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1 Introduction

This report presents the findings of the independent evaluation of the Public Sector Food Procurement Initiative (PSFPI). This evaluation was carried out by Deloitte between October and December 2008. The final report was presented to Defra during February 2009.

1.1 The PSFPI

The PSFPI was launched in August 2003 as one of the initiatives under the Government’s Strategy for Sustainable Farming and Food. Its primary purpose was to encourage public bodies to procure food in a manner that considers the principles of sustainable development. The aims of the PSFPI are to:

- Promote food safety and increase the consumption of healthy and nutritious food;
- Mainstream good practice in food procurement and supply to improve efficiency and realise savings that can be ploughed back into improving public sector catering; and
- Improve sustainable performance at each stage of the food chain in support of the Government’s Strategy for Sustainable Farming and Food.

The PSFPI’s objectives were revised in 2007 to better reflect current Government priorities and knowledge gained from implementing the PSFPI and from NAO and PAC recommendations for smarter food procurement. The Initiative now has the following priority objectives:

- Promote food safety, including high standards of hygiene;
- Increase the consumption of healthy and nutritious food;
- Improve the sustainability and efficiency of production, processing and distribution;
- Increase tenders from small and local producers and their ability to do business;
- Increase co-operation among buyers, producers and along supply chains; and
- Improve the sustainability and efficiency of public food procurement and catering services.

Other important objectives of the PSFPI include:

- Influence consumers’ behaviour to reduce the impacts of food consumption;
- Increase demand for organic food;
- Promote animal welfare;
- Improve choice for ethnic minority, cultural and religious groups;
- Better working conditions for catering staff;
- Fair treatment of suppliers; and
- Improve data collection and measurement of performance.
1.2  **Scope of this evaluation**

Deloitte were appointed to undertake an evaluation of the PSFPI to:

- consider the initiative’s achievements to date;
- identify any limiting factors in its uptake and extent of its success; and
- make some initial recommendations as to what the future policy landscape in support of sustainable food procurement should constitute.

1.3  **Disclaimer**

This report has been prepared for Defra in connection with the purpose expressed in the report and any party seeking to rely upon the report, whether in connection with the agreed purpose or otherwise, does so at their own risk and Deloitte accepts no duty of care to such parties.

1.4  **Exclusions**

The engagement has been delivered subject to the following exclusions:

- The Deloitte engagement team have not generated any primary data within this report other than that generated by the online survey. The analysis has been informed by existing research made available by Defra or sourced from public sources and data gathered from interviewees and survey respondents;
- Deloitte has not been responsible for verifying the data presented in research reports or obtained from formal and informal sources associated with the project. It has been assumed that the research and data being analysed is correct unless specifically proven otherwise;
- Deloitte was not responsible for providing contact details for the strategic interviews and survey. However, relevant names of known contacts were provided where possible by Deloitte (e.g. existing contacts in the RDAs);
- Deloitte has not provided state aid advice to Defra on the potential state aid compliance or otherwise of recommendations for the future development of the Initiative; and
- In this period of economic turbulence and uncertainty, this evaluation is judging success and impact to date and is not intended to comment on the potential impact of the economic scenarios we may now be facing: policy makers will need to take these into account when considering the outcomes.

1.5  **Report structure**

The remainder of this report covers the following issues:

Section 2 – Our approach: outlining the methodology of the evaluation;

Section 3 – Strategic context: outlining the policy landscape within which PSFPI operates;

Section 4 – Evidence of success: summarising key findings from the research and analysis;

Section 5 - Emerging issues: summarising key findings from the research and analysis; and

Section 6 – Recommendations: presenting recommendations to Defra.
2 Our Approach

2.1 Scope and objectives

In accordance with the brief, the purpose of the evaluation was:

- To determine the extent to which PSFPI has delivered against its objectives to date;
- To obtain the views of a range of stakeholders on the success of the initiative and the future direction it should take;
- To consider how the initiative should evolve in line with recent policy developments including but not limited to the Cabinet Office’s recent report “Food Matters: Towards a Strategy for the 21st Century” and the Office of Government Commerce’s ongoing work on public sector food procurement; and
- To make recommendations and an associated action orientated plan for the future development of the initiative.

In particular outputs of the evaluation include:

- Key findings from strategic interviews and a survey of procurement practitioners;
- An analysis of emerging issues; and
- High level recommendations for Defra and others.

2.2 Methodology

The approach taken to this evaluation is summarised in figure 2.2.1 below:

Figure 2.2.1: Overview of methodology

Source: Deloitte Analysis, 2008
Literature Review

Extensive desk based research was undertaken to gain a more in depth understanding of the scheme and associated policies and strategies. Best practice case study materials and PSFPI literature were reviewed, along with previous studies which have included some evaluation of the PSFPI such as the NAO Smarter Food Procurement Survey in 2006 and the 2007 Ipsos Mori Survey. Wider strategic context literature was also considered, such as the Cabinet Office’s 2008 work - “Food Matters: Towards a Strategy for the 21st Century,” in order to gain an understanding of how the initiative is linked to, and impacted by, wider food policy developments.

A list of references consulted can be found at Annex 1.

Research and analysis

Interviews with strategic stakeholders

Wide reaching external engagement was undertaken to form the basis of the evaluation and to verify findings from desk based research. A principal element of this was consultation with 48 strategic stakeholders including:

- Defra personnel – those involved directly with the PSFPI and those working on sustainability and food issues more broadly;
- Other Government departments – individuals involved in food procurement;
- Government Offices for the Regions;
- Regional Development Agencies;
- Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnerships (RIEPs);
- SFFS (Sustainable Food and Farming Strategy) Regional Chairs and members of the Delivery Group;
- Interest groups e.g. National Farmers Union (NFU), Food and Drink Federation (FDF);
- Caterers; and
- Others significantly involved with or interested in the PSFPI.

A full list of organisations involved can be found at Annex 2.

These semi-structured interviews were designed to draw out key issues and provide an opportunity to discuss the future of the initiative in more depth. The types of questions considered during the interviews can be found at Annex 3.

Online survey

In addition, a survey was used to gather qualitative and quantitative information about public sector food procurement from procurement practitioners in local authorities, government departments, schools, prisons and hospitals. The survey was based upon a range of questions devised in order to ascertain the direct influence of the PSFPI on changes made by the organisations with regard food procurement.

A full version of the survey was sent to over 50 practitioners in central government departments, prisons and hospitals\(^1\). A list of questions included in the survey can be found at Annex 4.

---

\(^1\) The exact number of recipients of the long survey is not known as it was circulated further by Defra’s contacts in the National Offender Management Service (NOMS), the NHS and the regions.
Around 550 practitioners\(^2\) in local authorities and schools also received a shorter version of the survey to avoid any overlap with the recent ‘Schools Food Procurement, Procurement Skills and Sustainability’ survey run by the School Food Trust (SFT) and Local Authority Caterers Association (LACA)\(^3\). The recipients also had the option of completing the longer version of the survey. The differences between the long and short versions of the survey are described at Annex 5.

Recipients had two weeks to complete the survey online using DeloitteDEX software. The figure below gives an example of the appearance and functionality of the survey:

**Figure 2.2.2: A sample of the online survey**

![Survey Example](image)

Source: DeloitteDEX, 2008

**Recommendations and Final Report**

Analysis of the interview and survey results was conducted and emerging issues identified. High level recommendations were then made for the future policy and support structures around sustainable food procurement. Emerging issues and recommendations were discussed with the Sustainable Farming and Food Delivery Group before this final report was produced.

### 2.3 Limitations of the approach

Limitations of the approach have been identified:

- The number of strategic interviews undertaken was limited by the amount of time available to carry out this evaluation. However, a sufficiently broad, representative sample of strategic stakeholders was engaged so the qualitative interview information is deemed to be robust.

---

\(^2\) The exact number of recipients of the short survey is not known as it was circulated further by Defra’s contacts in the School Food Trust (SFT) and Local Authority Caterers Association (LACA).

\(^3\) The questionnaire for the SFT/LACA ‘School food procurement, procurement skills and sustainability survey’ was sent out on 8 August 2008 and follow up emails and calls continued until the end of November 2008.
The shorter version of the online survey omitted some of the follow-up, PSFPPI-specific questions on topics such as product types procured, standards and specifications and environmental actions (such as waste reduction and energy conservation).

The survey response rate was low. Only 56 surveys were completed and 36 were the shorter version. There were no responses from prisons and only 3 hospitals participated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Government</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long survey</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short survey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Deloitte Analysis, 2008

A full list of organisations responding to the survey can be found at Annex 6.

It was not mandatory to respond to either the short or longer version of the survey. Therefore, it is likely that the majority of practitioners completing the survey are particularly interested in sustainable food and have an opinion on the success, or otherwise, of the initiative which may skew the results.

Despite the low uptake and data limitations, when supplemented with previous evaluations and reporting exercises and in conjunction with the strategic interviews and broader analysis, it was deemed that the evaluation had a sufficiently robust baseline from which to make recommendations.

---

4 These follow-up questions were not included in the SFT/LACA ‘Schools Food Procurement, Procurement Skills and Sustainability’ survey in 2008. The list of questions excluded from the shorter version of the survey can be found at Annex 5.
3 Strategic Context

3.1 Policy drivers

Food is an increasingly prevalent topic of debate, both publicly and politically. In a recent speech at the Oxford Farming conference\(^6\), the Rt Hon Hilary Benn MP, Secretary of State for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, stressed the importance of the food security issue and the need for British agriculture to "produce as much food as possible" whilst recognising the fine balance between food production and stewardship of the land. There is a growing public interest in the environment and in our food – where it comes from and how it is produced. Overlaying this is the rapidly shifting behavioural context of consumers and the influences upon them – social, economic and environmental. There is also a growing consensus that the nation’s eating habits represent a major health, environmental and economic challenge and that our current food supply chain and consumption habits are unsustainable in the long term.

Therefore, key themes occupying Government, the food and beverage industry and consumers include:

- Minimising the negative environmental impacts of food production - the food chain creates 18% of greenhouse gas emissions in the UK\(^6\);
- Tackling food poverty and diet related obesity and disease - if UK diets met nutritional guidelines, 70,000 premature deaths could be prevented each year\(^7\);
- Creating an economically sustainable future for UK agriculture – which, amongst other things, is internationally competitive without reliance on subsidy or protectionism, anticipates and responds to changes in the market and integrates responses to higher world prices; and
- Securing food supplies in an increasingly volatile market – prices of agricultural commodities have increased significantly on international markets in the last two years (an almost 100% increase in the dairy price index, for example\(^8\)) and the price of a basket of food in the UK Retail Price Index rose 6.9% from April 2007 to April 2008\(^9\).

The concept of ‘sustainable food’ is not new, it is however complex and necessitates the consideration of numerous facets across the whole supply chain from primary agricultural production, to processing, retail, consumption and disposal. Every working day millions of people eat food provided by the public sector – in schools, nurseries, work canteens, hospitals, care homes and elsewhere. Almost a third of all meals served by caterers in the UK are prepared in public sector institutions. Over 300 million meals are served each year by the NHS alone\(^10\). Given this enormous buying power, the public sector should be leading by example in the delivery of healthier and more environmentally sustainable food. In doing so, the public sector has the ability to influence supply chains and encourage the food industry to adopt more sustainable practices.

The Public Sector Food Procurement Initiative (PSFPI)

The PSFPI was launched in support of the Strategy for Sustainable Farming and Food (2002) to encourage the public sector to procure food in a more sustainable way.

---

\(^5\) 6 January 2009


\(^7\) Ibid.

\(^8\) FAO Dairy Price Index (2008) at http://www.fao.org/docrep/010/ai466e/ai466e01.htm#38


The Strategy for Sustainable Farming and Food (SSFF) set out how industry, Government and consumers can work together to secure a sustainable future for our farming and food industries that contribute to a better environment and healthy and prosperous communities.

The SSFF was developed in the context of unsustainable high spending on the CAP, farm incomes at “rock bottom” and the tragedies of foot and mouth, and BSE epidemics that led to a widespread realisation that British food and farming “cannot go on like this.”

Initially therefore, a key focus of the PSFPI was developing the market opportunities for domestic food in the public sector to support UK farmers. However, from the beginning the PSFPI also encompassed wider concerns such as promoting healthy food and protecting the environment which, as has been described, are increasingly coming to the fore of the food policy debate.

### 3.2 The policy landscape

Food policy is a complex area which has developed iteratively in response to a number of social, economic and environmental factors and events, with different strategies addressing different aspects of the food system. ‘Food Matters, Towards a Strategy for the 21st Century’ published by the Cabinet Office Strategy Unit in 2008 describes the current food policy landscape in the UK as a ‘patchwork’ but recognises that many of the key elements of a comprehensive food policy are in place. Figure 3.2.1 attempts to illustrate some of the ‘patchwork’ of food, sustainability and procurement policies within PSFPI’s strategic environment:

**Figure 3.2.1: A sample of the PSFPI fragmented policy landscape**

---

Further information on these policies can be found at Annex 7.

At an EU level, food and catering is an important category under Green Public Procurement (GPP), a component of the EU's Sustainable Consumption and Production Action Plan. The concept of GPP is to use the substantial purchasing power of European public authorities to help shape production and consumption trends and to create or enlarge markets for environmentally friendly products and services. In practice, GPP is based on a set of common environmental criteria for a range of products and services, divided between ‘core’ criteria, which focus on the key areas of environmental performance of a product, and ‘comprehensive’ criteria, that take into account further aspects or higher levels of environmental performance. The Commission has proposed that a political target be set, whereby, by 2010, 50% of all tendering procedures should be ‘green’, where ‘green’ means compliant with the endorsed ‘core’ criteria. The UK has a long standing interest in this field and, in 2005, committed to being amongst the leaders in sustainable procurement by 2009.

Specific objectives with regards food are also built into the UK Government’s performance management framework. For example:

- Defra has two Departmental Strategic Objectives which relate to food:
  - a sustainable, secure and healthy food supply; and
  - a thriving farming and food sector with an improving net environmental impact.
- Food and health issues are picked up within two of the Public Service Agreements (PSAs);
  - for children and young people: ‘Increasing the number of children who have school lunches...reducing the rate of increase in obesity among children under 11’;
  - for better health and wellbeing: ‘To continue to increase life expectancy by tackling the biggest killer diseases, with an emphasis on ill health prevention’; and
- Policies that shape the business environment for food chain industries are covered by PSAs on skills, competition, productivity and migration (rather than sector-specific objectives).

The inclusion of these targets in the UK’s policy framework suggests that there is a well developed understanding of the issues regarding food, however the structures in which these policies operate often detracts from their effectiveness. Consequently, it is widely regarded that despite the strength of many of the strategies, UK food policy today is “somewhat less than the sum of its parts”\(^\text{13}\). The relationship between different elements is not always clearly spelled out and the relative importance of objectives in different areas of policy is not always clear. A stronger, better integrated policy framework on food is now needed, recognising that the world has changed since many of the mechanisms for our modern day food system emerged in the 1940s.

It would therefore now seem to be an opportune time to launch a new, integrated statement of future food policy, which would provide the overarching framework for any further efforts to influence public sector food procurement.

**Moves to greater coherency in food policy**

A clear vision, and a strategy that defines the Government’s priorities and purpose across the food system, are needed both to underpin the transformation of the food system and to provide the direction and leadership needed to get there.

\(^{13}\) Food Matters, Towards a Strategy for the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century, The Strategy Unit, July 2008.
This was recognised in ‘Food Matters’ and a Cabinet Office-chaired Food Strategy Task Force will oversee delivery and work towards more ‘joining up’ of food policy across Government to:

- Oversee and coordinate work on food issues across government;
- Drive forward delivery of measures in Food Matters;
- Join up food policy through improved coordination of activities across government; and
- Ensure common positions are reached on issues relating to low impact, safe food and healthy diets.

