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ENVIROMENTAL FOOTPRINT

- Common method
  - Life cycle based
  - Multiple environmental indicators
- Common tool for internal market
- Identify environmental hotspots
- Credible information for communication

PEF/OEF guide: published in 2013
Circular economy: the full life cycle

Review ecodesign legislation:
Focus on durability, future re-use, reparability, recycling and recovery

Resource efficiency indicators

Phasing-out of landfilling, and the right infrastructure for recycling

Consumer-related measures: product information on repair/maintenance, environmental performance
Tackle food waste
3-year pilot (2013 – 2016)

1. Test the **process** for the development of PEFCRs and OEFSRs
2. Test different approaches for **verification** systems
3. **Communication** vehicles

- SMEs
- International
- Data
Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules

Organisation Environmental Footprint Sector Rules

Default secondary datasets
24 product groups & sectors

- Batteries and accumulators
- Decorative paints
- Hot and cold water supply pipes
- Household detergents
- IT equipment
- Leather
- Metal sheets
- Footwear
- Photovoltaic electricity generation
- Thermal insulation
- T-shirts
- Uninterruptible Power Supply
- Intermediate paper product
- Retail
- Copper
- Beer
- Dairy
- Feed for food-producing animals
- Packed fresh meat from bovine, pigs and sheep
- Wine
- Uncooked pasta
- Packed water
- Pet food
- Olive oil
Status at end of pilot phase

- For 24 products & sectors:
  - Specific modelling rules
  - A European average footprint (15 impacts)
  - The EF to be communicated as 3-4 impacts
  - One score as a weighted average of all 15 impacts
- Thousands of background datasets
- Rules on how to verify an EF result
- Rules on how to communicate an EF result
Where are we standing today?

All pilots closed final consultation

End of the pilot phase: delay of final adoption of 10 months
Experience gained: Content-wise

- More guidance needed on the granularity of the FU
- Better market data needed for the representative product(s)
- The development of « benchmarks » is technically feasible
- Definition of classes of performance requires further thoughts
- No information on verification approaches
- No information on communication
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Consultations https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/wikis/display/EUENVFP/