply indicate that the country of origin or the place of provenance of the primary ingredient is different from that of the food.

The Regulation also stipulates that the above rules will apply **without prejudice to labelling requirements** provided for in specific Union provisions, in particular the provisions governing the use of the EU schemes known as PDO<sup>2</sup> (protected designation of origin), PGI (protected geographical indication) and TSG<sup>3</sup> (traditional speciality guaranteed). **So foods subject to mandatory origin labelling or covered by EU quality schemes are not covered by the new requirements.**

Definitions of "primary ingredient", "place of provenance" and "country of origin" are given in Article 2 of the Regulation:

**"primary ingredient"** means an ingredient or ingredients of a food that represent more than 50 % of that food or which are usually associated with the name of the food by the consumer and for which in

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18

<sup>2</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 of 20 March 2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs OJ L93 31.3.2006

<sup>3</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 509/2006 of 20 March 2006 on agricultural products and foodstuffs as traditional specialties guaranteed OJ L93, 31.3.2006

most cases a quantitative indication is required.

**"place of provenance"** means any place where a food is indicated to come from, and that is not the "country of origin" as determined in accordance with Articles 23 to 26 of Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92; the name, business name or address of the food business operator on the label shall not constitute an indication of the country of origin or place of provenance of food within the meaning of this Regulation.

**"Country of origin"** is determined in accordance with Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 which provides the following rules :

- Article 23 defines goods "wholly obtained" in a country:
  - "1. Goods originating in a country shall be those wholly obtained or produced in that country.
  2. The expression 'goods wholly obtained in a country' means:
    - (a) mineral products extracted within that country;
    - (b) vegetable products harvested therein; [...]
    - (d) products derived from live animals raised therein;
    - (e) products of hunting or fishing carried on therein;
    - (f) products of sea-fishing and other products taken from the sea outside a country's territorial sea by vessels registered or recorded in the country concerned and flying the flag of that country;
    - (g) goods obtained or produced on board factory ships from the products referred to in subparagraph (f) originating in that country, provided that such factory ships are registered or recorded in that country and fly its flag; [...]
    - (j) goods which are produced therein exclusively from goods referred to in subparagraphs (a) to (i) or from their derivatives, at any stage of production.
  3. For the purposes of paragraph 2 the expression 'country' covers that country's territorial sea. "
- Article 24 clarifies that "goods whose production involved more than one country shall be:

"deemed to originate in the country where they underwent their last, substantial, economically justified processing or working in an undertaking equipped for that purpose and resulting in the manufacture of a new product or representing an important stage of manufacture".

The new rules on voluntary origin labelling shall apply from 13 December 2014 but subject to the

<sup>4</sup> Council Directive 2001/110/EC of 20 December 2001 relating to honey (OJ L 10, 12.1.2002, p. 47).

Council Regulation (EC) No 104/2000 of 17 December 1999 on the common organisation of the markets in fishery and aquaculture products (OJ L 17, 21.1.2000, p. 22).

<sup>5</sup> Commission Regulation (EC) No 1580/2007 of 21 December 2007 laying down implementing rules of Council Regulations (EC) No 2200/96, (EC) No 2201/96 and (EC) No 1182/2007 in the fruit and vegetable sector (OJ L 350, 31.12.2007, p. 1).

<sup>6</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 104/2000 of 17 December 1999 on the common organisation of the markets in fishery and aquaculture products (OJ L 17, 21.1.2000, p. 22–52 )

<sup>7</sup> Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 establishing a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 820/97 (OJ L204, p1, 11/08/2000)

<sup>8</sup> Commission Regulation (EC) No 1019/2002 of 13 June 2002 on marketing standards for olive oil (OJ L 155, 14.6.2002, p. 27).

<sup>9</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1493/1999 of 17 May 1999 on the common organisation of the market in wine (OJ L179 14.7.1999, p1-84)

<sup>10</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1028/2006 of 19 June 2006 on marketing standards for eggs (OJ L 186, 07.07.2006, p1-5)

<sup>11</sup> Council Regulation (EEC) No 1906/90 of 26 June 1990 on certain marketing standards for poultrymeat (OJ L 173, 6.7.1990, p. 1)

<sup>12</sup> Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 of the European parliament and of the Council of 15 January 2008

on the definition, description, presentation, labelling and the protection of geographical indications of spirit drinks and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 1576/89 (OJ L39/16,13.2.2008, p16-54)

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/registre/docs\\_autres\\_institutions/commission\\_europeenne/sec/2008/0092/COM\\_SEC\(2008\)0092\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/registre/docs_autres_institutions/commission_europeenne/sec/2008/0092/COM_SEC(2008)0092_EN.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> Study of the functioning of the meat market for EU consumers – to be published

<sup>15</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/agriculture/tenderdocs/2012/63845/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/agriculture/tenderdocs/2012/63845/index_en.htm).

<sup>16</sup> According to the Commission Recommendation 2003/361 concerning the definition of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, Micro SMEs are those SMEs with less than 10 employees and a turnover or balance sheet total equal to or less than 2 million Euro.

<sup>17</sup> SMEs with less than 10 employees and a turnover or balance sheet total equal to or less than 2million Euro.

<sup>18</sup> For example if a firm is exempt from legislation provided it does not employ more than 10 people, there would be an incentive to ensure that the threshold is not crossed, thus restricting employment growth.

<sup>19</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/commission\\_guidelines/commission\\_guidelines\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/commission_guidelines/commission_guidelines_en.htm)

<sup>20</sup> OJ L 139, 30.04.2004, p.55

<sup>21</sup> Commission Regulation (EC) No 1825/2000 of 25 August 2000

<sup>22</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/commission\\_guidelines/commission\\_guidelines\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/commission_guidelines/commission_guidelines_en.htm)

adoption of implementing acts that must be adopted by 13 December 2013. Article 26 (8) of the Regulation requires an impact assessment to support these implementing acts.

### Mandatory indication of origin of meat as ingredient

Currently mandatory rules on origin labelling exist for several sectors, such as honey<sup>4</sup>, fruit and vegetables<sup>5</sup>, fish<sup>6</sup>, beef and beef products<sup>7</sup>, olive oil<sup>8</sup>, wine<sup>9</sup>, eggs<sup>10</sup>, imported poultry<sup>11</sup>, and spirits drinks<sup>12</sup>. In particular for beef, the EU legislation requires the indication of the country of birth, fattening and slaughter or an indication of one origin where all three above-mentioned stages of the life of an animal took place in one country.

