



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 4 February 2014
(OR. en)**

**6059/14
ADD 2**

**AGRI 69
AGRIFIN 10
AGRIORG 17
CODEC 295**

COVER NOTE

From: Secretary-General of the European Commission,
signed by Mr Jordi AYET PUIGARNAU, Director

date of receipt: 30 January 2014

To: Mr Uwe CORSEPIUS, Secretary-General of the Council of the European
Union

No. Cion doc.: SWD(2014) 28 final - Part 3/3

Subject: COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT IMPACT
ASSESSMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a
REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE
COUNCIL amending Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 and Regulation (EU)
No 1306/2013 as regards the aid scheme for the supply of fruit and
vegetables, bananas and milk in the educational establishments

Delegations will find attached document SWD(2014) 28 final - Part 3/3.

Encl.: SWD(2014) 28 final - Part 3/3



Brussels, 30.1.2014
SWD(2014) 28 final

PART 3/3

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Accompanying the document

**Proposal for a
REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL
amending Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 and Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013 as regards
the aid scheme for the supply of fruit and vegetables, bananas and milk in the
educational establishments**

{COM(2014) 32 final}

{SWD(2014) 29 final}

ANNEX 4 – PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SMS EXTERNAL EVALUATION (TO BE PUBLISHED IN OCTOBER 2013)

▲ Recommendations

- **Redesign the SMS to permit for a sustainable stimulation of children’s milk consumption.** Key strategies for a more efficient design are developed within this report and should be taken into consideration for the future SMS model.
- The **intervention logic should be based on a behavioural theory and include environmental, personal and social determinants.** It is recommended to **introduce educational measures** as part of the general strategy; meaning that their role in the scheme, their expected impact and implementation should be specified and monitored. In order to form long-lasting healthy eating habits the SMS should build on all kinds of possible support, in particular on the parents since they are very important direct role models for children and take care of the food preparation at home. **A bridging to the home environment is promising to improve the scheme’s effectiveness.**
- **Attention should be paid to children’s age** since milk consumption declines with increasing age and adolescents show higher needs to meet the recommended intake. Furthermore, **age appropriate approaches** are necessary to keep children’s interest in the scheme.
- Given the fact that educational measures carried out voluntarily under the scheme are mainly financed by the milk suppliers and funds are therefore limited, the **eligibility of educational measures should be discussed.** This applies also for communication measures targeting at a strong partnership between all relevant stakeholders.
- As an increase of the EU subsidy rate would not lead to a remarkably stronger uptake of the scheme, **a distribution fully out of charge should be pursued.** Therefore, it is advisable to **discuss alternative financing models**, for example a co-financing approach. Various advantages can be realised by the free distribution, e.g.:
 - an empirical research shows that the participation in the scheme increases drastically if the products are provided for free
 - due to the omitted parental contribution the problem of excluding children of low-income families can be avoided
 - all children in a class may participate so that the scheme might benefit from group dynamics
 - free distribution reduces the scheme’s administrative and organisational burden
- **Reduction of avoidable administrative costs and deadweight effects** to increase the efficiency of the SMS.
 - Promising approaches to avoid and overcome deadweight effects are the prioritisation of certain milk products where the price subsidy would theoretically lead to an over-proportional or at least proportional demand effect (price elasticity concept). Those products have to be defined by Member State since the consumer behaviour is influenced by individual and cultural habits. Furthermore, milk products

should exclusively be distributed “explicitly” to increase the awareness of the programme. A distribution within the framework of regular school meals is not beneficial.