To achieve greater coherency, there will also be a renewed focus as ‘Food Matters’ recommends that the Government will adopt the following strategic policy objectives for food:

- Fair prices, choice, access to food and food security through open and competitive markets;
- Continuous improvement in the safety of food;
- The changes need to deliver a further transition to healthier diets; and
- A more environmentally sustainable food chain.

Defra, together with the Department for Health and the Food Standards Agency (FSA), are taking forward the vision and strategic framework for food policy which will be developed in an open and collaborative process involving the public and stakeholders with the aim of producing a final statement of the vision and strategic objectives for food policy by October 2009.

In addition, the Government has already adopted actions intended to accelerate progress towards the vision - via public sector leadership, support for consumers and engaging with the supply chain, including:

- Development of consumer advice that integrates health, safety and environmental issues;
- Working with WRAP and the food industry to secure a new agreement to cut food waste;
- Launching a Healthier Food Mark for public sector food in England tied to standards for nutrition and environmental sustainability; and
- A Joint research Strategy for Food to provide better coordination of the departments’ food related research.

**Moves to smarter food procurement**

One mechanism for the implementation of policy mechanisms for more sustainable food is through procurement. The public sector spends just over £2 billion on food and catering services in England and Wales and there are over 30,000 public sector organisations that place orders for food on a daily basis. In response to the National Audit Office's 2006 report, "Smarter Food Procurement in the Public Sector", the Office of Government Commerce (OGC) and the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) launched a collaborative food group bringing together the major public sector procurement organisations to develop a strategy for how to take the recommendations made in the report forward.

The group has identified the need to develop a Food Governance model that can achieve value for money gains as well providing a quality food offer for customers that fulfils the aims of the Cabinet Office “Food Matters” report.
This is based on a collaborative participation of several key stakeholders including DCSF (lead), Defra, Ministry of Defence (MoD), National Offender Management Service (NOMS), NHS Supply Chain, Food Standards Agency (FSA) and OGC.

The strategy sets out to deliver a collaborative framework for public sector organisations to work together. It builds on their current food procurement excellence and looks to set direction and guidance for the public sector procurement of food and drink and will identify opportunities to improve Value for Money, quality of service, sustainability and customer requirements. The Collaborative Food Procurement (CFP) programme will deliver smarter food procurement through, for example, identifying and exploiting aggregation opportunities; piloting interactive, professional networking facilities; providing support for e-procurement, e-tendering and e-auctions; establishing framework logistics contracts; and developing networks and communication channels.

Sustainability is a cross-cutting issue at the core of the strategy and is led by Defra. The aim of the sustainability workstream is to ensure that sustainability is embedded into all areas of public sector food procurement.

### 3.3 Summary

There continue to be developments in both the UK and beyond which are bringing the issue of ensuring a sustainable food system increasingly to the fore. This strategic context provides a renewed focus and considerable opportunities for the PSFPI moving forward, including the opportunity to:

- Re-establish ownership and leadership of the initiative;
- Re-focus objectives in line with Food Matters;
- Ensure that the initiative fits well with domestic and international developments such as Collaborative Food Procurement within OGC and the EU’s Green Public Procurement agenda;
- Increase the focus on food within Defra following the creation of the Department of Energy and Climate Change; and
- Re-ignite interest and debate in public sector food procurement.

However, we are currently in a challenging economic climate which will increase the need for any recommendations on sustainable food procurement by the PSFPI to be practical and well evidenced. The primary research undertaken for this evaluation therefore focuses on understanding the limitations of the initiative in its current form and key opportunities moving forwards, as well as recognising the levels of success to date.
4 Evidence of success

4.1 Introduction

It is widely believed by those involved in the initiative that the PSFPI has had some positive impact on the progress of public procurement towards a more sustainable model with the limited funding and resources dedicated to it over the last five years. Indeed, the launch of the PSFPI in 2003 was described by Morgan and Sonnino (2008) as “a seminal event in the history of public food policy in the UK.” They assert that “despite its modest resources, the PSFPI is one of the most innovative programmes of its kind in the world, embracing as it does almost every stakeholder in the food chain, including central and local government, public sector purchasing bodies, primary producers, food service companies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs).”

This section presents the evidence of success informed by the strategic interviews and the online survey of procurement practitioners undertaken for this evaluation, supported by a selection of the results of previous studies and other literature (a full list of reference material can be found at Annex 1).

4.2 Evidence

It is difficult to quantify the success of the PSFPI because it has not been measured or monitored regularly during its lifetime and quantifiable targets were not established at the outset. However, the data gathered for this evaluation and the findings of previous studies and reports indicate that:

1) Awareness of the initiative has increased;
2) There is widespread support for the objectives of the PSFPI;
3) The PSFPI guidance/support has been useful (when used);
4) Some progress has been made towards PSFPI goals; and
5) There are examples of good initiatives across the country delivering PSFPI objectives.

1) Awareness of the initiative has increased

The NAO Smarter Food Procurement Survey\textsuperscript{14}, published in 2006, showed that less than two thirds of those surveyed (59\%) were aware of the PSFPI. Due to the different sample groups it is not possible to compare this result directly with those in more recent surveys. However, some comparison can be made with other studies involving local authorities. Only 67\% of the 12 local authorities involved in the NAO survey were aware of the PSFPI, compared with 83\% of the 65 local authorities involved in the 2008 SFT/LACA survey\textsuperscript{15}, and 87\% of the 39 local authorities responding to the survey for this evaluation. This suggests that awareness has increased amongst local authorities.

\textsuperscript{14} NAO Smarter Food Procurement Survey was based on responses from 48 government departments/Exec Agency/NDPB, 36 NHS Trusts, 12 Local Authorities, 49 universities and 1 ‘other’. The report was published in 2006 and the data was collected in 2005.

\textsuperscript{15} 2008 SFT/LACA survey was based on responses from 73 local authorities although only 65 responded to this question (as per the first draft report issued to stakeholders on 15 December 2008).
2) There is widespread support for the objectives of the PSFPI

It was evident during the strategic interviews that there is widespread support for the objectives of the PSFPI amongst stakeholders involved in policy, delivery, supply and other interest groups. Certain stakeholders focus on some objectives more than others and many have their concerns about the achievability of all the objectives, but overall the feedback was very positive about the aims of the initiative.¹⁶

Example comments from strategic interviews:

"I feel it is a very important initiative; the aims are positive and right regarding bringing together the public sector food chain and British producers."

"It is a good initiative and the right thing for government to do. It can underpin local economies and support local employment."

The 2007 Ipsos Mori survey found that amongst those aware of the initiative, the majority of local authorities (72%) and schools (69%) were favourable to the PSFPI.¹⁷ This is also supported by the 20 procurement practitioners responding to the long survey for this evaluation who stated that the following were ‘very important’ or ‘important’ considerations in their food procurement:

Table 4.2.1: Importance of food procurement considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSFPI Priority Objectives</th>
<th>Providing healthy / nutritious food</th>
<th>Reducing environmental impact / carbon footprint</th>
<th>Increasing tendering opportunities for small and local producers / providers to supply your organisation</th>
<th>Increasing cooperation among buyers, producers and along supply chains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Deloitte Analysis, 2008

Furthermore, it was recognised by many stakeholders interviewed that the initiative has an important role in joining up food policy across government, bringing together elements of the procurement and sustainability agendas.

3) The PSFPI guidance/support has been useful

The survey for this evaluation found that the majority of procurement practitioners using written PSFPI guidance/support found it ‘extremely’ or ‘very’ useful:

¹⁶ Please refer to section 2.1 for the list of PSFPI objectives.
¹⁷ 2007 Ipsos Mori survey, ‘PSFPI Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis’, was based on data from 255 schools who do their own procurement and 81 local authorities.
Table 4.2.2: Usefulness of PSFPI guidance/support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Number of respondents using this information</th>
<th>Extremely useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catering Services and Food Procurement Toolkit</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIY Guide to implementing the PSFPI – advice for practitioners</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to increase opportunities for small and local producers when aggregating food procurement - guidance for buyers and specifiers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting PSFPI into practice: advice for promoting healthy food and improving sustainability and efficiency</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSFPI case studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Deloitte Analysis, 2008

This suggests an improvement from 2005 when the NAO study found that only 23% of respondents rated the Catering Services and Food Procurement Toolkit as ‘extremely useful’ or ‘quite useful’.

Support provided by contacts in the regions, either from the Government Office or RDA, was rated even more highly by respondents to the survey for this evaluation. Almost three quarters of procurement practitioners rated the services received from these contacts as ‘extremely’ or ‘very’ useful.

4) Some progress has been made towards PSFPI goals

Evidence from this evaluation and previous studies indicates some progress has been made towards the PSFPI goals:

Table 4.2.3: Evidence of progress towards PSFPI goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Evidence of progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increasing the use of domestically produced food                          | • The average proportion of food commodities of UK origin used by Government departments was up from 64% in Defra’s first report on the ‘Proportion of domestically produced food used by government departments etc’ (2006/07) to 66% in the second report (2007/08).\(^\text{18}\)
• 13 out of 20 procurement practitioners (65%) responding to the full survey for this evaluation, reported an increase in the proportion of food procured from within the UK since 2003. |

\(^{18}\) Please note that this is not a weighted average (i.e. it does not take account for one Department procuring a higher volume of food than another) and is based on figures provided by the Departments.
### Objective | Evidence of progress
--- | ---
**Increasing the use of seasonal produce** | • 13 out of 20 procurement practitioners (65%) responding to the long survey for this evaluation, reported an increase in the proportion of seasonal food procured since 2003.
• The 2008 SFT/LACA survey found that over 50%, of the 44 LAs who provided an in-house service had menus that were ‘mostly’ or ‘fully’ aligned with regional seasonal production cycles.
• 7 government departments and NHS Supply Chain reported 75% or more menus were aligned to seasonal produce for all food supplied in the recent Defra study of the ‘Proportion of domestically produced food used by government departments etc’. Three departments, Department for International Development (DfID), Department for Transport (DfT) and the Foreign & Commonwealth Office (FCO), fully aligned their menus to seasonal produce.

**Increasing tenders from small and local producers and their ability to do business** | • 11 out of 20 (55%) of procurement practitioners responding to the full survey for this evaluation, reported an increase in the proportion of food procured from small and local producers since 2003.
• The 2007 Ipsos Mori survey also found improvement in this area. In half of the local authorities (52%) and two in five schools (44%) the proportion of food supplied by small and local producers during the last two to three years had increased.

**Increasing co-operation among buyers, producers and along supply chains** | The 2008 SFT/LACA survey, suggests that there have been achievements on this objective by LAs that provide an in-house catering service. 67% of the 43 LAs who provided an in-house service, indicated that they had previously collaborated with another public body and 86% had procured collaboratively with other departments within the LA.

**Increasing the availability of healthy and nutritious food** | • 60% of the 56 procurement practitioners responding to the survey for this evaluation had ‘significantly increased’ the availability of healthy and nutritious food in their organisation in the last 5 years above the mandatory or minimum regulatory requirement. A further 30% had seen ‘some increase’.
• There is clear evidence of increased availability of healthy and nutritious food in schools linked to the introduction of Government nutritional standards. For example:
  • 72% schools and 67% of LAs in the 2007 Mori survey had increased consumption of healthy and nutritious food; and
  • All of the 22 LAs who procured a school meal catering service, and almost 80% of the 39 LAs who provided an in-house catering service made reference to, or required suppliers to meet, Government nutritional standards for school food in their catering service contracts or food contracts, when surveyed by SFT/LACA in 2008.
### Objective

**Improving the sustainability and efficiency of public food procurement and catering services**

- Although the studies are not directly comparable and there are limitations with the data, the survey for this evaluation and the recent SFT/LACA survey indicate improvements in the sustainability and efficiency of public sector catering services when compared with the findings in the NAO report published in 2006:

Table 4.2.4: Evidence of improvements in the sustainability of public sector food procurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of respondents who had:</th>
<th>Studies in 2008</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey for this evaluation n=20</td>
<td>SFT/LACA (in-house school catering) n=42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced consumption of energy</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced consumption of water</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased recycling</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced packaging of products</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced food waste</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Deloitte Analysis 2008; NAO Smarter Food Procurement Survey 2006; SFT/LACA ‘Schools Food Procurement, Procurement Skills and Sustainability’ first draft of report to stakeholders, 15 December 2008.

### Other evidence of progress towards the procurement of more sustainable food

- Since 2003, over half of the 20 practitioners responding to the full survey for this evaluation stated that they had increased the proportion of regional and fairly traded products they procure.
- Over a quarter of the 56 practitioners responding to the survey for this evaluation stated that they had significantly increased the availability and choice of food for ethnic minority, cultural and religious groups in their organisation in the last 5 years. A further 38% said there had been ‘some increase’.
- According to Defra’s second report of the ‘Proportion of domestically produced food used by government departments etc’ 2007/08:
  - 9 government departments plus NHS Supply Chain source over 80% of their fish from managed sources, including MoD, Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR), Defra and DCSF who source 100%.
  - 6 government departments plus NHS Supply Chain procured 75% or more farm assured products.
- The Mori survey in 2007 also found that 72% of 81 Local Authorities questioned specified Farm Assurance standards in their contracts.

Source: Deloitte Analysis 2008, unless otherwise stated

---

19 Data for the NAO report was collected in 2005.
20 Respondents procuring a school meal catering service were asked if they had taken any steps to encourage suppliers to conserve energy and water, reduce food and packaging waste or recycle in a responsible manner. The categories were not broken down.
21 In-house catering service respondents were asked if they had reduced packaging and food waste.
5) There are examples of best practice initiatives delivering PSFPI objectives

Defra’s PSFPI website includes a summary of 76 case studies and provides links to case studies of other organisations such as the School Food Trust, English Farming and Food Partnership, and the Health Education Trust. They highlight best practice examples of, amongst other things:

- Cost effective healthy meals;
- Improving nutrition;
- Innovative framework agreements;
- Locally sourced food;
- Reducing environmental impacts;
- Supplier development.