The beef origin labelling has created consumer expectations and, according to the impact assessment<sup>13</sup> carried out in the context of the Regulation of Food Information to Consumers, origin of meat appears to be a major consumer concern. It was, therefore, considered appropriate by the European Parliament and the Council to impose a mandatory indication of the country of origin or place of provenance for the other types of widely consumed meat: pig, poultry, sheep and goat meat. The importance of the information on the country of origin for meat is confirmed by results of the meat study, e.g. 48% of EU consumers say they look for it when buying fresh meat or meat products<sup>14</sup>.

Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 provides mandatory indication of country of origin or place of provenance for unprocessed meat of pigs, poultry, sheep and goats, as from 13 December 2014. The Commission has to adopt implementing acts by 13 December 2013 following impact assessments that shall consider the feasibility and costs of the options for implementing the rules of origin labelling with respect to place of birth, rearing and slaughter of an animal. This is subject to another study led by DG AGRI with an external contractor.<sup>15</sup>

The European Parliament and the Council consider that there is a need to explore the possibility to extend mandatory origin labelling for other foods. Therefore, Regulation (EU) N° 1169/2011 requires the Commission to prepare 7 reports covering the following foods: (1) types of meat other than beef, swine, sheep, goat and poultry; (2) milk; (3) milk used as ingredient in dairy products; (4) meat used as an ingredient; (5) unprocessed foods; (6) single ingredient products; and (7) ingredients that represent more than 50% of a food. Based on the conclusions of the reports, the Commission may submit relevant legislative proposals. The deadline for the Commission to present the above-mentioned reports is the 13 December 2014 with the exception of the report on the meat as ingredient that must be presented by 13 December 2013.

## **1.2 Objectives and general approach of the study**

The objective of this study is twofold:

**a)** to study the impact of different options for the modalities of application of the provision governing the use of voluntary origin labelling laid down in Article 26.3 of the Regulation (EU) N° 1169/2011 and

**b)** to study the need for the consumer to be informed regarding the origin of meat ingredient(s) and the operational feasibility of providing the mandatory indication of the country of origin or place of provenance of meat ingredients.

### Voluntary origin labelling

The overall objective of the provisions on voluntary origin labelling is to prevent fraudulent practices and counterfeit consisting in misleading origin indications. The approach for the implementation of the new requirements should be to meet consumers' expectations and industry needs regarding food origin labelling, by developing proportionate rules, avoiding unnecessary burdens or unjustified

discrimination.

The rules on voluntary origin labelling will have to be coherent with existing and coming rules on mandatory labelling of country of origin, EU quality schemes and international standards and agreements.

This part of the study implies, in a nutshell, to analyse the impact that the different modalities for the indication of origin of the primary ingredient would have on:

- consumers: as to their understanding of different types of information likely to constitute origin labelling and their perception of the level of detail/accuracy needed about the origin of primary ingredient to ensure consistent and fair origin labelling;
- food business operators, as to the feasibility, the burden, the costs and the impact on competitiveness that the different options would imply, taking into account current practices. The study should estimate the feasibility of each option, the burden due to the traceability of the information on the origin of the primary ingredient, and the possible additional costs linked to the introduction of additional origin labelling requirements. The coming rules on voluntary origin labelling will affect all the food industry, from the producer to the retailer. Particular attention should be paid to SMEs and micro enterprises, in order to minimise the administrative burden and to provide a proportionate system of rules. The Commission policy is that micro-enterprises should no longer be covered by EU legislation unless it is clearly demonstrated that it is necessary and proportionate to cover them.<sup>16</sup>In the present case it is obvious that microenterprises cannot be exempted since no such exemption was introduced in the basic act. However, the possibility of applying adapted solutions should be assessed;
- the internal market and on the international trade, taking account of international standards and agreements in this area. The possible segmentation of the market and changes of trade flows should be evaluated, given the fact that the operators could refrain from mixing different origins. As regards the impact on trade with third countries, the focus should be on the competitiveness, with particular attention to similar origin labelling rules under development and the related discussion at WTO level;
- the Member State controlling authorities, as to the administrative burden and costs of the possible options.

### Origin of meat ingredients

The objective of this part of the study is to collect data that will allow the Commission to take into account the need for consumers to be informed regarding the origin of meat ingredient(s) and to examine the operational feasibility of providing the mandatory indication of the country of origin or place of provenance of meat ingredients.

The study will also provide an analysis of the costs and benefits of the introduction of mandatory labelling of origin or place of provenance of meat as ingredient, including the legal impact on the internal market and the impact on international trade.

The costs and impact of mandatory origin/provenance labelling will depend on the actual definition of country of origin and place of provenance, the type of players that need to participate (SMEs, microenterprises) and to the extent to which such information has to be traced back, based on the different animal identification and registration systems in place for the different domestic animals. Given that information on origin/place of provenance of meat as ingredient should be based on and in line with the information that should be provided on fresh meat, the study will use as a basis, if available in time, the findings of the study led by DG AGRI which is on going on the implementation of the mandatory origin of pig meat, poultry meat, sheep and goat meat.

Otherwise, the study will need to assess the feasibility and costs of different ways of expression of the country of origin or place of provenance of meat ingredients: in particular, different geographical

levels: EU (EU or non-EU), country (Member State or third country), a different geographical area or a combination of these.

In the case of meat ingredients used in the form of meat products for the production of multi ingredients foods (i.e. pizza with ham or minced meat) the country of origin is to be determined in accordance with the Union Customs Code (see Article 2.2 of Regulation (EU) 1169/2011). This means that it would mainly correspond to the country of the last substantial transformation.

However, the study will also examine the option of more extensive origin information related to the provenance of the fresh meat from which the meat product is produced. Concerning ingredients in form of unprocessed meat, minced meat, mechanically separated meat or meat preparations, different modalities for the definition of the provenance shall be considered:

- each of the three different points in the life of the animal: birth, rearing, slaughtering: ( following the beef origin labelling or at different combinations)
- the customs origin definition: slaughter and minimum period of raising prior to slaughter.