- Two strategies are recommendable to reduce administrative burden: (1) Simplification of product checks and administrative controls through a risk-orientated, spot-check approach as well as a simplification of the registration procedure of suppliers. (2) Realise the profit of synergy-effects between the SMS and SFS as both programmes provide the potential to be handled within a combined administrative framework.
- **Organisational burden for suppliers and schools should be reduced**
 - To support smaller suppliers, adequate software tools should be provided within the framework of the scheme to reduced administrative costs by process-automation and –standardisation.
 - If the “collecting-money problem” exists in schools, alternative approaches should be considered that manage the payment procedure outside the school (e.g. by an external service provider, supplier or by automation).
- As the **motivation and the engagement of all stakeholders** have a crucial impact on the scheme’s uptake, their subjective impression of burden should be considered in detail.
- Regarding the monetary input-output relation of the scheme **a sufficient balance has to be defined in the schemes design between the real spending per child and the scale of the scheme**. A relatively high spending per child maximises the interest of the target group for participation but, on the other hand, leads in most cases to a reduced scale of the scheme as a result of budgetary limitations.
- **The alignment between the SMS and the School Fruit Scheme should be improved. Merging the administrative framework or even the whole schemes provides various advantages.**
- Since the SMS contributes also to the objectives of the EU information and promotion policy, it should be discussed whether **school milk suppliers shall be motivated to carry out information campaigns** e.g. by easier access to EU subsidies under the information policy.
- In order to consolidate synergies between the SMS and the Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and obesity-related Health issues a review of the scheme’s design as regards to the principle and the six political strategies of the Strategy is recommended.
- A **set of monitoring and evaluation indicators should be defined** that allow an assessment on the performance and impact of the SMS and on its contribution to the fight against obesity and overweight. Clear monitoring and evaluation obligations should be introduced at Member States and Community level limiting the parameters to as few as possible but to as many as necessary to gain all relevant information.
- **EU value added of the scheme should be improved:**

- Introduction of a knowledge transfer between Member States (Community conferences of implementing agencies, meetings of Member State's representatives with similar scheme design and meetings of administrative personnel and milk suppliers at Community or national level).
- Introduction of a more active promotion of the SMS on Community level. A promotion campaign would add to the visibility and understanding of the scheme.
- Turning the SMS into a "learning programme" (e.g. by including a periodical review of the scheme, the consideration of results from an improved monitoring and evaluation procedure and the adjustment to recent scientific findings)
- Evaluation and further development of the SMS are closely linked. With this understanding the **critical question arises why results and recommendations of prior reports did not lead to a serious modification of the scheme.**

ANNEX 5 – ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS: CAP 2020 IMPACT ON THE SFS IN FINANCIAL TERMS AND VOLUMES

In order to calculate the potential of CAP 2020 reform, certain parameters have been kept stable, such as the cost per child per year (€12) and expected consumption of approximately 6.2 kg. In this case, the variables are the number of potential beneficiaries (children) and the potential in tons of products distributed under different budgets. This is done for the sake of calculations to estimate the impact, taking into account that MS could decide to increase the frequency of distribution and consequently consumption per child, while keeping the number of beneficiaries stable.

	Pre-CAP2020	CAP 2020
Total funds available <i>EU</i> <i>National</i>	€156 mio € 90 mio € 66 mio (25/50% national co-financing rates, 58% average)	€182 mio € 150 mio € 32 mio (10/25% national co-financing rates, 18% average)
Total funds used in 2011/2012	€100 mio	
Other eligible costs (outside distribution) in max % (threshold) <i>Actual use in 2011/2012</i>	communication (5%), evaluation/monitoring (10%), transport (3% if invoiced separately) <i>2.5% total funds used</i>	accompanying measures (15%), other eligible costs (5%)
Funds for distribution available in total Funds used in total for distribution only (EU+MS):	€128 million (156 mio – 18% for other eligible costs) €97.5 mio (total of €100 use – 2.5% for other costs)	€146 mio (182 mio – 20% for other measures), 120 mio EU
Cost per child per year + average consumption child/year	€12 6.2 kg	€12 6.2kg
Output Potential output	Output: 50.000 tons, 8.1 million children 65.700 tons; 10.6 million children	75.400 tons, 12.1 million children

Adding accompanying measures under measures eligible for EU funding is expected to take up approximately max 15% of the budget available. Total funds available for the distribution will increase by 13 % which is, on account of the higher EU co-financing rates, lower than the proportionate increase in funds. This assumes that MS will not provide more national funds than required (25% or 10% for less developed).