Numerous examples of good practice were also highlighted during the interviews, through survey responses and in previous studies and literature. It was beyond the scope of this study to determine the causal links between PSFPI and these examples, however, the case studies do demonstrate that some of the objectives of the PSFPI are being met in areas across the country. A selection of the five most commonly cited best practice examples from the survey and interviews is shown below. They highlight examples of cost effective local sourcing, reducing environmental impacts, using seasonal produce, enabling small and local suppliers to compete for contracts, effective collaboration and more:

---

### Royal Brompton Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • The Royal Brompton has taken action as part of the London Hospital Food Project (run by the charity London Food Link in partnership with the Soil Association, and supported by Defra and the King’s Fund). | • Successfully increased the amount of local and organic food served in staff restaurants, retail outlets and wards.  
20% of all hospital food now sourced from local or organic suppliers. For example, free range eggs from Kent; bread from Kilburn (London); and mushrooms grown under the North Circular Road.  
Organic meat served to patients one day per week.  
Soups made on-site with locally grown organic vegetables.  
Healthier options in vending machines and organic coffee.  
Organic milk served to patients, staff and visitors. |

---

### Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • In 2004 the Nottingham City Hospital campus began to adopt PSFPI.  
• Realigned catering plan to PSFPI.  
• Opened the entire catering menu to local and regional suppliers.  
• The Trust is also behind a highly successful chain of fair trade cafes, called Coffee City. | • Now 30% of all food served to patients is coming from local producers, including nearly all the hospital’s milk and meat and much of its fruit and vegetables.  
• The Trust plans to build on its success in 2009 by installing a centralised, carbon neutral kitchen covering both sites, which is expected to pump £2m a year into the local and regional economy and cut food miles by 30,000 a year.  
• Coffee City has extended beyond the hospitals to several outlets in the city. |

### Bradford Education Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • As part of its commitment to bringing locally sourced meals to schoolchildren, in 2004 Bradford Education Contract Services (ECS) was instrumental in forming a steering group with representatives from ECS, NFU, Grassroots Food Network, University of Bradford, Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber, and Yorkshire Forward.  
• This steering group brought together local food growers, farmers, distributors, processors and nutritionists. | • Increased volume of locally produced food used in school meals.  
• Better quality school meals at no extra cost.  
• Bradford ECS now obtain most of its supplies, including fruit, vegetables, multigrain bread, free-range eggs, fresh meat and fresh poultry from local sources.  
• This has been achieved by simplifying the menus, reducing the use of processed food, improving product specifications, adapting to seasonal availability and using fresh meat from local butchers.  
• There has also been streamlining of packaging and delivery arrangements. |

### North East Improvement and Efficiency Project - North East Public Sector Procurement Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Demonstrated how specifically collaboration in regions can help to achieve the objectives of the PSFPI by developing the NE Public Sector Food Programme in 2006.  
• The project, which involves four local authorities in the region, was initiated as part of an ongoing regional programme of activity which aims to improve both the efficiency and sustainability of the regions public sector food supply chain. | Some of the key outcomes secured (to date) through this initiative include:  
• Collective annual cashable savings of £165,915;  
• Non cashable savings as a result of the elimination of the need for multiple tender processes by individual authorities;  
• Better terms and conditions of contract (various new clauses relating to efficiency and sustainability were included);  
• Improved supplier engagement and receptivity (NEIEP are now working with suppliers on efficiency and sustainability objectives); and  
• The identification and successful testing of contractual procedures which reduce barriers to regional SME’s which has allowed the introduction of regionally produced eggs into two local authorities. |

---

23 Source: ‘Hospital Caterer’ October 2007 and information obtained from stakeholder interviews.  
Shropshire County Council’s School Meals Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Have taken a creative and innovative approach when putting food contracts for suppliers out to tender, which enables small local businesses to compete against the giants.</td>
<td>• Shropshire County Council’s Shire Services has been singled out as a ‘Beacon of Excellence’ for the way that it sources local produce for school meals across the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They have split the area so that smaller producers can bid for all or part of a contract according to their resources.</td>
<td>• It has become the first local authority caterer to be awarded the Food for Life Silver Catering Mark by the Soil Association for using seasonal, local and organic ingredients in its primary school menus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New contracts include two local butchers, two local fruit and vegetable suppliers, a link with an organic milk producer and a contract with Belton cheese of Whitchurch.</td>
<td>• As well as securing jobs in local areas, the school meals service has made an overall saving of 11% in the first year on fruit and vegetables, quality has improved, as has efficiency in the supply chain, and there’s less waste and more flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In response to local concerns over battery chickens, a contract has also recently been awarded for free range eggs within the county.</td>
<td>• Schools, pupils and parents can now be supplied with information regarding the suppliers, the quality of food, the breed of the animals, where they come from, where the vegetables are picked and the culture of healthy eating in general.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Summary

It is fair to say that establishing the PSFPI, generating awareness of it and encouraging uptake of some of the principles, has been a noteworthy achievement with the small amount of money and resource available. Importantly, good relationships have been built across the complex patchwork of public sector organisations and although there is some way to go in many areas important foundations have been laid.

The intentions of the initiative are positive and the approach to establishing a comprehensive view of what constitutes sustainability in the context of food has contributed to an increased understanding of the issues across the public sector. The focus now should be on:

• tackling the key issues so that procuring food sustainably becomes the norm across all parts of the public sector; and
• moving the majority from awareness of the issues towards proactive engagement and action.

http://www.shropshire.gov.uk/shropshire/schoolmeals.nsf/open/5CC553488FE5132080257457365A
5 Emerging Issues

In addition to the positive views of the initiative discussed in section 4, the evaluation has highlighted a number of limitations which have been summarised as four key issues:

1) Take up of the initiative has been limited;
2) It has not been clear to all stakeholders what the initiative is trying to achieve, or how progress will be measured;
3) There are still supply side constraints which need to be addressed; and
4) It is unclear who in Government will own and deliver public sector food procurement policy in the future.

5.1 Take up of the initiative has been limited

There is clearly evidence of successful initiatives across the country delivering the objectives of the PSFPI. However, these are isolated examples and this evaluation has found little evidence of widespread take up of the initiative. There appear to be five key reasons for this:

1) PSFPI is not embedded across the public sector;
2) Buyers don't have the skills required to implement the initiative;
3) The initiative relies on enthusiastic individuals for success;
4) There is a perceived cost barrier; and
5) The initiative would benefit from more visible political weight.

1) PSFPI is not embedded across the public sector

Despite the evidence of increasing awareness presented in section 4.2, gaps in awareness of the initiative, the low priority given to food, lack of appreciation for the benefits of the scheme, insufficient knowledge and use of the guidance available, and lack of widespread progress towards objectives, suggest that PSFPI is not embedded across the public sector at all organisational and geographical levels.

Gaps in awareness

Stakeholders highlighted gaps in awareness within particular sectors and at certain levels of public sector organisations, for example:

- Caterers described the inconsistent level of awareness and understanding across the public sector organisations they dealt with.

- A number of regional facilitators, caterers and others mentioned the difficulty of getting widespread take up of the initiative within the NHS despite some good best practice examples in this sector.

- Many Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnerships (RIEPs) had very little, if any, awareness of the initiative or understanding of its objectives and many regional representatives expressed the difficulties they had faced in trying to interest RIEPs in
PSFPI. The focus of RIEPs is efficiency targets as these are what local authorities will be measured on at the end of CSR07.

- 4 of the 13 central government departments responding to the survey for this evaluation stated that they were not aware of the initiative.

- 6 of the 46 procurement practitioners responding to the survey for this evaluation (13%) stated that PSFPI had not influenced procurement in their organisation ‘at all’ and a further 16 (34%) stated that it had only ‘a little’ influence.

- Stakeholders, including procurers, commented on the lack of awareness or understanding “at the coalface” suggesting that in many cases high level commitment to the initiative does not filter down to procurers dealing with the contracts.

> “At the top level of departments they have bought into the initiative but this has not translated into contracts run at the local level.”

> “Many contracts are ill thought out. They specify things like ‘exotic fruit’ and ‘orange juice’ which cannot be sourced in the UK.”

**Low priority**

It is difficult to embed the PSFPI across the public sector because in many organisations food is not a priority and constitutes only a small proportion of the goods they procure. Therefore, increasing awareness and raising PSFPI up their agenda will be difficult. For example:

- About a third of respondents to the Mori survey in 2007 rated ‘environmentally preferable process’ and ‘degree of locally sourced food’ as ‘least important’ when awarding contracts.

- Figure 5.1.1 below also shows that on average only 29% of respondents to the full survey for this evaluation rated key objectives of the PSFPI as ‘very important’ considerations when procuring food. The most common response was that the objective was a ‘necessary consideration’.

**Figure 5.1.1: Importance of PSFPI objectives when making procurement decisions**

![Graph showing importance of PSFPI objectives](image)

Source: Deloitte Analysis, 2008
Lack of appreciation for the benefits of the scheme

It is also difficult to raise sustainability up a buyer’s agenda because in most cases the benefits of procuring sustainably are not directly apparent over short timescales. In some cases cost savings can be achieved but where they can’t the incentive for buyers is unclear.

Schools have been particularly successful at implementing objectives of the PSFPI, especially increasing the availability of healthy and nutritious food. Yet one of the key reasons for this is that the health and behaviour of children has been seen to improve, in some cases, when they eat more nutritious meals. Consequently schools and parents benefit directly.

To encourage greater take up it will therefore be important to better articulate to buyers and organisations what the benefits of sustainable procurement are. It will be particularly important to highlight cost savings where they can be achieved, in conjunction with broader benefits socially and environmentally.

“By challenging traditional ways of doing things the PSFPI is opening up new opportunities for buyers and suppliers. This has significant potential for increasing both efficiency and sustainability. The major challenge is to convince everyone of this fact.”

Low awareness and use of the guidance available

Low awareness and usage of the PSFPI support and guidance available also suggests that PSFPI is not embedded within the public sector, even amongst those organisations that are aware of it.

Of the 46 procurement practitioners surveyed for this evaluation who were aware of the PSFPI, less than half had used the written guidance as shown in figure 5.1.2. Lack of awareness of the guidance was the most commonly cited reason for not using it.

Figure 5.1.2: Percentage of procurement practitioners using PSFPI written guidance or support through regional contacts

Source: Deloitte Analysis, 2008
Similarly, 29% of the 46 practitioners aware of the PSFPI, were not aware of regional PSFPI contacts that could assist them. A further 23% were aware of the regional assistance but had not been in contact with anyone.

These findings are supported by the SFT/LACA survey of schools and local authorities in 2008 which found that only 35% of respondents had used Defra guidance on PSFPI and only 25% had used services from the Government Office for the Region or the Regional Development Agency.

Stakeholders substantiated the view that the guidance and support available has been under-used. They felt that generally the toolkits and other written information available on the Defra website was useful, but their nature was not necessarily ideal for encouraging action by procurement practitioners. Arguably there is too much guidance provided in a too fragmented and reactive way to be able to establish genuinely causal links between the PSFPI and moves towards more sustainable procurement:

Example comments from strategic interviews:

“They are swamping people with details”

“Have had some feedback that the toolkits on the PSFPI website are very good and that there is good information there. However, I know others view it as ‘death by toolkit’. There is the view that there is such a wealth of information there that it would kill you to get through it.”

“The toolkit is helpful but more tailored guidance is required for different parts of the food chain.”

Gaps in progress towards the PSFPI objectives

It was highlighted in section 4.2 that there appears to have been good progress made on some of the PSFPI objectives. However, it was a common view among stakeholders interviewed that progress has been limited. Many highlighted that other factors have been more influential where progress has been made (for example, government nutritional standards have been the key driver for increased availability of healthy and nutritious food in schools) and that the momentum of progress has particularly slowed in recent years.

There is evidence to support this in survey findings. For example:

- The mix of results within Defra’s second report on the proportion of **domestically produced food** in 2008 shows that not all areas of the public sector are equally committed:

  - Overall proportions of indigenous food procured by government departments, NHS Supply Chain and NOMS ranged from 90% in the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) to 45% for the STEPS contract covering 11 HM Revenue & Customs (HMRC) sites. Two of the main sectors of public expenditure on food, NOMS and MoD, had some of the lowest percentages of indigenous food (49% and 59% respectively).

  - Percentages are also low when UK produced food as a percentage of all food supplied is considered. Less than a third of all food supplied in DFID, HM Treasury and prisons, is UK produced. A further 5 departments (DCSF, Home Office National Police Improvement Agency, HMRC (Steps), NOMS and NHS Supply Chain) have less than 50% UK produced food relative to all food supplied.

---

27 SFT/LACA, School food procurement, procurement skills and sustainability survey, first draft of report to stakeholders, 15 December 2008.
There is also evidence of limited progress on cooperation as the majority of buyers do not appear to have been collaborating with other buyers, or encouraging collaboration between suppliers, distributors or wholesalers, according to recent studies:

- The SFT/LACA survey in 2008 found that only 36% of the 22 LAs who procured a catering service had procured collaboratively with other departments within the LA and only 1 had collaborated with another public body.
- The majority of procurement practitioners responding to the full survey for this evaluation (14 of the 20 respondents) had not been involved in procuring food or catering services collaboratively or in partnership with either other divisions or departments within their own organisation, or with another public sector body.

A review of the best practice examples also highlights gaps in progress:

“No all best practice case studies are that great and often do not have a holistic approach to sustainability, focusing on only one two areas such as local sourcing and organic.”

It would appear that there have possibly been too many objectives, not articulated in a coherent enough fashion, or taken up consistently enough, to constitute a comprehensive approach to sustainable food procurement.

2) Buyers don’t have the skills required to implement the initiative

Buyers, caterers, policy makers and other interest groups all highlighted the issue of a skills gap in public sector procurement when interviewed. There was a common feeling that the role is under-recognised and under-valued by public sector organisations generally.

“Procurement is a strong discipline in its own right but this is not recognised in the public sector – you don’t get the same level of professionalism in government as you do in private sector procurement.”

To achieve the objectives of PSFPI, purchasing needs to be done efficiently and effectively rather than purely in an economically advantageous way. This requires:

- Sophisticated buying, usually on a category basis recognising where it is more efficient and sustainable to buy in bulk, to collaborate, to source locally and so on;
- Intelligent drafting of terms, conditions and penalties in contracts to ensure that subcontractors are also bought in to meeting the aims of PSFPI; and
- Intelligent application of PSFPI objectives so that sustainable procurement is still in line with the particular objectives of the public sector organisation concerned.

Only 4 of the 20 procurement practitioners responding to the full survey for this evaluation felt that their staff were ‘very skilled’ in sustainable food procurement. None of the local authorities and only one central government department gave this response. The 2008 SFT/LACA study also found that 25% of Local Authorities felt that there were skills lacking in their existing school food procurement workforce.

To improve the situation, interviewees suggested more training and hands on support for procurement practitioners:

Example comments from strategic interviews:

“More tailored help and advice required...any additional funding should be for training.”
Example comments from strategic interviews (continued):

“Would be useful if the PSFPI focused more on the practical training of staff, for instance, by setting up regional training centres of excellence.”

“All very well that there is a lot of information out there, but procurers will still want someone to show them how to do it, more training, practical and hands on guidance.”

3) The initiative relies on enthusiastic individuals for success

A large part of PSFPI to date has been the development of static resources in the form of online tools and guidance that need activating by skilled and enthusiastic individuals.

It was beyond the scope of this evaluation to investigate best practice examples cited during this study to determine the impact of PSFPI on their achievements. However, it is clear that the great majority, if not all of these examples, were driven by passionate, enthusiastic individuals. This was certainly a view held by many of the stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation as the quotes below illustrate:

Example comments from strategic interviews:

“Champions are leading the way but their example is not being followed by the mainstream.”

“What has been achieved is owed to the passion, charisma and hard work of individuals...”

“Best practice examples have been driven by local enthusiasts. Little has changed on a national scale due to the PSFPI.”

“Across the piece, the strength of personal characteristics has driven the success of this initiative.”

This situation presents a risk for the initiative because widespread adoption will not be achieved if disproportionate time and effort continues to be required by a few individuals. There is also the risk that the good work to date could be lost when key individuals move on as much of this success is reliant on the strength of relationships. Examples were given during the interviews of particular regions and organisations where momentum has been lost following the departure of influential individuals. Yet turnover of personnel in the regions is, under the current arrangements, largely inevitable due to fixed term contracts, uncertainty associated with the funding and future of the role, and the feeling among many that “you need to move on to move up”.

4) There is a perceived cost barrier

There is a perception amongst procurement practitioners that implementing the PSFPI is costly and that sustainability and efficiency cannot both be achieved across all objectives. Their focus is largely on the financial cost yet the evidence obtained in recent studies, and as illustrated by a number of best practice examples, shows that implementing the PSFPI does not have to increase financial cost. It does however seem to require significant investment of time and resource (often from a few committed and enthusiastic individuals).