It should be taken into account that origin information for meat used as ingredient cannot be more detailed than that of the unprocessed meat itself.

The impact of introducing such origin labelling should be assessed considering the following areas:

- **Food supply chain:** the economic impact on the food supply chain should be assessed in the context of costs and feasibility of applying origin labelling for meat used as ingredient. The main focus should be on the food processing industry that uses meat either from own industry (meat processing attached to cutting plant and slaughterhouse) or from other local or EU meat industry or from third countries. Linkage between the processing and fresh meat production and the interdependence (pig sector more oriented towards ham production, sheep more towards unprocessed) should be looked at. The different points in the process shall be examined: processing, packaging, slicing, re-packaging. Sourcing meat from different origin and mixing it for one product should also be considered. The existing meat origin/provenance labelling rules should be taken into account (beef, voluntary schemes and the possible future rules on three meats). The existing traceability systems should also be considered. The Commission policy is that micro-enterprises should no longer be covered by EU legislation unless it is clearly demonstrated that it is necessary and proportionate to cover them<sup>17</sup>. The contractor should estimate the possible negative or positive impacts on micro-enterprises, the risk whether their exclusion could materially affect the capacity of mandatory origin requirements to achieve its goal taking also into account the share of micro-enterprises and the possible obstacles to micro-enterprise development<sup>18</sup>.
- **Internal market:** impact on the internal markets shall be assessed. National origin labelling rules shall also be studied.
- **Trade:** impact on trade with third countries shall be analysed from the perspective of possible distortion due to difficulties to implement the labelling requirements in third countries. Labelling systems applicable in the main trading partner countries should also be studied.
- **Competitiveness of enterprises,** including cost and price competitiveness, capacity to innovate and international competitiveness.
- **Environment.**
- **Consumer behaviour:** the study shall take into account the need of consumers to be informed on the origin of meat ingredients; it shall also analyse consumer behaviour as regards level of willingness to pay for additional information related to origin/provenance of meat and if, appropriate for more or less extensive information related to origin of meat/provenance (geographical level and stage of the life of the animal). The study should also look at consumer

ability to understand and make use of such information.

- **Administrative burden:** impact on the administrative burden on producers, traders, food manufacturers, retailers and the Member States, as well as on the implementing of the controls to ensure a proper system of origin labelling shall be studied. This work should be carried out following the methodology established by the European Commission.<sup>19</sup>

The study should evaluate the situation and possible impact of origin labelling in EU27 but also include a number of case studies in different sectors and Member States.

### 1.3 Use of the contract

SANCO E4 (Nutrition, Food composition and Information) is the unit in charge of performing the study.

Associated SANCO Units: G2 and G4

Associated DGs: SG, LS, AGRI, MARE, TRADE, MARKT, ENTR, ENVI, CLIMA

## 2. TASK(S) TO BE PERFORMED BY THE CONTRACTOR

### 2.1 Scope of the study

#### Voluntary origin labelling

The study will cover foods bearing voluntary origin indications. Foods for which rules on mandatory origin labelling already exist are out of the scope. However, it should be taken into account that foods or ingredients for which the Regulation foresees a possible specific treatment (for example, meat or milk as ingredient) would in any case be covered by the new rules, if no mandatory labelling is finally decided for them.

PDO (protected designation of origin), PGI (protected geographical indication) and TSG (traditional speciality guaranteed) are out of the scope.

#### Mandatory origin labelling of meat ingredients

The study will cover meat preparations (mechanically separated meat and minced meat used as ingredient should also be included as the labelling obligation should also cover the low cost sector) and meat products as defined in points 1.1.5 and 7.1 of Annex I to Regulation (EC) N° 853/2004<sup>20</sup> laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin) and also other processed multi ingredient foods. Although in the latter case emphasis should be given to foods where meat is considered as "primary ingredient", foods where meat is present but not as primary ingredient should also be covered. The term "primary ingredient" shall refer to the definition laid down in Article 2 (2) q of Regulation (EU) 1169/2011. In the case of multi ingredient foods the meat ingredient in its initial state can be unprocessed meat (ex: slices of pork in a meat soup), a meat preparation (raw sausages, meat with herbs) or a meat product (ham), minced meat or mechanically separated meat. Definitions of minced meat, trimmings, cut meat etc. are already contained in the EU legislation<sup>21</sup>.

#### 2.1.1 Time frame

The study work will refer to the current situation.

#### 2.1.2. Geographical coverage

The study will refer to EU27. The main third countries trading partners should also be considered for

the impact on international trade. A list should be proposed by the consultant and agreed with the Commission's services.

Regarding the origin of meat ingredients, as the sectors concerned (pig, beef, poultry, sheep, goat, rabbit, game and other meat) present different characteristics in terms of production, processing, marketing systems, and consumer behaviour, the impact of applying origin/provenance labelling may differ between Member State and sectors. Therefore, the selection of the Member States and sectors for the case studies in total at least seven case studies should ensure a representative overview in terms of production, trade volume and geographical coverage of the species concerned. (to be agreed with the Commission's services). The selection of the third countries should ensure a representative overview in terms of trade volume of the species concerned.

### **2.1.3 Actors**

Sectors particularly concerned by the study are food industry in general, meat industry (slaughterhouses, cutting plants and meat processors), butchers and retail/distribution sector, traders (imports and exports), EU farmers, consumers and national competent authorities.

In order to perform the study, the contractors should consult national and EU regulators (in charge of food labelling, agriculture, consumer protection and other relevant issues), as well as relevant food business operators, involved in the food chain, from the farm to the fork (in particular SMEs), farmers, processors, traders, retailers at national and European levels. The study needs to involve third countries trading partners too. The study should also involve relevant Non Governmental Organisations, in particular those dealing with consumer protection and rights.

Public research organisations active in agriculture and food chain economics, food labelling, and consumer behaviour analysis should be consulted.

An indicative list of relevant stakeholders to consider is provided in [Annex I](#).

## **2.2 Study themes**

### **2.2.1: Themes on the voluntary origin labelling**

**Theme 1: To map the current voluntary origin labels in the EU and to investigate the sourcing practices of primary/raw ingredients of the main food sectors.**

The first question to be answered would be to what extent the origin of final products is being claimed, as the new rule will only apply to products having an origin claimed on their label or in the advertising made on them.