ANNEX 6 - ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN

The administrative burden generated by the EU legislation on the SFS and SMS has been measured in the CEPS special report of 2011, the AFC evaluation report on the SFS, the MS reports of 2012 and the AFC evaluation report on the SMS of 2013. As concerns the SFS, data from CEPS study refer to school year 2009/2010 in 24 Member States and are integrated by three case studies contained in AFC report on school years 2009/2011. For the SMS, CEPS study is based on 2008/2009 school year for 26 Member States integrated by the AFC evaluation report of 2013.

These studies are the main data sources on the burden under the two schemes as currently implemented. However, they all mention limitations in finding more reliable data, given the difficulty to obtain complete information, even when specific questionnaires were sent to national/regional authorities and other actors involved in the implementation of the schemes.

Conclusions from CEPS report show that administrative burden per school and per pupil ranges from €2.9 (SFS) and €3 (SMS) and from €0.22 (SFS) and €0.28 (SMS) respectively, which cannot be considered as the main obstacle for applicants to participate in the schemes. The report also concludes that several burdens behave like fixed costs independently from the number of children/volumes distributed, meaning that their share over funds used decreases when the up-take of EU aid increases.

Results of the CEPS Report on administrative burden of the SFS

<i>AB in EUR</i>	School Fruit Scheme	School Milk Scheme
General Application	596,552	2,765,637
Aid Application	264,656	949,905
Obligations arising from checks	171,003	1,1486,660
Publicity	17,477	69,783
Total	1,049,687	5,271,985
Burdens over management funds	3.08%	4.11%
Burdens per school	32.90	34.00
Burdens per pupil	0.22	0.28

AFC report on SFS confirms the above figures by estimating administrative burden in 1 to 2 hours work per school and school year (with weighted averages of salary amount estimated at €15), based on case studies (one MS and two regions). This is in line with data provided in the EU Database on administrative burden, where the EU average hourly earnings is €7.

For SMS, AFC shows very different costs per child in different Member States based on implementation survey, confirming that they behave like fixed costs. The EU average administrative cost would be more than €0.35/child.

Estimated average annual administrative costs caused by the SMS – AFC Evaluation report on SMS

in 1,000 € per year	Average annual administrative costs	Average total product costs (2008/09 - 2010/11)	Share of average annual administrative costs in average annual product costs (2008/09 - 2010/11)	Average number of participating children in 1,000 (2008/09 - 2010/11)	Average administrative costs per participating child (2008/09 - 2010/11)
SLOVENIA	12	2	743%	1	23.32
AUSTRIA	210	707	30%	91	2.30
NETHERLANDS	120	596	20%	72	1.67
SPAIN	1,080	1,151	94%	661	1.63
DENMARK	179	1,775	10%	278	0.64
BELGIUM	280	743	38%	477	0.59
MALTA	8	46	18%	15	0.55
CYPRUS	57	248	23%	116	0.49
ITALY	664	1,793	37%	1,385	0.48
LATVIA	12	133	9%	27	0.44
SLOVAKIA	165	785	21%	470	0.35
CZECH REPUBLIC	180	399	45%	527	0.34
FINLAND	247	3,989	6%	825	0.30
UNITED KINGDOM	319	6,345	5%	1,129	0.28
FRANCE	1,299	11,105	12%	5,279	0.25
POLAND	480	11,635	4%	2,544	0.19
SWEDEN	292	8,832	3%	1,618	0.18
LUXEMBOURG	3	21	13%	17	0.16

AFC reports also integrate CEPS analysis by identifying the more substantial burden coming from the organisation of the schemes, in terms of physical distribution of products in schools and implementation of the accompanying measures. The definition of administrative burden is therefore broader than in CEPS study as it includes also organisational burden.