The importance of cost

In the current economic climate, cost will continue to sit “in a tier above” other considerations when procuring food and it is already felt that “PSFPI is trying to swim against the tide of rationalisation and cost cutting”. Many interviewees stated that contracts were still being let on price rather than value for money.

“PSFPI is fighting against forces to rationalise supply and cut costs.”
Recent reports indicate that the effects of increased financial pressure may already be taking their toll on PSFPI objectives:

- The 2007 Ipsos Mori Survey found that managing costs within budget was the joint second highest challenge for LAs and the second highest challenge for schools.

- The 2008 LEA survey showed that some LEAs were moving away from the principle of PSFPI, mostly because of cost as they needed to keep their service viable at a time of falling numbers and reduced or zero subsidy. The survey reported a 17% fall in LEAs adopting sustainable development policies.

- The 2007 Ipsos Mori survey also found that 88% of Local Authorities and 65% of schools reported that increasing financial pressures may have caused a change in the way in which food is procured.

- A report by Mintel in September 2008 considering the market for locally sourced foods also determined that “Price is regarded as the chief barrier to expansion of the market for locally sourced food.”

Decisions need to be made by individual organisations weighing up the economic sustainability of procurement decisions against social and environmental impacts. To date, PSFPI has not adequately addressed this issue.

"Cost will always be a priority and needs to be considered as part of the sustainability package...some compromise will be inevitable."

**Lack of understanding of whole life value for money**

Procurement officers are focused on achieving value for money which, many of the stakeholders interviewed for this study felt, equated to the cheapest price in most cases. Yet, OGC defines value for money as the “optimum combination of whole life cost and quality (or fitness for purpose) to meet the customer’s requirement.”

The emphasis on “whole life costs and quality” means that buyers can take account of a variety of factors, including running and disposal costs and quality aspects of the product or service, and not just the initial purchase price. Yet the purchase price continues to be the main driver of procurement decisions:

"In real terms, the sustainable procurement element is a bolt on, efficiency targets are the main focus. This is not to say that this is the right approach but simply how it is in practice."

There appears to be a lack of understanding amongst buyers and their superiors that to achieve longer term, whole life value for money, food procurement needs to be sustainable. Sustainability and efficiency should not be seen to be always in conflict. It is difficult to balance efficiency and sustainability targets but in the long term an unsustainable approach to food procurement will not be efficient. Similarly, a sustainable approach to food procurement is not economically viable, and therefore arguably unsustainable, if it cannot be achieved within budget. For example:

- If a catering establishment is more efficient, the savings made can be used to buy better quality produce; or

- Buying better quality goods can lead to less waste therefore saving money further down the food chain.

The NAO’s report on public food noted that:

“Increasing efficiency can have a positive impact on sustainability and nutrition by enabling organisations to use cost savings in some areas to help finance improvements in others.”
At Nottingham University Hospital their catering manager has procured local food on a large scale and in budget. Savings were made by taking a different approach to different products. For example, the hospital saved over £20,000 a year and received better quality produce and more flexible supply by procuring fruit and vegetables locally. Savings have also been made by buying better quality braising steak which although costs more on a per kilo basis than under the previous arrangement, costs less overall because 50 fewer portions are required due to the reduced shrinkage during cooking.28

**Time and resource costs**

As indicated above regarding the importance of individuals, time and resource costs can be a more significant barrier to implementing the PSFPI than the financial cost of procurement.

> “There are lots of best practice case studies out there. But these are from enthusiastic dedicated people who have proved that you can make a difference and achieve the objectives without increasing costs and without additional funding. Not every procurement manager is enthused. Many are not trained to think about anything other than cost.”

**Costs need to be considered on a case by case basis**

It would be unrealistic to say that adopting PSFPI can be completely cost neutral as there is variation between categories. Results from the survey for this evaluation found:

- No reports of cost increases from those practitioners increasing their procurement of UK and regional produce;
- Examples of cost decreases when there was an increase in the procurement of UK, regional, seasonal, farm assured and small/local supplier produce;
- Only in the case of increasing procurement of organic and fair trade produce did more respondents report cost increases than cost decreases or no impact;

**Figure 5.1.3: Cost impact of increasing food procured from PSFPI preferred sources**29

Source: Deloitte Analysis, 2008

---

28 Source: 'Hospital Caterer' October 2007 and information obtained from stakeholder interviews.
29 Figures in brackets are the number of respondents to each question.
• Only one cost increase was reported linked to conserving energy, reducing food packaging waste or recycling; but

Figure 5.1.4: Cost impact of taking steps to reduce energy, water and waste\textsuperscript{30}

\begin{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig5.1.4}
\caption{Cost impact of taking steps to reduce energy, water and waste}
\end{figure}

Source: Deloitte Analysis, 2008

• Cost increases were reported by the majority of respondents that increased healthy and nutritious food and choice of food for ethnic minority, cultural and religious groups.

Figure 5.1.5: Cost impact of increasing availability of healthy and nutritious food and availability and choice of food for ethnic minority, cultural and religious groups\textsuperscript{31}

\begin{figure}
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\caption{Cost impact of increasing availability of healthy and nutritious food and availability and choice of food for ethnic minority, cultural and religious groups}
\end{figure}

Source: Deloitte Analysis, 2008

\textsuperscript{30} Figures in brackets are the number of respondents to each question.

\textsuperscript{31} Figures in brackets are the number of respondents to each question.
Due to the differing cost implications of PSFPI objectives, caterers highlighted during the interviews that they would like to have more open communication with public sector organisations to discuss this. They felt that the current tendering process was too rigid and better outcomes could be achieved if they were able to speak to organisations about their priorities. For example, if an organisation prioritises the use of organic fruit and vegetables which cost more, the caterer could discuss other areas where costs may be saved.

It seems it is currently unrealistic to expect public sector organisations to be equally socially, environmentally and economically sustainable across all areas of food procurement. This is particularly the case where organisations such as prisons, schools and the armed forces, face the added pressure of delivering meals within a fixed low budget or in very specific conditions (e.g. for MoD personnel on active service overseas). Priorities have to be identified and appropriate decisions made.

5) The initiative would benefit from more visible political weight

The PSFPI is constituted predominantly as a set of tools and guidelines which aim to promote food safety, increase the consumption of healthy and nutritious food, mainstream good practice in food procurement and supply, and improve sustainable performance at each stage of the food chain. However, it has no regulatory framework and the initiative has been criticised by many of the stakeholders interviewed for its lack of high level support and strong steer from government.

In addition to the other points raised in this section, it is likely that there has not been widespread take up of PSFPI because when governed by cost, procurement officers will not seek to undertake such voluntary measures without a ‘push’ from ministers or a binding regulatory framework.

“There is a perception within the farming industry that government do not take it [PSFPI] seriously and are not committed to achieving the objectives.”

Summary

Take up of the PSFPI has been limited to date and currently there are only “islands of success” evident which owe much to the commitment and enthusiasm of key individuals. PSFPI has “piggy backed” on other initiatives and although the PSFPI’s achievements are commendable given the resource that was available, it now needs to move into the conscious of the majority and along that continuum into widespread action.

Sustainable sourcing must become a routine part of contract drafting and not an exceptional best practice example. Achieving widespread take up of the objectives of the PSFPI (whatever they may be going forward) is important to generate economies of scale and deliver a sustainable market for suppliers. This was recognised in Food Matters:

“We are all public sector food provision to reflect health policy aims, a sizeable ‘lead market’ could be created, similar to the Government’s plans for lead markets in low-carbon goods and services. This could catalyse the implementation of innovative catering and vending solutions, which could then be available to the whole market. Action across the whole of the public sector, rather than in a piecemeal way, could create a powerful demand-side lever in relation to the large contractors that dominate the market.”

5.2 It has not been clear to all stakeholders what the initiative is trying to achieve, or how progress will be measured

Many of the stakeholders interviewed, including those delivering the initiative, commented on the lack of clarity over what the initiative is trying to achieve or how progress will be measured. This evaluation found four key reasons for this:

1) The complexity of sustainability and what it means for food;
2) The number of PSFPI objectives and the lack of prioritisation or focus;
3) The lack of clarity around the definition of ‘local’; and
4) The lack of quantitative targets, common performance metrics or clearly defined goals.

1) The complexity of sustainability and what it means for food

The concept of ‘sustainable food’ is a complex area that requires the consideration of a number of factors across the whole value chain. During the stakeholder interviews it became clear that there are differing interpretations of what ‘sustainable food’ means and this has led to confusion and differing interpretations of PSFPI objectives.

If sustainability is the goal of a public sector food procurement initiative then it needs to be defined. Admittedly, this is easier said than done as sustainability requires consideration of social, economic and environmental factors and what constitutes ‘sustainable food procurement’ for one organisation will not necessarily be suitable for another.

This certainly presents a difficulty for caterers who want to clearly understand what they need to demonstrate to score well in their tender responses. For example, do they need to offer organic food to score well on sustainability criteria? If so, there will be a cost implication. However, if they can meet the sustainability criteria through actions such as local and seasonal sourcing then costs need not rise. Clearly this is an important dilemma as caterers could lose contracts just because they didn’t understand what the public sector organisation was looking for.

“A caterers are not sure...clear guidance as to the importance of sustainability issues during tenders is essential if they are to be addressed properly.”

A number of stakeholders felt that sustainable food procurement was simply about reducing the environmental footprint of public sector food procurement. Yet if this was the case, the levers used should be different. There is a growing body of evidence showing that, in terms of the environmental impact of households’ food consumption, the composition of our diet is more important than how and where food items are produced. Evidence on health and the balance of environmental analysis suggests that a healthy, low-impact diet would contain less meat and fewer dairy products than we typically eat today\(^{32}\). Public Sector organisations should therefore focus on re-designing menus which is something East Anglia Food Link highlighted that they had begun to facilitate. However, it is unlikely to be an attractive scheme to the majority and key groups such as livestock farmers and processors perceive that they could suffer from the consequences of reduced demand.

Other stakeholders felt strongly that PSFPI was not formulated as a sustainable development strategy, being driven primarily by a desire to support British farmers when it was established. It seems that the policy framework is now ready to be realigned “through a sustainable development lens”.

2) The number of PSFPI objectives and the lack of prioritisisation or focus

There are currently six priority objectives for the PSFPI and seven other important objectives. Overall, there was a lot of criticism of the number of objectives from stakeholders although many did appreciate the importance of the holistic approach to sustainable food procurement that the thirteen objectives represented. However, it seems that a key issue for many is the lack of clarity about what the initiative is trying to achieve and how progress will be measured which is compounded by the number of objectives.

Example comments from strategic interviews:

“What strikes you is how many objectives there are and how difficult it is to understand the meanings of some of the objectives and how difficult some of them are to measure.”

“It is difficult to remember the objectives as the language is very convoluted and they can seem a bit daunting – an easier to understand format is needed.”

“There certainly isn’t awareness of all objectives. A Public Sector procurer/head of catering would struggle to name more than 3 objectives of the PSFPI.”

“There is some support for the number of holistic objectives but also recognition that there needs to be some prioritisation so that people know where to start.”

Many of the stakeholders interviewed referred to the objectives as “woolly”, “wordy”, “unclear” and felt that it was difficult to know what they really mean. Consequently, different interpretations of the objectives have been noted across the public sector by suppliers.

“PSFPI doesn’t know what it wants to achieve and often falls back on the economic argument of the importance of business for SMEs as its reason for trying to encourage the sourcing of local food. However, many SMEs feed into the larger providers so moving away from larger providers supplying the public sector to SMEs supplying the public sector directly would perhaps only be displacing one SME for another and increasing the complexity of procurement for public sector buyers.”

Caterers interviewed highlighted a number of instances when buyers have not known what they want because of their lack of understanding of the objectives. A common example was the choice between ordering non-organic meat from Britain or imported organic meat- often buyers don’t know which is the better option. Similarly, caterers often don’t know which to offer – will they score better if they provide British or organic produce?

There needs to be fewer, clearer objectives and they need to be prioritised so that buyers know what to ask for and suppliers understand how things will be rated in the tendering process. The objectives should focus on the areas where this initiative can have the most impact and prioritisation might also be considered on a category or sector basis.

Example comments from strategic interviews:

“PSFPI needs to clarify its message and then prioritise its objectives and push them out again with renewed vigour.”

“Needs to be strategic and high level, rather than piecemeal and bottom up.”
3) The lack of clarity around the definition of 'local'

Increasing tenders from small and local producers and increasing their ability to do business is one of the primary objectives of the PSFPI. This objective has led to much confusion amongst buyers and suppliers who believe that pursuing local produce contravenes EU procurement laws. They also questioned the inclusion of the objective within the PSFPI and the definition of 'local'.

Perception that buying local contravenes EU procurement laws

All public procurements are required to comply with the EU Treaty of Rome of which the principles of non-discrimination and equal treatment, transparency, proportionality and mutual recognition to ensure free movement of goods and supplies still apply. This means, for example, that public sector buyers cannot restrict their purchases to specific locations or categories of suppliers.

There is a perception that the EU Treaty and procurement regulations prevent buyers from pursuing PSFPI objectives. They do place some limits on the tender process such as in the way contracts are advertised. However, this is mainly to ensure fairness and transparency and to prevent discrimination. Buyers can still achieve their objectives by working within the rules, which are designed to make the buyer consider exactly what they want from a contract at the start of the procurement process. It is when identifying need and at the specification stage that there is the most scope for considering sustainability issues.

For example, buyers can set requirements for delivery frequencies, freshness, taste etc. Such criteria can be used to identify which tenders are the most economically advantageous and may therefore encourage small and local suppliers to bid for more contracts.

Each tender has to be considered on a case by case basis. It isn't always going to be the local supplier that is the best value but sometimes it will be and this will be more likely where the requirements have been carefully considered at the start of the process.

Lack of clarity of what this objective is trying to achieve

Some stakeholders also questioned the inclusion of the ‘small and local producers’ objective within the PSFPI. Their main arguments were:

- ‘Food miles’ are a poor indicator of the environmental impact of food products;
- Small-scale production is not necessarily resource-efficient or low-impact;
- Evidence suggests that at some times during the year, transporting produce from other countries may have a lower environmental impact than heating or refrigerating produce grown in Britain; and
- There are social equity arguments for some imports – UK demand for fresh produce grown in Africa supports over 700,000 workers and their dependants33.

Yet supporting small and local producers can provide new market opportunities for farmers and small-scale food manufacturers, contribute to food security issues, strengthen social capital within communities and provide a focus for local economic development. When considering the sustainability of food procurement such economic and social considerations are to be weighed up alongside the environmental ones.

**Lack of understanding of 'local'**

The other key point made by stakeholders was that 'local' is not defined. For example, is 'local' referring to somewhere within walking distance, within the region, or within the UK?

Without a clear understanding of what 'local' is, buyers do not know what they are trying to achieve and suppliers do not know how they can meet their needs.

Many raised concerns about the practicalities of buying locally because of the economies of scale involved, their requirements for specific products, or their geographical location (e.g. if they were based in London). In such cases, a relatively narrow geographical view of 'local' was being taken.

Environmental concerns were also highlighted as the pressure to buy locally may encourage producers to produce food in a location and on a scale that is inefficient.

Like cost, locality is another factor to be considered when determining the best value tender. The objective, to increase tenders from small and local producers, aims to achieve this by encouraging more domestic producers to bid for public sector business – so increasing competition. ‘Local producers’ needs to be better defined to give clarity to buyers and suppliers who must apply the criteria. Just as procurement officers shouldn’t just go for the cheapest tender, nor should they just go for the nearest.