Preliminary discussions with food business operators suggest that the origin of the ingredients they use may depend on availability, seasonality, and price, leading to an origin that can vary in time. These practices may depend on the food sector and a sectoral approach is therefore necessary. The following sectors could be considered:

- dairy products
- cereal products (bread, rice, pasta, crisps, fine bakery wares, breakfast cereals)
- meat preparations
- beverages (coffee, tea, fruit juices, soft drinks)
- processed vegetables and fruits products
- confectionary products and snacks (chocolate, sweet and savoury snacks)

- prepared dishes (example lasagne), sandwiches.

**Theme 2: To assess which indications are recognised by consumers and enforcement authorities as origin indications that would trigger the application of the rule on origin of the primary ingredient.**

Labelling such as 'made in x',' from X' are obvious origin indication, but some labelling practices, which are not formulated like origin indication, can be construed as origin indication.

The first issue is to draw a line between the labelling that should be considered as origin labelling and fall in the scope of the rule on voluntary origin, and the labelling that should not be regarded as origin labelling. This could be facilitated by considering the following open list to collect reactions from stakeholders.

- Flags and maps
- Pictures or symbol
- Localiser in the name of product
- Trademarks
- Common family name
- Use of terms as "kind", "type", "style", before a food name including an origin.

To set the rules on voluntary origin, stakeholders should also be questioned on the opportunity to exempt indications that literally indicate origin but whose understanding is different, like 'Frankfurter sausage', 'Italian taste', 'German quality'.

**Theme 3: To investigate stakeholders' understanding on the notion of "primary ingredient" and its origin.**

**3.1** For the application of the provisions of Article 26 (3)(b) of the Regulation, the primary ingredient has to be determined. The Regulation defines "primary ingredient" as an ingredient or ingredients of a food that represent more than 50 % of that food or which are usually associated with the name of the food by the consumer and for which in most cases a quantitative indication is required. Given the flexibility of this definition, the primary ingredient concept may be clarified, taking account food business operators' and consumers' point of views.

**3.2** Once the primary ingredient is identified, the issue is to determine what should be considered as "different" origins for the food and its primary ingredient. Although where the primary ingredient originates from another Member State than the final food the "difference" is obvious, it may be less clear in case where the primary ingredient originates from a different region than the one claimed on the origin labelling of the final food but comes from the same country.

**Theme 4: To define what origin should be considered for the application of the rules.**

Country of origin is defined in Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 as the place where the food underwent its last, substantial, economically justified transformation. Place of provenance is defined in Regulation (EU) N° 1169/2011 as being any place which is not the country of origin.

In the case where the information on the origin of the primary ingredient has to be given and that ingredient is a processed one, the following options should be studied.

- Option 1: origin information corresponding to the place where the primary ingredient underwent its last, substantial, economically justified transformation or

- Option 2: origin information corresponding to the place where the raw ingredient originates, such as the place of harvest or place of farming.

**Theme 5:** In view of the options of origin labelling analysed under theme 4, to study the impact of the possible modalities of indicating the origin of the primary ingredients, including the possible combinations/correspondence between the origin indication of the final food and the one of its primary ingredient, as well as the way to indicate that origins of primary ingredient and food are different.

(If the origin of the primary ingredient(s) is different from the origin of the food, what should be labelled is:

- either a statement indicating that the provenance of the primary ingredient is different, or
- the country of origin or place of provenance of the primary ingredient.)

**5.1.** The legal flexibility given by the Regulation allows to label that the origin of the primary ingredient is different, without having to indicate the origin of the primary ingredient. However, no statement is fixed in the Regulation and, would a statement have to be precised, different formulation should be studied, such as:

- Product X from Y, with ingredient Z of different origin
- Made in X from ingredients of different origin
- Made in X from local and imported ingredients.

**5.2.** Knowing that the origin/provenance of the final product would be indicated as from either EU, or a country or a more precise place (region, city),, the following options should be studied for the case where the origin/provenance of the primary ingredient is declared:

- Option 1: The origin/provenance of the primary ingredient must be declared at the same level of precision than the one of the final product.

Example: Product X from country Y with ingredient x from country Z

- Option 2: The origin/provenance of the primary ingredient must be declared at a higher level of precision than the one of the final product (except where the latter is local).

Example: Product X from EU with ingredient x from third country Z

- Option 3: The origin/provenance of the primary ingredient may be declared at a lower level of precision than the one of the final product.

Example: Product X from Member State Y with ingredient x non EU.

### 2.2.2: Mandatory origin of meat as ingredient

#### **Theme 1: Consumers' interest in the origin of meat ingredients.**

Consumers' attitude towards origin labelling of meat ingredients shall be studied. The focus shall be on consumer interest, understanding and preferences in relation to information on origin, to different types of origin labelling of meat ingredients, as well as on willingness to pay more for additional information on origin. It should also assess the proportion of consumers with strong preference and possibility to pay for additional information, making them aware that information from various private voluntary labelling systems may be available.

This analysis shall be carried out using three sources of information: studies and data already

available on consumer attitude towards origin labelling, including empirical evidence on consumer preferences as regards origin in EU27. Additional qualitative assessment should be provided based on meetings with relevant bodies (consumer organisations, industry, retailers and other stakeholders) in the framework of the case studies.

**Theme 2: Characteristics of the food supply and processing chain in relation to meat preparations, meat products and other meat containing processed foods.**

The study shall elaborate an overview of the structure and characteristics of the food supply and processing chain in relation to minced meat, mechanically separated meat, meat preparations, meat products and other meat containing processed foods. The consumer stage shall be understood as sales to final consumer. The analysis should include the description of existing methods and systems of traceability, origin labelling and controls in the meat supply and processing chain in view of the feasibility of applying origin labelling to meat ingredients. The analysis should also include an appreciation of the linkages between unprocessed meat production and processed or meat preparation production, whether one depends on the other and vice versa. An estimation of the frequency of changing supply sources and mixing meat of different sources by food industry should be provided, in particular with regard to pig meat, beef meat, poultry meat, sheep and goat, rabbit and game meat.