In the following Table all the obligations stemming from EU legislation are listed for both schemes in their current form for each actor (MS, applicant and Commission). Other activities linked with the setting up and implementation of the schemes, even though not directly mentioned in the legislation, are also listed because of their effects in terms of organisational burden. Also obligations stemming from CAP2020 are added, being the baseline against which the burden is measured.

Table B: School Milk Scheme - Administrative and organisational burden																			
Counc.Reg. (EC) No 1234/2007, Comm. Reg. (EC) No 657/2008, CAP2020																			
N°	Article	STEP 1	STEP 2	STEP 4	STEP 5	STEP 6	STEP 7	STEP 8	Total Administrative Costs (AC)	Business As Usual Costs (BAU) %	Total Administrative Burden (AC - BAU) (2)			STEP 3 Regulatory Origin					
		Type of obligation	Description of required action(s)	Target group	Frequency (per year)	Time (working days)	Number of entries involved	Price			High	Medium	Low	Int	EU	Nat	Reg		
1	CAP 2020	Submission of document / report	Drawing up of the strategy	26 MS	1												100%		
2	Art. 5(1)	Certification of process	MS shall verify that the max 0.25 l/pupil/day is not exceeded	26 MS													100%		
3	Art. 5(3)	Application for individual authorisation	The total number of school days, excluding holidays, shall be notified by the school to the MS and, where appropriate, to the applicant	26 MS (Schools)													100%		
4		Application for general authorisation	Indicative allocation - NA	26 MS	1												100%		
5	Art. 6.2	Application for individual authorisation	Selection of aid applicants among the following bodies: educational establishments, educational authorities in respect of the products distributed to the children within its area, suppliers of the products, if MS provides so, organisations acting on behalf of one or more educational establishments or educational authorities and specifically established for that purpose, if MS provides so.	26 MS		depends on MS (once in the moment of joining the scheme if MS do not decide differently)													
6	Art. 7,8,9	Application for general / individual authorisation	Applicant must be approved by the competent authority of MS General conditions for approval Specific conditions for approval	26 MS		depends on MS											100%		
7	Art.12	Certification of process	Payment of the aid	26 MS		depends on MS											100%		
8	Art. 13	Payment	MS may pay an advance	26 MS													100%		
9	Art. 14	Certification of process	MS shall ensure that the aid amount is duly reflected in the price paid by beneficiaries / MS may set max prices to be paid by beneficiaries	26 MS													100%		
10		Submission of document / report	Monitoring - NA	26 MS	1												100%		
11		Submission of document / report	Evaluation - NA	26 MS													100%		
12	Art.15(8)	Certification of process	MS shall draw up a control report on each on-the-spot check	26 MS													100%		
13		Submission of document / report	Notification of the aid request - NA	26 MS	1												100%		
14	CAP 2020	Submission of document / report	Notification of the national strategy (CAP2020) to be defined in an implementing act when MS has to send to the Commission this notification each year	26 MS	1												100%		
Costs for MS									1 - General application to the scheme (*)										
15	Art.15	Certification of process	Member States shall take all necessary measures to ensure compliance with this Regulation (administrative and on the spot checks)	26 MS	1				€2.765.637,00	0%	€2.765.637,00								
16	Art.15.8	Certification of process	The competent control authority shall draw up a control report on each on-the-spot check. The report shall describe precisely the different items controlled.	26 MS	1												100%		
17	Art.17(1)	Certification of process	MS shall notify the number of applicants, number of schools, number of checks, amount of aid claimed, paid, controlled, etc.	26 MS	1												100%		
18	Art.17(2)	Certification of process	MS shall notify the quantities of products per category, maximum permissible quantity, EU expenditure, number of participating pupils and national top up	26 MS	1												100%		
Costs for MS									2 - Public administration and checks costs (**)										
19	Art. 11	Payment applications	Applicants must lodge payment applications, specifying at least the quantities distributed by category of product, the name and address or unique identification number of the schools concerned	Applicants		from 1 to 12 times per year (aid applications may cover 1 to 7 months)											100%		
20	Art.16	Information labelling for third parties	Use of the European 'School Milk Scheme' poster - Schools shall produce a poster to be permanently situated at the main entrance of the school	Applicants		MS decide											100%		
21		Other	Distribution of products	Applicants															
22		Other	Drawing up of Accompanying measure: NA	Applicants															
23		Other	Participation in on-the-spot checks	Applicants															
Costs for applicants									3 - Aid application and publicity (****)										
24	Art. 102 of R.1234/2007 and Art. 4 and Art.5. of R. 657/2008	Other	Allocation of aid - NA (there is no budgetary ceiling insofar that the EU aid is fixed at 18,15 euro /100kg for milk (see Annex I of Reg. 657/2008) and a maximum quantity of 0.25 l per pupil per school day)	COM	1												100%		
25		Submission of document / report	Monitoring - NA	COM	1												100%		
26		Submission of document / report	Evaluation - NA	COM	0.2 (every five years)												100%		
27	CAP 2020	Submission of document / report	Registration of strategies	COM															
28	CAP 2020	Submission of document / report	Publication of strategies	COM															
TOTAL COSTS									€5.271.985,00	0%	€5.271.985,00	€0,00	€0,00						