4) **The lack of quantitative targets, common performance metrics or clearly defined goals**

A common theme throughout the interviews was the issue of quantitative targets, common performance metrics or clearly defined goals. Although some felt that such rigid targets would hinder PSFPI by creating resentment, encouraging minimum effort and deterring innovation, the majority felt they would be of great benefit and ensure wider take up across the public sector.

**Example comments from strategic interviews:**

“Standards and regulation would be the key enabler.”

“There needs to be something tangible to aim for to get buy-in.”

“Mandatory specifications are needed. Guidelines are not going to persuade anyone.”

“A consistent approach to monitoring and measurement is needed.”

“Need to set tough targets and make government departments and local government accountable.”

“People will only ever do what they have to.”

There are, however, a number of standards and accreditation requirements already in existence plus a new set of food category standards under development by OGC. As well as stressing the need for more formal targets and metrics of sustainable food procurement in the public sector, stakeholders highlighted the need to clarify and consolidate these with existing requirements whilst ensuring that any “gaps are filled”.

Furthermore, it would be important to tie these measurements in with existing targets at a regional level. For instance, targets that drive sustainable consumption could become part of Local Area Agreement targets. These targets are the focus of local authorities and would bring food increasingly to the attention of the RIEPs who are focussed on helping local
authorities achieve these targets. Similarly, highlighting the contribution PSFPI objectives can make to local economic development would tie in to another important consideration of local authorities coming out of the Sub National Review and open up potential partnership working and funding from the RDA. Climate change targets are also on the agenda following the Climate Change Act 2008. Again, PSFPI objectives can contribute to these targets.

**Summary**

The lack of clarity about what the initiative is trying to achieve and how progress will be measured leads to a lack of momentum and diluted success.

In some cases success has been limited because the focus has been on one or two issues rather than a holistic picture of sustainable development. In other areas, success has been limited due to insufficient focus, spreading resources too thinly and providing small pots of money to a number of projects which do not have a significant impact especially when repeat funding isn’t available.

In the current economic climate, resources are increasingly constrained making it harder for both central government and the regions to develop strategies and deliver on initiatives. Targeting resources in the places where they will achieve the greatest outcomes in return for investment is key.

It will therefore be important to reduce the number of objectives, clarify their meaning and establish a way to monitor progress in ‘real time’. Doing this will ensure that everyone is working to the same goal, can identify and respond to performance on a regular basis, and consequently maximise the return on resources invested.

### 5.3 There are still supply side constraints which need to be addressed

To date, the PSFPI has focused primarily on the demand side of public sector procurement, helping organisations to express their demands more effectively. However, the initiative will only be a success if suppliers can respond to those demands.

A common view expressed by stakeholders was that buyers have been converted faster than suppliers are able to respond.

**Example comments from the stakeholder interviews;**

“There has been too much involvement with buyers and not enough with producers and those who work with small producers.”

The initiative hasn’t quite “got the cart and the horse moving together.”

Four key supply side constraints were often cited during this evaluation:

1) Insufficient capacity to supply some product categories;
2) Inability of small and local producers to break into existing supply chains;
3) Complexity of the Public Sector tendering process; and
4) Impracticalities of having numerous suppliers.
1) Insufficient capacity to supply some product categories

There is a clear need for food suppliers (producers, processors, manufacturers and distributors) to be fully engaged in efforts to advance the practice of sustainable food procurement and to be able to meet demand. This will involve, among other things, an element of capacity building along the supply chain in order to consistently supply the sustainable food required.

Currently, the capacity is not available in some products. Frozen lamb was a common example, particularly from those involved in procurement for the MoD, who stressed that they were unable to source frozen British lamb. They also highlighted the fact that buying British lamb was more expensive than buying New Zealand lamb despite the transport cost the latter must incur.

A collaborative food procurement programme would encourage more cooperation among public bodies to aggregate demand and to use national and regional framework contracts. Initiatives such as EFFP’s “Share to Supply” programme are working to establish the collaborative arrangements necessary among domestic producers to consistently supply the quality and quantity of produce required and meet the needs of this changing market.

However, a number of stakeholders felt that more needed to be done to ensure that the right supply is available. Prioritising issues by category was suggested as a way to get buyers and suppliers discussing the problem areas. Other suggestions included more training of business advisers so that they are better equipped to advise SMEs on public sector food procurement.

2) Inability of small and local producers to break into existing supply chains

Interest groups in particular, raised the concern that existing supply chains are too rigid, inflexible and consolidated for small and local producers to break into or run alongside. They felt this was especially the case given that there was a lack of resource and direction on how to do this.

The perception amongst those involved is that the existing supply chains are efficient and effective. Many are based on large scale procurement and can deliver a good price, consolidated distribution, lower transaction costs and much more.

Consequently, it is difficult to for producers to break into existing supply chains and there is no incentive for anyone to help them in.

3) Complexity of Public Sector tendering process

A long standing issue raised by all those involved in supplying the public sector is the complexity of the Public Sector tendering process.

Example comments from the stakeholder interviews;

“The complexity of the tendering process puts off small suppliers.”

“You need a Masters degree to understand them! Suppliers don’t have time to struggle.”

“There have been no moves to simply tenders.”

In response to concerns such as this, ‘Food Matters’34 recognised the need for greater commonality of approach across the public sector in England in procurement of food. This would mean:

---

• tenders and contracts would carry similar requirements;
• products supplied to the public sector would be less varied in specification and easier to quality assure;
• suppliers would be able to respond in a single common way to all public sector tenders; and
• suppliers and markets would be better able to plan ahead to meet known government requirements.

Although there may be cost implications of such a change, a process built around common standards should lead to efficiencies in the procurement process that, overall, would offset any increases in the cost of ingredients or training. Work has already begun in this area with the development and launch of 37 food category standards, collaboratively produced by the key food buying departments in the public sector and now used in current tendering processes by those departments.

Further practical support with the complexities of the public sector tendering process was suggested by stakeholders during the interviews. As well as calls for more hands-on support and advice when completing tenders, there was a demand for earlier advertising of contracts coming up for tender in a place that suppliers will be able to see and access.

"...a list of upcoming contracts on the website is needed. A week just isn’t long enough to do a good job of the tender."

Many caterers interviewed also raised the point that the process driven approach to tendering makes it difficult for suppliers to engage with Public Sector buyers to discuss issues such as cost, collaboration, menu options etc. To achieve the objectives of the PSFPI efficiently and effectively, more opportunities for communication and discussion between buyers and suppliers is needed outside of the current complexities and limitations of the tendering process.

4) Impracticalities of having numerous suppliers

It was highlighted in section 5.2 that there is much uncertainty and confusion around the objective to increase tenders from small and local producers and their ability to do business. There is a trend towards aggregation of supply which is leading to fewer, larger contracts and is increasingly squeezing out smaller producers. The PSFPI encourages action such as breaking contracts into lots to facilitate tenders from small and local producers. However, a key issue raised is that many public sector buyers find it impractical to have numerous suppliers. The MoD and prison service, for example, have strict security checks and controls on their suppliers and therefore want to keep numbers to a minimum. Many public sector organisations also rely on the refrigerated storage, warehouses and other storage and distribution services provided by their larger suppliers. Such large suppliers may also provide other services to the organisation such as cleaning and maintenance.

A number of stakeholders therefore stressed that the focus should be on ensuring that the larger tier 1 providers use small and local providers in their own sourcing. They felt that more resource should be focussed on developing regional hubs and supply networks in order to achieve this.

Summary

Public sector food procurement policy needs to address both the demand and supply side of the equation. There is still work to be done on the demand side but the balance of focus is likely to shift towards the supply side in the coming years as issues such as capacity,
collaboration and distribution are tackled. Unlike the demand side where achievements can be made relatively quickly, improving the supply side will be a longer term process.

5.4 Unclear who will own and deliver food procurement policy

There is a need to reconsider leadership and ownership of food procurement policy and delivery due to:

1) Unclear ownership of food policy at the national level;
2) Changing role of Government Office at a regional level; and
3) Unclear roles and responsibilities of facilitators.

1) Unclear ownership of food policy at the national level

As highlighted in section 3 of this report, the food, procurement and sustainability policy context is complex and can be confusing. Many departments have a key role to play including:

- Defra in relation to farming and the food industry;
- DCSF in relation to school food;
- Department for Health in relation to public health and nutrition (as well as hospital food);
- FSA in relation to food safety;
- Cabinet Office as the owners of the ‘Food Matters’ report and subsequent chair of the new Food Strategy Task Force; and
- OGC in relation to food procurement.

Therefore, depending on the position of the stakeholder being interviewed, who they felt should lead public sector food procurement going forward varied. For example:

- Buyers were more inclined to suggest OGC for “economic and legislative teeth” and with whom they have a stronger relationship; and
- Those focussed on health and wellbeing were more likely to suggest the Department for Health.

However, the majority still felt food policy was Defra’s responsibility despite concerns that “Defra is not an important enough Department to lead this.”

Example comments from the stakeholder interviews:

“OGC are in a good position to understand how it works ‘at the coal face’.”

“Over £2bn spent on food each year so it needs a weighty government department like the Department for Health behind it.”

“Defra are the best placed to lead on sustainability as the focus of other organisations such as the OGC is more on value for money and efficiency.”

Stakeholders also highlighted the importance to date of ministerial support and the key role previously played by Sir Don Curry and Lord Whitty in the success of the initiative. Such high
profile support is felt to be critical to the future success of sustainable food procurement in the public sector.

"Without the letters of support which Sir Don Curry wrote to fight my corner, I could not have achieved it."

2) Changing role of Government Office

The work of Government Offices is increasingly strategic and focussed on facilitation rather than delivery. This could lead to a gap in the delivery capability of the food procurement agenda in the regions from 2009.

Many of the regional PSFPI co-ordinators highlighted that their roles may come to an end next year due to the short term nature of their contracts and PSFPI funding. They therefore face the prospect of looking for new posts. Such people are hard to replace due to the knowledge and relationship based nature of their roles and their departure can lead to a loss of continuity. At the 14th meeting of the Government Office Regions Steering Group on 11 November 2008, there were regions currently without PSFPI coordinators and regions that were already unable to fund a coordinator next year.

Example comments from the stakeholder interviews:

“Government Offices are essential to delivery because they can influence a broad range of Public Sector bodies that wouldn’t listen to the central departments.”

“What is needed now is funding for a dedicated regional facility.”

3) Unclear roles and responsibilities of facilitators

Many PSFPI facilitators interviewed for this study, in addition to other interviewees who had been in contact with them, highlighted the lack of clarity around the roles and responsibilities of a PSFPI facilitator. The facilitators sit in different organisations within the regions, some were part of the Government Office, some sat in the RDA, and some sat in the regional food group or the RIEP. This adds to the confusion and leaves many facilitators feeling torn between their PSFPI objectives and the objectives of the organisation within which they work. This situation is further compounded by uncertain security of their role induced by the short term nature of the PSFPI funding.

Summary

Although a single department does not need to wholly own a future public sector food procurement initiative, the common view was that a strong leader does need to be identified to drive this forward. Currently, a ministerial and departmental focal point is missing.

The delivery issue also needs to be addressed and the roles of Government Office and PSFPI facilitators clarified so that the quality of delivery is maintained across regions.
5.5 Concluding thoughts

The emerging issues identified in this evaluation highlight a number of key points to be addressed in any future public sector sustainable food procurement initiative. As a priority, the core strategy, leadership and delivery issues should be tackled to:

- Establish clarity of purpose;
- Offer clear leadership;
- Establish an evaluation stream to measure performance in ‘real time’; and
- Deliver adequate training and support to buyers and suppliers.
6 Recommendations

As the analysis has shown, there have been some areas of success in driving the principles of sustainability into public sector food procurement in recent years, acknowledged to be attributable in part to the PSFPI. What is clear however is that a more intuitive approach, that responds to the prevailing conditions in a given location or institution, is required to facilitate continued progress towards a genuinely sustainable model for the procurement of food across the public sector. Future intervention needs to account for the changing factors acting on food – social, economic and environmental as well as the shifting policy landscape. With regards public sector food procurement, this evaluation and others have revealed areas of strength and weakness in the current delivery of support and future interventions should take account of this.

This section of the report considers three key questions:

1) Should there continue to be intervention to support sustainable public sector food procurement?

If continued intervention is necessary:

2) How should it be structured?

3) What should be delivered?

It is proposed that continued intervention is necessary because the results of this evaluation suggest that more effort is required to embed sustainable procurement principles across the public sector. Whilst pockets of best practice do exist they tend to be isolated and not mainstream in their application.

These recommendations together make up the package of activity and interventions thought to be required for a comprehensive approach to securing sustainable food procurement across the public sector and thus are presented in priority order.

6.1 The case for continued intervention

The overarching recommendation is that there should continue to be some intervention to encourage the public sector to lead by example and influence the supply chain for sustainable food in the UK.

The strategic context of food policy – the increasing public health, environment, price and supply chain sustainability concerns – alongside the influence and buying power of the public sector in this area, makes it unquestionable that the public sector should be leading by example on sustainable food procurement. Yet, without continued intervention it is very unlikely that the public sector will be able to develop and sustain a leading edge position in this regard.

The evidence collected in this evaluation and other studies shows that whilst the PSFPI has been a useful mechanism for establishing sustainable food on the agenda of a growing number of organisations, there is still some way to go before the majority of the public sector is genuinely implementing strategies to improve the sustainability of food procurement.

Without further intervention, the uncertainty around what constitutes sustainable food, the skills gap on both the supply and demand sides, supply side capacity constraints, and competing procurement priorities along with other issues identified in this report, will hinder
progress. Action will continue to lag significantly behind the increasing expectation that organisations, both public and private, pay regard to their wider impact in the course of their operations.

Intervention and policy mechanisms around sustainable food procurement in the public sector therefore need to be firmly focussed on addressing the gap between awareness and action.

**Figure 6.1.1: Participation in sustainable food procurement**

![Diagram showing participation levels: Unaware, Aware, Engaged, Active]

- **Unaware**: Does not consider sustainability at any stage of the food procurement process. Unaware of any support.
- **Aware**: Knows of sustainability issues. Aware that support is available.
- **Engaged**: Wants to implement sustainable food procurement. Has accessed support.
- **Active**: Includes sustainability criteria in tenders. Has used available guidance and support to achieve this.

*Source: Deloitte Analysis, 2008*

Ensuring that actions can be brought in line with aspirations will be a fundamental requirement of future intervention.

### 6.2 Recommendations for future intervention

Having established that there is a continued need for intervention; the purpose of that intervention and how it will be structured requires consideration.

A series of high level thematic recommendations are made below relating to the need to establish clarity of purpose and offer clear leadership within any future intervention.

Whether the PSFPI retains its name and evolves under the current banner, or a new identity for the package of interventions and support is developed is a minor point at this stage – determining the purpose and governance structure of a future programme of intervention is the priority.

#### 1) Establish clarity of purpose

It is recommended that the aims of any continued programme of intervention are simplified and reflect the four strategic objectives adopted by the Government in 'Food Matters'.

One of the challenges associated with sustainable procurement is the breadth of the debate regarding what constitutes sustainability, whether or not there is genuinely such a thing as
‘sustainable food’, or whether the most appropriate aspiration should be to procure food that at best minimises overtly negative consequences either socially, environmentally or economically. Rather than trying to establish a narrow definition of sustainable food that may not be achievable across the broad range of organisations that constitute the public sector, it is recommended that an ambitious, yet flexible set of parameters are established as a clear framework for the components of a sustainable approach to the procurement of food.