**Theme 3: Identification and description and analysis of economic, social, and environmental impacts of the main options of meat ingredient origin labelling.**

The contractor shall identify and describe the possible options of origin labelling for meat used as ingredient and analyse the advantages and disadvantages of the different options, taking into account the structure and characteristics of the supply and production chain as described in Theme 2 and the already existing (beef) and possible future (pig, poultry, sheep and goat) options of origin labelling of unprocessed meats.

**3.1** In terms of the geographical level of origin labelling, the following options and aspects shall be considered:

- Option 1: origin labelling based on a) EU/non-EU origin or b) EU/third country
- Option 2: labelling indicating the Member State or third country
- Option 3: other geographical entities as place of provenance.

**3.2:** For each of the options of origin labelling described under point 3.1 different modalities for the definition of origin shall be examined.

**3.2.1:** In the case of unprocessed meat ingredients, minced meat, mechanically separated meat and meat preparations the following modalities for the definition of origin/provenance shall be considered:

- Option 1: Origin split in three stages: "born, raised and slaughtered" following the beef origin labelling or any different combinations)
- Option 2: Origin determined according to the customs origin definition: slaughter and minimum period of raising prior to slaughter.

Moreover, in the case of such foods produced from animals born, raised, slaughtered in more than one country, meaning if one or more of these activities took place in more than one country, the interest and feasibility of indicating each of those different countries should be also addressed.

**3.2.2.** In the case of meat ingredients used in the form of meat products for the production of multi ingredients foods (ham or minced meat in a pizza) the following options shall be examined:

- Option 1: Origin as determined in accordance with the Union Customs Code (see Article 2.2 of

Regulation (EU) 1169/2011). This means that it would mainly correspond to the country of the last substantial transformation.

- Option 2: More extensive origin information related to the provenance of the fresh meat from which the meat product is produced, as described under 3.2.1.

The impact on the meat supply and food production chain should be assessed in the context of feasibility and costs of introducing mandatory origin labelling of the different meat ingredients, considering the above mentioned options.

The cost of origin labelling shall be assessed from the perspective of administrative and direct costs for the whole meat supply chain and food processing and distribution. Existing traceability systems should be taken into account. The likely impacts of mandatory origin labelling of meat ingredients shall also include impact on cost/price competitiveness and innovative competitiveness of food business operators. Possible impacts of possible shortage of supply (e.g. following an outbreak of an animal disease) should also be assessed.

The impact on intra-union exchanges and on external trade shall be assessed from the angle of possible segmentation of the EU market and changes of trade flows, given the fact that operators could refrain from supplying meat from other or certain countries or from mixing different origins. Trade with third countries shall be analysed from the perspective of: a) competitiveness b) origin labelling systems already applied by the main trading partners and c) additional import requirements for exporting third countries and its implications in terms of the WTO rules, both in terms of SPS and TBT Agreement.

The impact of the options on the administrative burden for the Member States and the controllability of the origin labelling shall be studied. The analysis should take account of the controls on the implementation of origin labelling, administrative costs and red tape for private and public entities. This work should be carried out following the methodology established by the European Commission<sup>22</sup>.

Impact on consumers will also include analysis of how labelling based on each of the above mentioned options influence consumers' choices, taking into account that where a food was produced can give some indication as to whether it was in season, how it may have been grown and its food miles. Different countries, even within the EU, have differing standards of animal welfare, meaning shoppers or consumers may want to avoid meat sourced from certain countries. The contractor will take into account the data provided in the context of a behavioral study on consumer attitudes and consumer willingness to pay carried out in parallel by DG SANCO.

Impact on environment will be analysed taking into account the consumers' preferences for foods produced in proximity, in accordance with certain standards but also the risk of increasing the size of food labels.

### **2.3. Tasks**

The contractor is required to provide the Commission with the necessary quantitative and qualitative data, as well as analytical and descriptive inputs on the impacts as identified in the specific respective request under point 2.2. These inputs shall be consistent with the policy requirements, quality and standards necessary to conform to the Commission's Guidelines on Impact Assessment.

#### **Task 1: Structuring**

- Identification of information sources, quantitative and qualitative database, studies, people to be interviewed, appropriate case study areas, etc.
- Overview of relevant Union and national legislation/guidance and already existing research papers, evaluation and impact assessment reports and other publications relevant in the

study area.

- Creating methodology and tools for the assessment of each of the themes of the study.
- Selection of Member States and sectors for case studies. The final choice of countries and sectors for the case studies will have to be discussed and validated by the Commission before the collection of information starts.

## **Task 2: Observing**

Data collection and processing should be performed drawing from desk research, but supported by IT- based expert survey, telephone or face-to-face interviews (as found suitable within the data collection agenda), and broad consultations within the respective Member States and third countries and stakeholders.

## **Task 3: Analysing**

The analysis to be carried out must be based on well established and acknowledged methods used. The reasoning followed in the analysis, indicating among other things, the underlying hypotheses of the reasoning, and the limitations of the analysis, must be clearly described.

## **Task 4: Overall assessment**

Drawing on above analysis, the results of the assessment are to be brought together in a consistent format to allow for assessment of the technical feasibility and the economic, impacts of the various options.

## **Methodology**

As an indication, the following methodological steps are foreseen:

I. Establish an inventory of private voluntary origin labelling and provide an overview of the existing situation with regard to origin labelling of meat ingredients/ Baseline per MS/ Best practices compendium.

As regards origin labelling of meat ingredients first step is to establish a baseline model of the current situation. A dynamic economic model based on several scenarios should quantify future direct and indirect economic impacts that are likely to occur (both intended and unintended ones) as a consequence of introducing different ways of mandatory origin labelling of ingredients. Drawing from this model, a qualitative analysis according to several scenarios should be elaborated.

II: Technical feasibility per sector (operational – e.g. traceability) – a disaggregated approach is appreciated, but the contractor may choose whether the sector involves the type of meat at stake or the part of the food chain referred to (farmers, retailers, distributors, intermediaries, etc).

Regarding the origin labelling of meat ingredients, the contractor, should, as far as possible, ensure a coordinated approach with the contractor in charge of the study that will be running in parallel and led by DG AGRI on the implementation of mandatory origin labelling for unprocessed meat from sheep, goat, swine and poultry.

III: Problem definition and EU added value per sector – the same definition of the 'sector' as espoused above applies.