Table C: Areas for possible reduction of Administrative and organisational burden

SFS											SMS				
STEP 1			STEP 2		STEP 4	STEP 5	STEP 1			STEP 2	STEP 4	STEP 5			
N°	Article	Type of obligation	Description of required action(s)	Target group	Frequency (per year)	N°	Article	Type of obligation	Description of required action(s)	Target group	Frequency (per year)				
1	Art. 3.1	Submission of document / report	Drawing up of the strategy referred to in Article 103ga(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007	25 MS	1	1	CAP 2020	Submission of document / report	Drawing up of the strategy	26 MS	1				
2	Art. 6.2	Application for general authorisation	Selection of aid applicants among the following bodies: educational establishments, educational authorities in respect of the products distributed to the children within their area, suppliers and/or distributors of the products, organisations acting on behalf of one or more educational establishments or educational authorities and specifically established for that purpose, any other public or private body to manage the distribution of fruit and vegetables and the evaluation and/or communication.	25 MS	1	5	Art. 6.2	Application for individual authorisation	Selection of aid applicants among the following bodies: educational establishments, educational authorities in respect of the products distributed to the children within its area, suppliers of the products, if MS provides so, organisations acting on behalf of one or more educational establishments or educational authorities and specifically established for that purpose, if MS provides so.	26 MS	depends on MS (once in the moment of joining the scheme if MS do not decide differently)				
3	Art. 6	Application for individual authorisation	Approval of aid applicants: Member States shall ensure that the aid provided for under their strategy shall be distributed to the aid applicants where these applicants have made a valid aid application to their competent authorities. An aid application shall only be valid if lodged by an applicant which has been approved for that purpose by the competent authorities of the Member State in which the educational establishment to which the products are supplied is located.	25 MS	1	6	Art. 7,8,9	Application for general / individual authorisation	Applicant must be approved by the competent authority of MS General conditions for approval Specific conditions for approval	26 MS	depends on MS				
6	Art. 11	Application for individual authorisation	Payment of the aid	25 MS	4 (at least every trimester)	7	Art.12	Certification of process	Payment of the aid	26 MS	depends on MS				
7-8	Art. 12	Submission of document / report	Monitoring reports	25 MS	1										
7-8	Art. 12	Submission of document / report	Evaluation	25 MS	0,2 (every five years)										
12-13	Art. 15-1	Application for general authorisation	Notification of the national strategy by 31 January each year (MS has to send to the Commission this notification each year)	25 MS	1	14	CAP 2020	Submission of document / report	Notification of the national strategy (CAP2020) to be defined in an implementing act when MS has to send to the Commission this notification each year	26 MS	1				
14	Art. 15-1 a)	Submission of document / report	Notification of the results of monitoring report (MS has to send to the Commission this notification each year)	25 MS	1	20	Art. 17(1), 17(2)	Certification of process	MS shall notify the number of applicants, number of schools, number of checks, amount of aid claimed, paid, controlled, etc MS shall notify the quantities of products per category, maximum permissible quantity, EU expenditure, number of participating pupils and national top up	26 MS	1				