The PSFPI evolved to constitute some 13 objectives covering a range of topics including food safety, healthy eating, environmental protection, increased opportunities for small suppliers, increased use of organic produce, animal welfare, and working conditions for catering staff. Whilst comprehensive in its coverage, this list of objectives has arguably been one of the weaknesses in the delivery of the PSFPI. By attempting to acknowledge a granular list of priority objectives, the core drivers of sustainability have been diluted as it would seem that organisations have selected certain criteria rather than focussing on the sum of the parts.

It is recommended that the aims of any continued programme of intervention are simplified and aligned to the four strategic objectives adopted by Government in the July 2008 Cabinet Office report – ‘Food Matters’. Representing the four pillars of sustainable food, these strategic objectives are listed below alongside an initial interpretation for public sector food procurement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Matters Objective</th>
<th>The procurement of food by the public sector will:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement in the safety of food</td>
<td>Ensure that the public sector leads by example in food safety and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The changes need to deliver a further transition to healthier diets</td>
<td>Increase the consumption of healthy and nutritious food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more environmentally sustainable food chain</td>
<td>Demonstrate environmentally responsible sourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair prices, choices and access to food and food security through open and competitive markets.</td>
<td>Support open and competitive markets to facilitate long term food security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the four objectives recommended above for public sector sustainable food procurement were to be adopted, more specific detail in the form of strategic objectives under each of the aims will be required. For example:

**Aim**
Demonstrate environmentally responsible sourcing

**Objectives**
- Promote the seasonality of menus, utilising local produce that demonstrates environmentally responsible production and processing
- Seek to reduce energy consumption and associated emissions at all stages of the supply chain
- Adopt the eliminate, reduce, reuse, recycle, recovery continuum to minimise, and eliminate where possible, waste from food and catering to landfill
- Consider efficient use of water throughout the supply chain, and the minimisation of pollutants when procuring goods and service
It is anticipated that under each of the four broad themes there would be a basket of policy mechanisms and interventions to support the public sector in procuring food in a manner that supports the achievement of the aims and any more detailed objectives. Some of these levers and interventions will already exist (such as the PSFPI tools and guidance currently available), some will be planned (such as Healthier Food Mark) and some may need to be developed specifically to achieve these aims.

2) Offer clear leadership

Departmental and Ministerial leadership

It is recommended that Defra retains overall lead for sustainable food as a policy issue and within that public sector food procurement.

Within Defra, the Food and Farming Group (FFG) should have ownership for taking forward the recommendations in this report and coordinating the initiatives.

The OGC collaborative food strategy should provide the overarching governance structure for the management and delivery of improved public sector food procurement.

Where there are specific issues, other departments and organisations should take ownership and work alongside Defra and the OGC to establish appropriate packages of interventions and support.

Given the plethora of policy initiatives, either existing or planned around food, there is a need to establish clear ownership of public sector food procurement from a policy perspective. That is not to say that only one Department should be involved with this issue – it is apparent that there are some distinct issues with clear departmental interests and the involvement of multiple departments and public sector organisations will only serve to further embed the principles of sustainability across Government and the public sector – rather that a clear lead is required to ensure coherency across the policy landscape.

Sustainable food is a fundamental part of Defra’s departmental strategic objectives. Defra is best placed to deal at a strategic and policy level with issues of sustainable food at all levels of the supply chain as historically its remit has covered the supply chain from primary production right through to consumption. The overarching recommendation is therefore that Defra retains overall lead for sustainable food as a policy issue and public sector food procurement within that agenda.

Defra’s Food and Farming Group (FFG) lead on the development of food policy within Defra. FFG already manage Defra’s input to the key advisory bodies and the development of a more sustainable food system.

The Office of Government Commerce (OGC) is responsible for helping Government deliver value for money and improve sustainability on the Government’s estate through procurement. It has established a Collaborative Food Procurement Strategy to drive forward food procurement efficiency and effectiveness through better collaboration and improved value for money whilst also embedding a greater level of sustainability. Supporting the Strategy is a governance model based on the OGC’s category governance approach. It includes representation from all the main spending departments and other departments with a key policy interest in food procurement including, of course, Defra. Defra take the lead on the sustainability work stream which is responsible for ensuring that sustainability is embedded into public sector food procurement. The OGC category based approach, has proved effective in other areas and should be seen as the overarching Governance structure for the management and delivery of improved public sector food procurement. Defra should
continue to lead on the sustainability work stream to ensure that sustainability is fully embedded within the collaborative food procurement processes OGC aim to deliver.

Where there are specific or topical issues, other departments and organisations should take ownership and work alongside Defra and the OGC to establish appropriate packages of interventions and support. For example, it is imperative that the Department of Health works with Defra, the Department for Children, Schools and Families and others, such as the FSA, on food issues pertaining to diet and the link to health and wellbeing (this is currently happening in relation to the development of the Healthier Food Mark). With Defra’s overall leadership of food policy, a coherent and coordinated approach to providing mechanisms to facilitate the increased supply of healthy and nutritious food in public institutions will be established.

To cement Defra’s strategic leadership role and obtain the required traction across departments and other public agencies, it will be imperative for Defra to be backed by strong ministerial support on food policy issues. In particular, public procurement should be emphasised as one of the key drivers towards a more sustainable food system and long term food security for the UK. It is suggested that ownership for taking forward the recommendations in this report and co-ordination of the initiatives, including any future PSFPI-type initiative, should be managed from within FFG.

Advisory groups

It is recommended that the focus should be on leveraging existing groups and relationships – a new advisory group is not required.

There are several multi departmental advisory groups that have been established to consider the component issues of sustainable food including, at a strategic level including:

- the Strategy Task Force chaired by the Cabinet Office (as announced in ‘Food Matters’);35
- the newly established Council of Food Policy Advisers which will “focus on the practical policies needed to maintain UK and global food security and the long term sustainability of the food chain, following on from the recommendations on food made by the Prime Minister’s Strategy Unit Report” (the Rt Hon Hilary Benn MP, Secretary of State for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, 6 November 2008);36
- the cabinet sub-committee on food chaired by the Rt Hon Hilary Benn MP, Secretary of State for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DA(F)); and
- the Sustainable Farming & Food Strategy Delivery Group chaired by Sir Don Curry.

Each group provides a discussion forum for issues around sustainable food and public procurement ought to be a regular agenda item in these forums. In particular, the new sub-committee on food chaired by Hilary Benn should help to increase political exposure and clout on sustainable food issues and help coordinate work across government and Defra must ensure that public sector food procurement receives sufficient coverage as a topic for this group.

Given this range of established groups and the senior representation on them it does not seem necessary to establish an additional overarching advisory group for the purposes of sustainable public sector food procurement. Rather, the focus should be on leveraging

37 The sub-committee on food (DA(F)) is “To consider issues relating to food and to report as necessary to the Committee on Domestic Affairs”. See http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/secretariats/committees/ daf.aspx for further information.
existing relationships and groups to pursue these issues and agree joint working practices to
develop the required interventions. It may be necessary to establish time limited issue-
focussed groups, where there are particular points to consider, but overall the established
networks seem to be sufficient.

6.3 Recommendations for future delivery

Having addressed the issue of how a future public sector sustainable food intervention should
be structured, by clarifying issues of purpose and leadership, it is now necessary to consider
what should be delivered under the re-structured intervention.

Again, a series of high level thematic recommendations are made below relating to the need
to establish an evaluation stream for the programme with performance measurements,
deliver appropriate training, and review the existing infrastructure around sustainable food
procurement. Further development of a clear and prioritised implementation plan will be
required once the strategic aims of the initiative have been agreed.

1) Establish an evaluation stream for the programme and measure performance

The need for performance measures

It is recommended that for each of the four priority aims identified, and associated
objectives, a series of critical success factors and key performance indicators
(KPIs) should be created and built into an evaluation stream for the programme.

Despite improving data collection and measurement of performance being one of the PSFPI’s
13 objectives, there appears to have been limited progress in this area and the programme
lacks a continuous evaluation stream. This evaluation was restricted by the lack of targets
and measures set out to monitor progress and achievements of the PSFPI and the evaluation
highlighted a degree of uncertainty amongst stakeholders with regards to what the PSFPI is
specifically trying to achieve and how progress will be measured.

Qualitative discussions and guidance with regards sustainability can only ever have limited
effect. Quantifiable targets are the key way to track progress in ‘real time’, identify success,
enable faster dissemination of best practice and set the ambitious stretch targets required to
accelerate change.

A future sustainable public sector food procurement intervention therefore needs to have a
clear purpose and set out simple measures to track progress towards the agreed aims in a
quantitative manner. The approach needs to be flexible enough to take account of the
diverse public sector food landscape and be mindful of the resource implications. The
development of a set of simple measures will ensure that stakeholders (policy makers,
buyers, suppliers, delivery bodies and others) know what they are working towards and by
tracking progress they can consider the success (or otherwise) of different actions in ‘real
time’. The overarching recommendation is therefore that for each of the priority aims
identified and associated objectives, a series of critical success factors and key performance
indicators are identified and built into an evaluation stream for the programme.
Selecting appropriate metrics and measures

Current and emerging targets/standards should be adopted - new metrics should be developed only as a last resort where there are specific gaps to be filled.

Further due diligence work should be undertaken to map existing targets/standards against the aims of sustainable food procurement.

There has been much activity in recent years in establishing metrics and measurable targets for sustainability objectives. However, the measurement of sustainability is notoriously complex and standardised sets of metrics are only just emerging in some areas utilising a range of indicators such as:

- CO2 emissions during production processing and transport;
- volume of sugar, salt and fat in foods;
- impact of primary production on the natural environment;
- volume of meat sourced locally; and
- percentage of organic food used.

The framework for measuring sustainability remains fragmented and there are few nationally recognised targets that enjoy uptake across the whole supply chain. Therefore, establishing quantitative targets to track the performance of organisations in respect of sustainable food will be difficult and constrained by the technical ability to measure the impact of certain actions. In addition, determining the number at which a certain metric is sustainable is dependent on many factors, often unique to a particular location or organisational circumstance. That said, this evaluation reveals that the lack of quantitative targets and measures has been a key barrier to attaining improved sustainability across the supply chain and therefore it is recommended that effort is invested in establishing measurable targets and standards to track progress.

Standards and award schemes are increasingly being adopted as a way of promoting model behaviours and assuring performance at pre determined levels. There are an increasing number of these schemes that the public sector can use to establish targets with regards to certain elements of sustainability. A few examples of current schemes are provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nutrient-based and food-based guidelines | • These guidelines have been produced for caterers and others involved with food in public sector institutions on behalf of the Food Standards Agency.38  
• Introduction of the guidelines in schools is governed by the School Food Regulations (2007).                           |
| "5 A DAY" programme         | • Public Sector organisations (and others) can apply to use the logo to highlight healthier options on menus and in promotion material if certain criteria are met relating to portion size, fat, sugar and salt levels.39 |
| LEAF marque                 | • A standard based on Integrated Farm Management (IFM), which integrates beneficial natural processes into modern farming practices using advanced technology.40 |
| Red Tractor                 | • The Red Tractor logo, owned by the Assured Food Standards organisation, shows that food meets specific standards of production relating to food                                                    |

---

40 http://www.leafuk.org
### Scheme | Overview
--- | ---
Food for Life Partnership Mark | • An award scheme led by the Soil Association for the transformation of the food culture within schools.
• Criteria for awards include the proportion of food freshly prepared, the number of seasonal school meals served, the range of organic items served, sources of fish, improvements to nutrition, an increase in school meal take-up and establishment of a cooking club.

In addition, the Healthier Food Mark is currently being developed in England following recommendations in ‘Food Matters’:

### Scheme | Overview
--- | ---
Healthier Food Mark | • The Healthier Food Mark is to be used to signal where public sector caterers are providing healthier, lower-impact food.
• The Healthier Food Mark will build on existing FSA and other guidance.
• The Mark will be awarded to participating public sector institutions that achieve specified standards for their catering services. The initial focus of the Mark will be on meeting general guidelines on food (e.g. servings of fruit and vegetables, meat and fish), macro-nutrients (fat and added sugar) and salt. Caterers will also be asked to meet agreed environmental standards as part of the Mark’s criteria.
• It was recognised in Food Matters that the criteria (standards) will need to be flexible to accommodate the needs and priorities of different public sector organisations. For example, the nutritional content of a meal in a care home will need to be different to that in a staff canteen.
• Public bodies will be invited to consider the requirements of the Mark in procuring food contracts. Guidelines will be produced for both buyers and caterers explaining sustainable food and the applicator of the Mark although adoption of the standards required to achieve the Healthier Food Mark will be voluntary.
• Government will explore the possibility of using an external standards body to recognise the Healthier Food Mark.
• The Mark will be developed and piloted in central government staff canteens, HM Prison Service and NHS services, to assess its practicality and impact in each institutional setting. Following these pilots, the Government will develop options for rolling out the scheme across the public sector in England. Subject to the development of proposals, experience in the voluntary phase and consultation, and an assessment of the Mark’s financial impact, the Government will consider whether compliance should be made compulsory by 2012 for central government departments and their agencies and for prisons in England. As the scheme progresses, all public bodies in England will eventually be encouraged to sign up to this promise of better food on the public plate.

The development by the European Commission of food related sustainability criteria as part of its Green Public Procurement proposals will be an important influence in this area. Any

---

42 [http://www.foodforlife.org.uk/awards](http://www.foodforlife.org.uk/awards)
nationwide agreed criteria, and any decision on how progress against those criteria is measured, should be compatible with the EU proposals.

Further due diligence work is required to map existing targets/standards against the aims of a future intervention in public sector sustainable food procurement, once those aims and objectives have been agreed. It will then be possible to determine where any gaps exist and consider what new measurements could be developed to monitor progress in such areas. However, given the extensive range of standards, targets and awards already in existence in relation to food, and particularly in light of the development of the Healthier Food Mark, any future intervention in public sector sustainable food procurement should adopt existing measurements to demonstrate progress on the majority of its aims and objectives. A rationalisation of the number of awards and marks in this area to simplify the system for the supply chain, procurement chain and consumers would be beneficial. Only after such due diligence will it be possible to establish the optimum system of measures for sustainable food procurement.

Flexible standards and awards

A tiered system of recognition of adherence to the principles of sustainable food procurement should be considered with the flexibility to accommodate the needs and priorities of different public sector organisations.

The majority of stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation felt that clearly defined goals, targets and metrics were required so that those involved in public sector food procurement have clarity of purpose and understanding of the target level of performance they should seek to achieve. In particular, it was felt that having a tangible ‘award’ or standard to aim for would encourage buy-in and focus. It is therefore recommended that a system of recognition for sustainable food procurement should be established based on the metrics adopted for measuring progress towards sustainable food procurement.

To be optimally effective, any award criteria will need to be flexible to accommodate the needs and priorities of different public sector organisations with regards to sustainable food procurement. For example, care homes have particular nutritional requirements and the MoD has particular requirements in relation to the life span and storage of food served to troops. The criteria will also need to remain open to the incorporation of new metrics and methods of measurement as they develop.

One option for the construct of this is to design a tiered system of adherence to the principles of sustainable food procurement. This could work as an overarching accreditation scheme, starting with entry level recognition for organisations working towards the development of a sustainable food procurement strategy and moving up through a tiered system to accredit organisations as they reach a certain level of ‘sustainability’. This might be based on the number of metrics/actions they hit (indicated by adherence with existing industry standards or awards), or each metric/action might have different targets or levels of performance associated with different levels of accreditation adding up to a cumulative total.

The opportunity to progress to higher levels should be flexible to encourage ambition and innovation in sustainable food procurement across the public sector. It is important that an organisation’s enthusiasm for sustainable food procurement is not stifled because they are constrained in a particular area by inflexible targets as what constitutes sustainable food procurement will differ for each public sector organisation.