IV: Economic viability per sector – assessment of the commercial ecosystem created by the labelling:

- cost-benefit analysis

- internal market (distributional effects, SME effects including more specifically impacts on

micro-enterprises)

- international dimension – trade effects from the perspective of: a) competitiveness b) origin labelling systems already applied by the main trading partners and c) additional import requirements for exporting third countries and its implications in terms of the WTO.

- administrative burden and legal impact

- economics of non-compliance (e.g. case of outbreak, misleading labelling, etc)

#### V. Social and environmental impact

#### VI. Key implementation indicators – indicators to be monitored for policy implementation success

The following methods are expected to be employed as a minimum strategy to access the necessary data:

- desk research (for inventory especially) – desk review of available resources: grey literature, online marketing and competent authority resources, with an attempt to establish a life-cycle of labels in use (i.e. still in use, no longer in use, etc)

- consumer survey/poll in 27 MS;

- stakeholder consultation – a representative sample should be targeted via e-survey (to be prepared by the contractor in consultation with the Commission) followed by telephone interviews or focus groups addressed on basis of evidence the contractor will provide them with;

- consumer attitudes and consumer willingness to pay, where appropriate, should be assessed via a parallel behavioural study commissioned by DG SANCO to feed in the needed data at the requested time;

- case studies: for the part related to the application of voluntary origin labelling rules 3 sensitive areas (possibly sectors) are to be chosen that provide convincing arguments and that inform about possible benefits of the implementing measures proposed; the areas can be supported by field-visits but the effort should be feasible and proportionate to the scope of the study exercise; as to the mandatory origin labelling of meat ingredients number and scope to be decided jointly by the Commission and the contractor;

- focus group: to refine the findings resulting from desk-research and consultative methods – a position paper will be submitted to a focus group for internal reflection and constructive discussion; the contractor is expected to present the results of the work done and to act as facilitator in this process.

Following the analysis of the questionnaire, a selected number of interviews will be carried out face to face or over the telephone to collect additional information. These interviews should be done on the basis of a representative sample, i.e. sufficient coverage in terms of countries and actors involved. The sample should be balanced in terms of geographical cover.

The results of the assessment are to be brought together to allow for assessment of the technical feasibility and the economic social and environmental impacts of the measures proposed in themes. Conclusion on the advantages and disadvantages of the various options to be established.

The contractor is to work in close collaboration with project officers at the European Commission in charge of follow-up of the contract. The contractor is expected to develop and implement a methodology that ensures that all the evaluation tasks are sufficiently well covered, including:

1. a detailed work plan covering at least: a project plan, detailed timetable, budget, a list of experts and their CVs to be involved in the contractor's team, indicating the task in the project plan to which

they will be committed. [Note: no on the spot visits are foreseen in this study];

2. a description of the complete methodology (building on the proposed guidance in annex II), including consideration given to past surveys to Competent Authorities in the concerned countries, and to other stakeholders; the contractor shall provide a selective overview of answers received.

Proposals for further methodological tools that may contribute to achieving the objectives of the study will be considered positively when evaluating the proposals.

### **3. Description of Experts skills & profiles**

#### **3.1 Experience required**

The contractor should possess

- proven experience in assessing the instruments of the EU policies ;
- proven knowledge of the agricultural sector, traceability and labelling, food supply chain economy, trade in agricultural products and consumer behaviour with special focus on data collection & analysis and policy development;
- proven experience in the field of impact assessment, especially for social, economic, and consumer related topics;
- proven experience with techniques, tools, and assessment methodologies in conformity with the state of the art.

The contractor should possess high level expertise required for the tasks to be carried out. Therefore he or she should:

- Indicate profile and categories of the experts of the contractor's team
- Designate the expert to be team leader for the whole exercise of evaluation to be carried out

The contractor must meet the following criteria:

- i. The contractor's team responsible for implementing all the tasks related to the objectives includes at least one team leader with a relevant post graduate university qualification. The team leader should ensure uninterrupted coordination with the European Commission.
- ii. Members of the team are to be assigned according to the necessary knowledge and skills for performing the various tasks and subtasks required.
- iii. Excellent English language skills are required, both written and spoken.
- iv. Demonstrated capability to access documents and interact with informants in all countries as necessary for the completion of the tasks.

### **4. Organisation of the work**

#### **4.1 Budget allocated**

Foreseen maximum amount: EUR 200.000

#### **4.2 Overall management of the contract**

The contractor is requested to produce records/minutes of meetings and to submit them to the Commission for approval the week following the meeting.

### **4.3 Reporting and deliverables**

The present assignment includes the submission of a series of deliverables: reports and presentations. The contractor will deliver the following reports at key stages of the evaluation process: inception report, interim report, draft final report and final report. Each report should be written in English or in French, and critically assessed as it provides the basis for tracking the quality of the work done by the evaluator. These reports will be submitted to the Commission, which may ask for complementary information or propose adjustments in order to redirect the work as necessary. Reports must be approved by the Commission. With work progressing and in the light of new findings, revisions of reports already approved may be necessary.

It is essential that all the reports be clear, concise, unambiguous and comprehensive. They should also be understandable for non-specialists. The presentation of the texts, tables and graphs has to be clear and complete and correspond to commonly recognised standards for studies to be published. A structured and precise elaboration of add-ons based on previous deliverables at every stage of the process is requested (for example, this could be done via colour-coding parts of the report developed at the offer, inception, interim and draft final stage). An indicative size of each report to be provided is (excluding annexes):

- inception report: up to 80 pages
- final report: up to 200 pages

The reports should be provided to the Commission in both MS-Word and Adobe Acrobat (PDF) format with the charts in Excel. They should be accompanied, where requested, by appropriate annexes and delivered in accordance with the deadlines and requirements set out in the Terms of Reference and agreed with the Commission.

Furthermore, the following reports and presentations shall be delivered:

#### ***Kick-off meeting report***

After signature of the contract, the contractor will participate in a kick-off meeting with the Commission. The purpose of this meeting is to verify:

- the contractor's understanding of the Terms of Reference
- the proposed general approach to the work (methodology, planning, structure of deliverables etc.)
- the composition and eligibility of the contractor's team.