This type of system could work across the supply chain from producers to processors right through to procurers providing a standardised system that would be recognisable to all in the sector. Public sector procurers may write minimum standards into their contracts to encourage uptake by private sector suppliers. By standardising the requirements from the demand side, the tender process may also be simplified as each tender would likely require a
minimum of entry level adherence and more points would be awarded for the higher tiers of accreditation with price being an additional and appropriately weighted criterion.

Consulting with other public sector organisations will be important during the development of such a system to better understand their needs and constraints in relation to sustainable food procurement. A pilot of the scheme (or several pilots across different areas of the public sector) should also be considered before roll-out.

Detailed due diligence is required to determine which existing standards and metrics are appropriate to be used in this context, where there are standards in development that may be applicable, and where the creation of new measures and standards needs to be considered. The implementation and assurance of the schemes will depend on the nature of the measures and metrics to be used and the degree of diligence required to assure performance against these.

**Definition of terms**

Key terms used in the aims, objectives or measurement criteria, should be clearly defined and/or their application explained.

On a number of occasions during this evaluation, the ambiguity of terms was raised as a barrier to the implementation of the PSFPI. The issue of ‘local’ food was one which caused particular concern.

It is not the place of a future public sector sustainable food procurement initiative to define terms such as ‘sustainability’ or ‘local’ in the context of food but it will be necessary for the application of those terms to be explained in the context of sustainable food procurement, particularly where they relate to metrics and measurements.

2) **Provide support and training**

**Direct support**

It is recommended that hands-on support is provided to encourage more widespread take-up of sustainable food procurement across the public sector. This support should be delivered on a regional basis although a pilot should be launched to determine the optimum funding and working arrangements.

It would seem that one of the challenges in implementing more sustainable procurement policies is the significant human and financial resource required at the outset within the procuring organisation to establish the new supply relationships, influence decision makers and institute cultural change. Anecdotal evidence from practitioners suggests that guidance and information provides useful support but that often what would expedite the process of moving to a more sustainable model of procurement is access to expert advice and support from individuals or organisations active in establishing sustainable procurement regimes.

There seems to be an emerging business case for investment in some dedicated support resource for certain organisations that do not have the skills or capacity to pursue the full remit of a sustainable food procurement strategy without third party support. This is particularly relevant if the system of quantifiable metrics that enable organisations to ‘earn’ certain accreditations is introduced as they will then require further short term support to establish their current performance and develop a strategy to move them towards the next level of accreditation.

It is recommended that support be made available on a geographic basis - with regional seemingly the optimum level at which to deliver support, whilst recognising that supply
chains operate across regional boundaries. This might be a dedicated full time resource in an existing organisation, such as the Business Link or RDA, or part of an existing role.

The support delivered should include advice from procurement experts, brokering of relationships, development of collaboration agreements, advice on how to structure tenders and how to record performance against metrics. Although it would be focussed on the procurer in the first instance the support should be available across the supply chain including caterers, processors and primary producers. On the supply-side further hands-on support should also be provided to assist with the completion of tender documents.

Once again, a pilot approach in some regions may be the best way to proceed initially to determine the optimum funding and working arrangements.

Training

It is recommended that training is provided either through classroom based courses or e-learning and e-assessment.

In addition to hands on support, training should be provided to ensure a base level of understanding of sustainable food procurement across the public sector. This training may take the form of a nationally designed classroom-based course delivered regionally through the Business Link, RDA, RIEP, or through a qualification body such as the Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply (CIPS). Alternatively it may take the form of e-learning and an online e-assessment which practitioners must pass in order obtain a certificate or other accreditation in sustainable food procurement (perhaps awarded by CIPS and linked to their existing qualification schemes). The training may be standalone or build on existing sustainable procurement training such as that provided by the Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges (EAUC), which has developed sustainable procurement training as part of their work under Defra’s Environmental Action Fund (EAF). The project provides support to universities and colleges wanting to integrate sustainability into procurement.

Training in sustainable procurement, including food procurement, also forms part of the plans for implementing the EU’s Green Public Procurement proposals. Any training developed in response to the proposals in this report should be consistent with those plans.

It will be particularly important for the sustainable food procurement training to explain how to record performance on metrics and how to write standards into contracts in order to attain these measures. The training should also cover points such as:

- The aims and objectives of sustainable food procurement in the public sector;
- The need for sustainable food procurement;
- Incorporating sustainable food into tenders and recognising alternatives to existing processes (including contents in ITTs, KPIs and other specifications);
- Managing numerous suppliers;
- Life cycle assessment and costing; and
- Compliance issues (debunking the concerns about conflicts with EU Directives).

Again, although it would be focussed on the procurer in the first instance, the training should be available across the supply chain including caterers, processors and primary producers. On the supply-side further training could also be provided looking specifically at how to complete tender documents.

Further development of the training options looking at content, cost, delivery methods and so on, will be required when the aims, objectives and associated sustainable food procurement metrics are established.
3) Review procurement and distribution infrastructure

It is recommended that Defra undertake a review of existing procurement and distribution infrastructure to determine gaps in provision, weaknesses in infrastructure, and to identify strengths and promote best practice.

Supply-side constraints were identified during this evaluation as a barrier to the further uptake and development of sustainable food procurement in the public sector. Key points raised included infrastructure constraints, the need for capacity building in some product categories (e.g. red meat) and greater collaboration. Certainly the need for further development of regional ‘hubs’ was a common recommendation from stakeholders as they would tackle two of the key obstacles faced by small and local producers:

- **Economies of scale** – Small and local providers often find it difficult to supply consistent quality and quantity of produce throughout the year. As numerous sources supply a hub, economies of scale can be maintained.

- **Distribution** – High frequency, low value drops make supplying the public sector too expensive for farmers. EFFP have done some work on this but the common view is that small producers need to be able to supply a regional hub or wholesaler to make this system work in practice.

Local food hubs have been shown to work well with supermarkets and some stakeholders interviewed were calling for funds to construct regional dedicated facilities for public sector procurement which could then be commercially managed (for example, on a 0% interest basis with a sensible claw back period).

However, in view of the report by Henry Brown and John A Geldard in August 2008, ‘Supplying Local Food to Mainstream Customers’, it is clear that in the first instance there is a need to investigate the performance of existing hubs in order to:

- raise awareness of the benefits of hubs;
- share best practice;
- raise the efficiency of existing hubs; and
- encourage public sector buyers to give hubs every opportunity to tender for contracts.

A detailed research piece and industry ‘gap analysis’ is required to identify where the procurement and distribution infrastructure is lacking, or where investments have been made that have not had the desired impact to determine what the weaknesses have been and indeed to identify areas of best practice. Brown and Geldard (2008) indicate that such research could draw on the findings of the IGD Food Chain Centre and the Red Meat Industry Forum, which have both studied efficiency and spread of best practice. In addition, the research should consider best practice distribution in other markets such as healthcare, in order to find ways of raising the efficiency of existing food hubs.

This research may promote the benefits of coordinated and collaborative infrastructure to producers, suppliers and procurers, highlight priorities for any further development of distribution channels, and identify best practice which can be shared and potentially replicated. It is expected, as supported by Geldard and Brown’s research (below), that a focus on strengthening existing infrastructure and distribution channels, rather than setting up new ones, would be the most effective route to improving the sustainability of procurement.

---

4) Share best practice with the private sector

Explore opportunities to share best practice with the private sector to encourage wider application of sustainable food procurement.

Although this evaluation and the initiative focus on sustainable food procurement in the public sector, there is much to be gained from knowledge exchange between the public and private sectors. There are areas of best practice on both sides that could be shared and built upon and the progress made under the PSFPI to date and in the future should be promoted to private sector procurers and others in the supply chain. The support and guidance made available under the initiative going forward should consider applicability to private sector procurers to ensure the widest uptake.

Elements of future training, performance measurement and support systems could also be shared with the private sector and these opportunities should be explored further by Defra as the overall lead for sustainable food policy.

6.4 Summary of recommendations

In summary, the recommendations are:

1) There should continue to be some intervention to encourage the public sector to lead by example and influence the supply chain for sustainable food in the UK;

2) The aims of any continued programme of intervention should be simplified and reflect the four strategic objectives adopted by the Government in ‘Food Matters’;

3) Defra should retain overall lead for sustainable food as a policy issue and within that public sector food procurement;

4) Within Defra, the Food and Farming Group (FFG) should have ownership for taking forward the recommendations in this report and coordinating the initiatives;

5) The OGC collaborative food strategy should provide the overarching governance structure for the management and delivery of improved public sector food procurement;

6) Where there are specific issues, other departments and organisations should take ownership and work alongside Defra to establish appropriate packages of interventions and support;

7) The focus should be on leveraging existing groups and relationships – a new advisory group is not required;

8) For each of the four priority aims identified, and associated objectives, a series of critical success factors and key performance indicators (KPIs) should be created and built into an evaluation stream for the programme;
9) Current and emerging targets/standards should be adopted - new metrics should be
developed only as a last resort where there are specific gaps to be filled;

10) Further due diligence work should be undertaken to map existing targets/standards
against the aims of sustainable food procurement;

11) A tiered system of recognition of adherence to the principles of sustainable food
procurement should be considered with the flexibility to accommodate the needs and
priorities of different public sector organisations;

12) Key terms used in the aims, objectives or measurement criteria, should be clearly
defined and/or their application explained;

13) It is recommended that hands-on support is provided to encourage more widespread
take-up of sustainable food procurement across the public sector;

14) This support should be delivered on a regional basis although a pilot should be
launched to determine the optimum funding and working arrangements;

15) Training should be provided either through classroom based courses or e-learning
and e-assessment;

16) Defra should undertake a review of existing distribution and procurement
infrastructure to determine gaps in provision, weaknesses in infrastructure and to
identify strengths and promote best practice; and

17) Explore opportunities to share best practice with the private sector to encourage
wider application of sustainable food procurement.

### 6.5 Actions and next steps

A number of high level thematic recommendations have been presented relating to the
support and delivery structure of a future intervention in public sector food procurement. The
next step for Defra will be to establish the support structure, taking into account the above
recommendations, before work on measuring performance and delivery can commence in
earnest. The six initial priority actions for Defra are therefore to:

1) Propose and confirm that Defra will be the lead department for sustainable food policy;

2) Agree the principle of continued intervention in sustainable food procurement in the
public sector;

3) Consult on the strategic aims of future intervention;

4) Agree specific objectives of future intervention;

5) Undertake detailed due diligence work to map existing metrics and assurance schemes
against the agreed aims; and

6) Undertake research and gap analysis around distribution and procurement
infrastructure.
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Annex 3 – Strategic interview guide

Below is the basic interview guide which was used during the stakeholder interviews. It should be noted that the approach and direction of conversation varied according to each individual organisation’s involvement with the PSFPI.

Section 1 – About you

1) Name / Role / Organisation
2) What has been your involvement in the Public Sector Food Procurement Initiative?

Section 2 – PSFPI to date

3) What is your view of the Public Sector Food Procurement Initiative?
4) What do you think are the most positive aspects of the initiative?
1) What areas of best practice have you identified?
2) Can you identify any barriers that have prevented the initiative from being more successful?

Section 3 – The future of the PSFPI

3) What are the key enablers of sustainable procurement in the public sector with regards food?
4) What are the key barriers?
5) How do you think sustainable food procurement policy should develop in the public sector? Should the PSFPI continue to be part of this policy? If yes, how should it develop? If no, why not?
10) Who do you see as leading the sustainable food agenda? Why?
11) What do you think your involvement in sustainable food procurement will be going forward?

Section 4 – Other

12) Explore further points raised in relation to the achievement, or not, of the PSFPI’s objectives.
Annex 4 – Survey questions

Below is a textual representation of the online survey which procurement practitioners in central government departments, prisons and hospitals were requested to complete.

SECTION 1 - ABOUT YOU

Background

1. Please provide the following information about your organisation:
   a) Please select the category of your organisation.
      - Local Authority
      - Central Government Department
      - School
      - Hospital
      - Prison
      - Ministry of Defence
      - Other (please specify)
   b) Please enter your organisation’s name.
   c) If you are procuring food for anyone other than your own organisation (e.g. a local authority procuring food for a school) please state who you procure food for.

2. Please also provide the following details if you are happy to do so: (Information provided will help inform our results, however, no comments made in this survey will be attributed to individual respondents.)
   - Name (optional)
   - Telephone number (optional)
   - Email Address (optional)
   - Department / Division (optional)
   - Job title (optional)

Your procurement

3. Please select the option/s from the list which best describe your procurement model:
   a) Procure an outsourced catering service
   b) Provide a single in-house catering service
   c) Procure catering services and provide in-house catering
   d) Procure food directly from producers e.g. farmers
   e) Procure food from wholesalers
f) Procure separately for the supply, delivery and service of food

g) Procure other services relating to food (e.g. kitchen equipment hire)

h) Other (please specify)

4. In the 2007/08 financial year, what was your total spend on food and catering service procurement?

- Less than £50,000
- £50,000 to £250,000
- £250,001 to £500,000
- £500,001 to £1,000,000
- More than £1,000,000

5. a) We understand that value for money, budgetary constraints and ensuring food safety are critical considerations when procuring food and catering services. In addition, which of the following factors also influence your procurement decisions?

Please rate the following factors as either ‘Very important’, ‘Important’, ‘Necessary consideration’, ‘Not important’, or ‘Not considered’, and add any others that influence your organisation.

- Increasing tender opportunities for small and local producers / providers to supply your organisation
- Reducing environmental impact / carbon footprint
- Providing healthy / nutritious food
- Providing organic or fairly traded food
- Increasing cooperation among buyers, producers and along supply chains
- Other (please specify)

b) Please select the three factors from the list above that would most influence your procurement decisions after value for money, budget and safety.