#### ***Inception report – within 1 month after the kick-off meeting***

The inception report completes the structuring phase of the study. It aims at describing the organisation of the work, adapting and substantiating the overall approach, the methodology required for each evaluation question and/or specific task requested as well as the work plan outlined in the proposal, including the planned timelines. It should set out in detail how the proposed methodology will be implemented, and in particular lay out clearly in tabular form how the method allows each task to be answered via establishment of judgement criteria and within these, of evaluation indicators. A further column highlighting choice of relevant evaluation tools should complete the table. The inception report should develop such a chart to a level that allows the Commission to gain a good understanding of the evaluation tools and related methodological steps proposed.

The report may complete and/or suggest additional evaluation questions the contractors consider suitable. As such, this document will provide an opportunity to make a final check on the feasibility of the method proposed and the extent to which it corresponds with the task specifications.

The known sources of information, use of tracers (case studies), contact persons in Member States, as well as the way the contractor will interact with Member States representatives will be fully

clarified at this stage.

The inception report is submitted to the Commission. On the basis of discussion, including with the contractor, changes and improvements may be requested. Final version of evaluation tasks/questions suggested by the contractor and evaluation indicators to be used will be validated by the Commission at this stage. The contractor will submit a final version within two weeks.

***Draft final report –a) the part on the voluntary origin labelling within 5 months of the signature of the contract b) the part on the mandatory indication of origin of meat ingredients within 9 months***

This document will provide the preliminary conclusions of the contractor in respect of the tasks in the task specifications. These will be based on evidence generated through the evaluation. Any judgements provided should be clear and explicit. It will also provide a technical overview of the analysis process highlighting limitations and possible bias therein.

The draft final report(s) should include an executive summary of not more than 10 pages (synthesis of analyses and conclusions), the main report (structure to be confirmed by the Commission services but planned to reflect the content of the assignment), technical annexes (inter alia the Task Specifications and a compilation of all requested country-based information) and a draft one-page summary of the Key Messages (conclusions in bullet form) of the study. The latter should precede the executive summary.

***Final report – to be submitted within 15 days of communication of comments made by the Commission on the draft final report***

The final report should have the same structure as the draft final report. It will take account of the results of the comments and discussions with the Commission regarding the draft final report insofar as they do not interfere with the autonomy of the contractor in respect to the conclusions. The executive summary (including the Key Messages section preceding it) should be provided.

The copyright of the reports remains with the Commission.

#### **4.4 Quality Assessment**

The Commission will have to agree on a quality assessment of the final report.

For details on minimal requirements regarding quality assessment of the deliverables, please see Annex 3.

In order to ensure the necessary quality for such work requested by the Commission, contractors should be constantly minded that:

- the study shall respond to the information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of reference and following discussions with the Commission;
- the methodology and design shall be adequate for proceeding to the tasks and for obtaining the results needed to answer the questions;
- collected data must be adequate for their intended use and their reliability must be ascertained;
- data shall be analysed systematically to answer the study questions and to cover all the information needs in a valid manner;
- findings shall follow logically from and be justified by the data/information analysis and by interpretations based on pre-established and rational criteria;
- conclusions for being valid shall be non-biased and fully based on findings.

## **5. Timetable**

### 5.1 Timetable for the work and deliverables

The contractor is to start the desk-work in **July 2012** and the contract should be completed within **9** months from the signature of the contract.

## **6. List of annexes with specific information**

Relevant Union legislation and statistics, databases and other information available at the Commission services

*(Detailed information allows better offers and more focused work of the contractor)*

## ANNEX I

### Indicative list of relevant stakeholders

Acronym	Full name	Area of work and links
ASS. I. CA.	Associazione Industriali delle Carni	<a href="http://www.assica.it/">http://www.assica.it/</a> assica.bruxelles@skynet.be
AVEC	Association of Poultry Processors and Poultry Trade in the EU Countries	poultry meat (trade and processing industry) <a href="http://www.avec-poultry.eu/">http://www.avec-poultry.eu/</a> cv@avec-poultry.eu
BEUC	European Consumers' Organisation	<a href="http://www.beuc.eu">www.beuc.eu</a> Ruth.Veale@beuc.eu
CEPS	European Spirits Organisation	<a href="http://www.europeanspirits.org">www.europeanspirits.org</a> <a href="mailto:info@europeanspirits.org">info@europeanspirits.org</a>
CIBC	International Butchers' Confederation	Butchers <a href="http://www.cibc.be/en/about/">http://www.cibc.be/en/about/</a> +32/2 230.38.76
CLITRAVI	Association of Meat Processing Industry	meat processing industry (not covering poultry meat) <a href="http://www.clitravi.eu">http://www.clitravi.eu</a> clitravi@skypro.be
COPA-COGECA	European farmers European Agri-cooperatives	<a href="mailto:mail@copa-cogeca.eu">mail@copa-cogeca.eu</a> <a href="http://www.copa-cogeca.be">http://www.copa-cogeca.be</a>
EDA	European Dairy association	<a href="mailto:eda@euomilk.org">eda@euomilk.org</a>
ERRT	European Retail Round Table	Large retailers <a href="http://www.errt.org/">http://www.errt.org/</a> <a href="mailto:errt@errt.org">errt@errt.org</a>
ESA	European Snacks Association	
UECBV	European Livestock and Meat Trading Union	Red meat slaughterhouses + livestock and meat traders <a href="mailto:info@uecbv.eu">info@uecbv.eu</a> <a href="http://www.uecbv.eu/">http://www.uecbv.eu/</a>
EUFIC	European Food Information Council	FLABEL/ focus on nutrition label; <a href="http://www.flabel.org/en/">http://www.flabel.org/en/</a>
EuroCommerce	Retail, Wholesale and International Trade Representation to the EU	commerce, wholesale and retail <a href="mailto:bastings@eurocommerce.be">bastings@eurocommerce.be</a>
EuroCoop	EU Community of Consumer Co-operatives	consumer cooperatives <a href="mailto:info@eurocoop.coop">info@eurocoop.coop</a> 00 32 2 231.07.57
FoodDrinkEurope	Confederation of the food and drink industries of the EU	Food and drink industry <a href="http://www.fooddrinkeurope.eu">http://www.fooddrinkeurope.eu</a> <a href="mailto:info@fooddrinkeurope.eu">info@fooddrinkeurope.eu</a>
FRESHFEL		
NFU	National Farmers Union	British Farmers <a href="http://www.nfuonline.com">www.nfuonline.com</a>
PFP	Primary Food Processors	<a href="http://www.pdf-eu.org">www.pdf-eu.org</a>
PROFEL	The European	<a href="mailto:profel@agep.eu">profel@agep.eu</a>