SECTION 2 - AWARENESS OF PSFPI GUIDANCE

6. a) Do you currently seek information relating to sustainable food procurement from the following sources? [YES/NO]

- Defra website or publications
- OGC website or publications
- Other Government Departments website or publications (e.g. DCSF, MoD)
- NHS Purchasing and Supply Agency website or publications
- FSA website or publications
- School Food Trust website or publications
- Government Office or Regional Development Agency
- The Mayor’s London Food Strategy
- Private consultant
- Other (please specify)

b) For each option, if yes, how useful do you find this source?
   - Extremely useful
   - Very useful
   - Quite useful
   - Not useful

c) For each option, if yes, how frequently do you access this source?
   - Regularly (i.e. more than once a month)
   - Occasionally (i.e. less than once a month)

7. a) Are you aware of the Public Sector Food Procurement Initiative (PSFPI)? [YES/NO]
   If your answer to Q7 was no please skip to question 11
   If your answer to Q7 was ‘YES’:
   i) When did you become aware of the PSFPI?
      - 2003
      - 2004
      - 2005
      - 2006
      - 2007
      - 2008
   ii) How did you become aware of the PSFPI?
      - Defra communication
      - Defra website
      - Colleague
      - Government Office
      - RDA
      - At a meeting (please specify the nature of the meeting)
      - Other (please specify)
      - Don’t know

8. a) Have you used the following PSFPI guidance? [YES/NO]
   a) Catering Services and Food Procurement Toolkit
b) DIY Guide to implementing the PSFPI – advice for practitioners

c) How to increase opportunities for small and local producers when aggregating food procurement – guidance for buyers and specifiers

d) Putting PSFPI into practice: advice for promoting healthy food and improving sustainability and efficiency

e) PSFPI case studies

f) Other guidance (please specify)

b) If your answer to Q8(a) was ‘YES’ for any of the options:

i) At which stage of the procurement lifecycle did you use this guidance? Please select all that apply.
   - When writing the ITT
   - When scoring tenders
   - Throughout
   - Other (please specify)

ii) How useful did you find it?
   - Extremely useful
   - Very useful
   - Quite useful
   - Not useful at all

b) If your answer to Q8(a) was ‘NO’ to any of the options, for each:

i) Why haven’t you used this PSFPI guidance?
   - Not aware of it
   - Not useful
   - Too complicated
   - Other (please specify)

9. Overall, to what extent has the PSFPI influenced food procurement in your organisation?
   - Significantly
   - To some extent
   - A little
   - Not at all

10. a) Are you aware that there is a regional PSFPI contact in the Government Office and RDA that can assist you?
   - Yes – aware and have been in contact with the GO
   - Yes – aware and have been in contact with the RDA
   - Yes – aware and have been in contact with both the GO and RDA
b) If your answer to Q10(a) was 'YES', and you have been in contact:

i) Why did you get in contact?
- I did not understand the PSFPI guidance
- I needed help implementing the PSFPI guidance
- I was invited to a seminar / training session led / attended by the GO contact
- They contacted me
- Other (please specify)

ii) How useful did you find the contact at the Government Office and/or Regional Development Agency?
- Extremely useful
- Very useful
- Quite useful
- Not useful

SECTION 3 - INFLUENCE OF PSFPI

Standards and specifications

11. a) In your contracts, do you include any additional standards / specifications in the following areas which exceed mandatory or minimum regulatory requirements? [YES/NO]
   
   a) Nutrition e.g. FSA ‘eat well’ plate
   b) Primary producers e.g. organic certification, animal welfare standards
   c) Food safety
   d) Other (please specify)

b) For each option (a) to (d) in Q11(a), if your answer was ‘YES’:

i) Please specify what additional standards/ specifications you include.

ii) What prompted the inclusion of these terms in your contracts?
- Customer demand
- Environmental considerations
- Other guidance
- Other

iii) Did you access the PSFPI guidance to help you achieve this? [YES/NO]

iv) If ‘YES’, how useful was it?
- Extremely useful
- Very useful
- Quite useful
- Not useful at all

v) Has including these specifications had any impact on cost?
- Yes – cost has increased
- Yes – cost has decreased
- No impact
- Don’t know

Health and nutrition

12. a) Have you increased the availability of healthy and nutritious food in your organisation in the last 5 years above the mandatory or minimum regulatory requirement?
- Yes – significant increase
- Yes - some increase
- No change
- Don’t know

b) If your answer to Q12(a) was ‘YES’:
   i) What prompted this increase?
   - Customer demand
   - Government guidance
   - Other guidance
   - Other (please specify)

   ii) Did you access the PSFPI guidance to help you achieve this? [YES/NO]

   iii) If ‘YES’, how useful was it?
   - Extremely useful
   - Very useful
   - Quite useful
   - Not useful

   iv) Has increasing the availability of healthy and nutritious food had any impact on cost?
   - Yes – cost has increased
   - Yes – cost has decreased
   - No impact
   - Don’t know

c) If the answer to Q12(a) was ‘NO CHANGE’:  

i) Why have you not increased the availability of healthy and nutritious food?
   - Cost
   - No customer demand
   - Products not available
   - Products difficult to source
   - Already providing this sufficiently 5 years ago
   - Other (please specify)

13. a) Have you increased the availability and choice of food for ethnic minority, cultural and religious groups in your organisation in the last 5 years above the mandatory or minimum regulatory requirement?
   - Yes – significant increase
   - Yes - some increase
   - No change
   - Don’t know

b) If your answer to Q13(a) was ‘YES’:
   i) What prompted this increase?
      - Customer demand
      - Government guidance
      - Other guidance
      - Other (please specify)
   ii) Did you access the PSFPI guidance to help you achieve this? [YES/NO]
   iii) If ‘YES’, how useful was it?
      - Extremely useful
      - Very useful
      - Quite useful
      - Not useful
   iv) Has increasing the availability and choice of food for ethnic minority, cultural and religious groups had any impact on cost?
      - Yes – cost has increased
      - Yes – cost has decreased
      - No impact
      - Don’t know

c) If the answer to Q13(a) was ‘NO CHANGE’:
   i) Why have you not increased the availability and choice of food for ethnic minority, cultural and religious groups?
      - Cost
      - No customer demand
- Products not available
- Products difficult to source
- Already providing this sufficiently 5 years ago
- Other (please specify)

The environment

14. a) In the last 5 years have you taken steps to do any of the following in relation to food procurement which exceeds the mandatory or minimum regulatory requirement? [YES/NO] This may include steps taken by you directly or through encouraging your suppliers to take action.
   a) Conserve energy
   b) Conserve water
   c) Reduce food waste
   d) Reduce food packaging waste
   e) Recycle
   f) Other (please specify)

b) For each option (a) to (f), if your answer for Q14(a) was ‘YES’:
i) What prompted you to do this?
   - Customer demand
   - Environmental considerations
   - Government guidance
   - Other guidance (please specify)
   - Other (please specify)

ii) Did you access the PSFPI guidance to help you achieve this? (YES/NO)

iii) If yes, how useful was it?
   - Extremely useful
   - Very useful
   - Quite useful
   - Not useful at all

iv) Have your actions in these areas had any impact on cost?
   - Yes – cost has increased
   - Yes – cost has decreased
   - No impact
   - Don’t know
Small and local producers

15. a) Are tenders from small and local food producers actively encouraged by your organisation when procuring food e.g. by splitting contracts into lots? [YES/NO]

b) If your answer to Q15(a) was ‘YES’:

i) How have you encouraged tenders from small and local food producers?

- Customer demand
- Government guidance
- Other guidance (please specify)
- Environmental considerations
- Quality of produce
- Desire to support British farmers
- Desire to support the local community/ economic development
- Other (please specify)

ii) What prompted you to actively encourage this?

iii) Did you access the PSFPI to help you achieve this? [YES/NO]

iv) If ‘YES’, how useful was it?

- Extremely useful
- Very useful
- Quite useful
- Not useful

v) Are tenders from small and local food producers competitive on cost?

- Yes – cheaper than other tenders
- Yes – broadly the same cost as other tenders
- No – more expensive than other tenders
- Don’t know

16. a) Has the proportion of food you procure from the following sources increased or decreased since 2003? [YES/NO]
a) UK produce (i.e. food grown / produced in the UK)
b) Regional produce (i.e. food grown / produced in your region)
c) Seasonal produce
d) Farm assured produce
e) Organic produce
f) Fairly traded tea, coffee and other goods
g) Small and local producers

b) For each option (a) to (g), if your answer to Q16(a) was ‘YES’:
   i) What prompted you to increase the proportion of food you procure from this source?
      - Customer demand
      - Environmental considerations
      - Desire to support British farmers
      - Desire to support the local community / economic development
      - Government guidance
      - Other guidance
      - Quality of produce
      - Other (please specify)
   
   ii) Did you access the PSFPI guidance to help you achieve this? (YES/NO)

   iii) If ‘YES’, how useful was it?
      - Extremely useful
      - Very useful
      - Quite useful
      - Not useful at all

   iv) Has increasing the proportion of food you procure from this source had an impact on cost?
      - Yes – cost has increased
      - Yes – cost has decreased
      - No impact
      - Don’t know

c) For each option (a) to (g), if your answer to Q16(a) was ‘NO’:
   i) Why have you not increased the proportion of food you procure from this source?
      - Cost
      - No customer demand
      - Products not available
      - Products difficult to source
- Unreliable / inconsistent supply
- Already providing this sufficiently 5 years ago
- Other (please specify).

Collaboration

17. a) Are you, or have you ever been, involved in procuring food or catering services collaboratively / in partnership with either other divisions / departments within your own organisation or with another public sector body?
   - Yes – with other divisions / departments in own organisation
   - Yes – with another public sector body
   - Yes – with other divisions / departments in own organisation and with another public sector body
   - No

   b) If 'YES', please give details of your collaboration arrangement and experience. Detail may include who the collaboration is with, how this collaboration came about, benefits and challenges, contribution to efficiency savings etc. If the collaboration has ended please explain why.

18. a) Have you considered collaborative procurement arrangements but not taken them up? [YES/NO]

   b) If 'YES', please explain why this was not taken up. Detail may include the options identified, factors involved in the decision making process, benefits and barriers identified etc.

Sustainable food procurement skills

19. How appropriately skilled are your staff to meet the challenges of sustainable food procurement?
   - Very skilled in sustainable food procurement
   - Quite skilled in sustainable food procurement
   - A little skilled in sustainable food procurement
   - Not skilled in sustainable food procurement

20. Do you have a plan in place to increase sustainable food procurement skills amongst your staff? [YES/NO]

Examples of best practice

21. a) Can you identify any best practice examples of sustainable food procurement and whether or not the support and information available as part of PSFPI contributed to this? [YES/NO]
b) If ‘YES’, please explain the best practice example and how the PSFPI supported this.

SECTION 4 – THE FUTURE OF SUSTAINABLE FOOD PROCUREMENT

22. a) Which of the following sources of support and advice would be most helpful in the future to assist your organisation to procure food in a more sustainable manner?
   Please rank the following types of support from 1 (most useful) to 5 (least useful).
   a) Written guidance (on a website or as a hard copy)
   b) Procurement training
   c) Regional advice through the Government Office or RDA
   d) Advice specific to collaboration including relevant networks and contacts
   e) Evidence of best practice
   f) One-to-one advice when preparing ITTs and evaluating tender responses
   g) Other (please specify)

b) For each option (a) to (g), do you currently receive this support? [YES/NO]

23. What else could be done to help your organisation procure food more sustainably?
Annex 5 – Short survey questions

A shorter version of the online survey was distributed to procurement practitioners in local authorities and schools, in order to avoid any overlap with the School Food Trust/ Local Authority Caterers’ Association survey ‘School Food Procurement, Procurement Skills and Sustainability’ which was completed between August and November 2008. The shorter version of the survey excluded the entirety of the following questions from the longer survey outlined in Annex 4:

Question 5
Question 11
Question 14
Question 15
Question 16
Question 17
Question 18
Question 19
Question 20
Annex 6 – Survey participants

Below is the list of organisations which responded to the long version of the online survey:

Cabinet Office
Citywide Service Salford City Council
Department for Children, Schools and Families46 (DCSF)
Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)
Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS)
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)
Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)
Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform47 (BERR)
Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO)
HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC)
HM Treasury (HMT)
Ministry of Defence (MoD)
Ministry of Justice (MoJ)
North Lincolnshire Council
Nottingham University Hospitals
Royal Brompton Hospital
Royal Cornwall Hospitals Trust
The City & County of Swansea
UK Border Agency
West Sussex County Council

Below is the list of organisations which responded to the short version of the online survey:

Bath & North East Somerset Council
Bolton Council School Meals
Bradford Council
Cardiff Council
Coventry City Council
Denbighshire County Council
Cumbria County Council
Devon Catering and Cleaning Services
Dudley Catering and Client Services
Durham County Council
East Sussex County Council
Edinburgh Catering Services
Gateshead Council
Hertfordshire Catering
Islington Council

46 The Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills indicated that their response to the survey was included in responses from the Department for Children, Schools and Families and Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform.

47 Ibid.
Islington Council, Children’s Services
Kingswood Catering
Leicester City Council, City Catering
London Borough of Barking & Dagenham
London Borough of Havering
Luton Borough Council
MetroFresh (Wigan Council)
Newham Catering and Cleaning Services
Northumberland County Council
Nottingham City Council
Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council
Plymouth City Council
Solihull Catering Services
Southampton City Council
South Tyneside Council
St Helens Council
Tameside MBC
Telford & Wrekin Council
Trafford Council
Warrington Borough Council
## Annex 7 – Summary of a selection of PSFPI-relevant policies

### Food policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Relevance to a sustainable food chain</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Food Matters: Towards a strategy for the 21st century (2008) | Adopted four strategic policy objectives for food:  
• Continuous improvement in the safety of food  
• The changes need to deliver a further transition to healthier diets  
• A more environmentally sustainable food chain  
• Fair prices, choices and access to food and food security through open and competitive markets. These objectives have led government to adopt actions including:  
• Development of consumer advice that integrates health, safety and environmental issues;  
• Working with WRAP and the food industry to secure a new agreement to cut food waste;  
• Launching a Healthier Food Mark for public sector food in England tied to standards for nutrition and environmental sustainability;  
• A Joint research Strategy for Food to provide better coordination of the departments' food related research.  
• Establishing a Cabinet Office-chaired Food Strategy Task Force which will oversee delivery and work towards more 'joining up' of food policy across Government. | Cabinet Office               |
| Sustainable Farming and Food Strategy (2002)          | Sets out how industry, Government and consumers can work together to secure a sustainable future for our farming and food industries, as viable industries contributing to a better environment and healthy and prosperous communities. | Defra                       |
| Food Industry Sustainability Strategy (2006)          | Aim is to help the food industry contribute to the UK’s sustainability goal. Has set targets to reduce the overall environmental impacts of waste, transport, water use and energy in the food chain | Defra                       |
| Healthy Weight, Healthy Lives: A cross-Government strategy for England (2008) | Focus is on tackling obesity in England – by 2020, aims to reduce the proportion of overweight and obese children to 2000 levels                                                                                       | Department for Health       |
| Food and Health Action Plan (2007)                    | Aim was to establish a coherent national plan to help people in England improve their diets.                                                                                                                                              | Department of Health        |
| FSA Strategic Plan for 2007-2010 (2007)               | Sets out the Food Standards Agency's aim of improving food safety, and addressing nutritional problems in the UK for instance through reducing the average salt and saturated fat intake of UK adults. | Food Standards Agency       |
### Sustainability policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Relevance to a sustainable food chain</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOGE Delivery Plan (2008)</td>
<td>Committed Government to achieving a significant change in sustainable development performance on its own civil estate. All central Government departments are required to complete annual returns against the SOGE targets.</td>
<td>OGC – Centre of Expertise in Sustainable Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Act (2008)</td>
<td>Aim is to improve carbon management and help the transition towards a low carbon economy in the UK. Provisions include legally binding targets and a carbon budgeting system.</td>
<td>Department of Energy and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Strategy for England (2007)</td>
<td>Goal is to make the transition towards 'One Planet Living.' Aim is to reduce waste by making products with fewer natural resources and to break the link between economic growth and waste growth.</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Act (2008)</td>
<td>Sets out the Government’s policy to deliver a secure, low carbon energy mix for the UK.</td>
<td>Department of Energy and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Procurement policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Relevance to a sustainable food chain</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Government Sustainable Procurement Action Plan (2007)</td>
<td>Aims to help achieve a low carbon and more resource efficient public sector. It is hoped that meeting the Plan’s commitments will bring about a behaviour change in key sectors such as food.</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGC Food Strategy (2008)</td>
<td>Has launched a collaborative food group which has developed a Food Governance model that can achieve value for money as well as providing a quality food offer for customers that fulfils the aims of 'Food Matters'.</td>
<td>OGC Category Sponsor-Commercial Director of DCSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Green Public Procurement (2008)</td>
<td>In July 2008, the European Commission called on governments to make sure that half of all their tendering procedures comply with a set of common green criteria by 2010. Criteria for food and catering services have been developed, which, for instance, address organic food and production methods, waste minimisation and selective collection. Both the Commission and the UK are developing and implementing a communications strategy to raise awareness and give training in GPP in the coming year.</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFT – A Fresh Look at School Food Procurement (2008)</td>
<td>Provides practical guidance to assist schools and local authorities in responding to the Government’s efficiency and sustainability agendas as they relate to school food.</td>
<td>School Food Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>