	Association of fruit and vegetable processing industry	
UEAPME	European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises	<a href="mailto:info@ueapme.com">info@ueapme.com</a>

## ANNEX II

### Indicative list of relevant documents

#### Basic EU legislation:

- Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers
- All EU legislation: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/>

#### EU Traceability legislation:

- Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 of 17 December 2003 establishing a system for the identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals
- Council Directive 2008/71/EC of 15 July 2008 on the identification and registration of pigs

#### EU Origin labelling legislation:

- Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 July 2000 establishing a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 1825/2000 of 25 August 2000 laying down detailed rules for the application of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the labelling of beef and beef products
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 543/2008 of 16 June 2008 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards the marketing standards for poultrymeat
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 589/2008 of 23 June 2008 laying down detailed rules for implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards marketing standards for eggs
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 1019/2002 of 13 June 2002 on marketing standards for olive oil
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 2257/94 of 16 September 1994 laying down quality standards for bananas
- Commission regulation (EC) No 607/2009 of 14 July 2009 laying down certain detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 as regards protected designations of origin and geographical indications, traditional terms, labelling and presentation of certain wine sector products
- Council Directive 2001/110/EC of 20 December 2001 relating to honey

#### Research related to origin labelling:

- Country of Origin Labelling: A Synthesis of Research. Oxford Evidentia, 2010. <http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/coolsyn.pdf>
- National Country of Origin Labelling Evaluation. Campten Technology Ltd. For DEFRA.2011. [http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=FO0433\\_10224\\_FRP.pdf](http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=FO0433_10224_FRP.pdf)

- Feasibility Study into Extending Country of Origin Labelling to Selected Packaged Fruit of Vegetable Whole Food Produce. Food Standards Australia New Zealand, 2010. <http://www.finance.gov.au/obpr/docs/cool-food-produce.pdf>
- Developing a Framework for Assessing the Costs of Labelling Changes in the UK. Campten Technology Ltd for DEFRA. UK 2010. <http://archive.defra.gov.uk/evidence/economics/foodfarm/reports/documents/labelling-changes.pdf>
- Commission impact Assessment on the proposal for a Regulation on the provision of food information to consumers. [http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/foodlabelling/publications/ia\\_general\\_food\\_labelling.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/foodlabelling/publications/ia_general_food_labelling.pdf)
- Rand report: Assessing the impact of revisions to the EU horizontal food labelling legislation, [http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical\\_reports/2008/RAND\\_TR532.pdf](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2008/RAND_TR532.pdf)
- [http://foodqualityschemes.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en/documents/Finalreport\\_000.pdf](http://foodqualityschemes.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en/documents/Finalreport_000.pdf)
- Food Safety Authority of Ireland - A Research Study into Consumers' attitudes to Food Labelling December 2009  
<http://www.fsai.ie/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=8900>

#### **Other studies related to meat:**

- Consumer survey of the meat market. DG SANCO 2011
- Study on the Competitiveness of the European Meat Processing Industry. Carried out within the Framework contract on sectoral competitiveness. ECORYS Nederlands BV, 2010. [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/files/report\\_compmeat\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/files/report_compmeat_en.pdf)

#### **Administrative burden:**

- Study on administrative burden reduction associated with the implementation of certain Rural Development measures. CAP GEMINI, Deloitte and Ramboll 2011. [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/external/rd-simplification/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/external/rd-simplification/index_en.htm)

#### **Statistics:**

- Eurostat Agriculture statistics <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/agriculture/data/database>
- Weekly prices of live animals and carcasses: [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/index_en.htm)

## ANNEX III

### Offer

The methodology of this study must be drawn by the tenders taking into account the objectives and scope described above and existing good practice. The final methodology will be agreed by the Commission and the Contractor during the inception phase.

The tenders are required to:

- prove understanding of the scope and objectives by drafting an intervention logic,
- prove ability to address the tasks envisaged by breaking them down as in the attached model (model - table n°1),
- clearly detail the different steps of the process specifying required resources (human and financial) and time (model - table n°2),
- present timetable of main milestones of the process

**Table n°1**

<b>Evaluation task</b>	<b>Judgement criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Data Sources</b>
------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------	---------------------

**Table n°2**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Expert (name, category specialisation)</b>	<b>Time required</b>
-------------	---	----------------------

Tenders are not expected to restrict themselves to listed minimum requirements. Proposals for additional methodological tools that may contribute to addressing the evaluation questions in a more satisfactory manner will be considered positively when evaluating the proposals.

### Inception report

This report will describe in more detail the way the evaluation will be conducted and the methodology. It will provide proposed content of the questionnaires (if any), interview questions (if any), focus group outlines (if any) and the list of organisms to be consulted and also the number of interviewees and their positions and names (if any) (model - table n°3).

This document will provide the Commission with the opportunity to check the feasibility of the method proposed and the extent to which it corresponds with the needs outlined in the terms of reference.

**Table n°3**

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Judgement</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Data</b>	<b>Survey</b>	<b>List of</b>	<b>Timetable of</b>
-------------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------	---------------	----------------	---------------------

task	criteria	Sources	<b>questions, interview questions, focus group outlines</b>	<b>organisms to be consulted, interviewees, their positions and names</b>	<b>consultations</b>
------	----------	---------	---	---	----------------------

**Interim Report**

This report shall describe the work completed (most of the fieldwork should be finished):

- list of reviewed documents,
- number of questionnaire and interviews completed,
- summary of preliminary results of the investigation,
- validation of data,
- the way the contractor intends to make the results of interviews comparable,
- (if relevant) list of problems the contractor faced in his work in the framework of the specific contract,
- a process advancement table with critical analysis on the progress of the fieldwork.

**Draft Final Report**

<b>Evidence from evaluation tools</b>	<b>Findings:</b> factual statements derived from the available evidence	<b>Conclusions:</b> the evaluators' interpretation of the evidence, applying transparent judgment criteria	<b>Possible recommendations:</b> recommended changes or improvements