15	Article 103ga - 1 Reg. 1234/2007	Other	Distribution of products: community aid shall be granted for the supply to children in educational establishments, including nurseries, other pre-school establishments, primary and secondary schools, of products of the fruit and vegetables, processed fruit and vegetables, and bananas sectors.	25 MS		21		Other	Distribution of products	26 MS					
16	Article 103ga - 2 Reg. 1234/2007	Other	Accompanying measures: Member States shall also provide for the accompanying measures necessary to make the scheme effective.	25 MS		22		Other	Drawing up of Accompanying measures	26 MS					
Costs for MS 1 - General application to the scheme (Total)				€596.552,00				€2.765.637,00							
17	Art. 13	Certification of process	Member States shall take all necessary measures to ensure compliance with this Regulation (administrative and on the spot checks)	25 MS	1	13	Art.15	Certification of process	Member States shall take all necessary measures to ensure compliance with this Regulation (administrative and on the spot checks)	26 MS	1				
18	Art. 13.8	Certification of process	The competent control authority shall draw up a control report on each on-the-spot check. The report shall describe precisely the different items controlled.	25 MS	n.a.	16	Art.15(8)	Certification of process	The competent control authority shall draw up a control report on each on-the-spot check. The report shall describe precisely the different items controlled.	26 MS	1				
19	Art. 15-1 b)	Submission of document / report	Notification of the on-the-spot checks (Administratives checks shall be conducted on all aid applications and shall include checkings of supporting documents)	25 MS	1	16	Art. 17(1)	Submission of document / report	MS shall notify the number of checks, amount of aid claimed, paid, controlled, etc.	26 MS	1				
Costs for MS 2 - Public administration and checks costs (Total)				€171.003,00				€1.486.660,00							
20	Art. 10	Submission of document / report	Aid application: filling of form application (at least: quantities, name and address of the applicant and number of children)	Applicant (*) 52 398	1 (at least one but can be more often)	19	Art. 11	Payment applications	Applicants must lodge payment applications, specifying at least the quantities distributed by category of product, the name and address or unique identification number of the schools concerned	Applicants	from 1 to 12 times per year (aid applications may cover 1 to 7 months)				
21	Art. 14	Information labelling for third parties	Publicity: use of the European 'School Fruit Scheme' poster	Applicant (*) 31 903	n.a.	20	Art.16	Information labelling for third parties	Use of the European 'School Milk Scheme' poster - Schools shall produce a poster to be permanently situated at the main entrance of the school	26 MS (Schools)	MS decide				
22	Article 103ga - 1 Reg. 1234/2007	Other	Distribution of products: community aid shall be granted for the supply to children in educational establishments, including nurseries, other pre-school establishments, primary and secondary schools, of products of the fruit and vegetables, processed fruit and vegetables, and bananas sectors.	Applicants		21		Other	Distribution of products	Applicants					
23	Article 103ga - 2 Reg. 1234/2007	Other	Accompanying measures: Member States shall also provide for the accompanying measures necessary to make the scheme effective.	Applicants		22		Other	Accompanying measures: NA	Applicants					
24		Other	Participation in on-the-spot-checks	Applicants		23		Other	Participation in on-the-spot checks	Applicants					
Costs for applicants 3 - Aid application and publicity (Total)				€282.133,00				€1.019.688,00							
25	Art. 4.4	Other	Definitive allocation: annual reallocation of the indicative allocation by 31 March	COM	1	24	Art. 102 of R.1234/2007 and Art. 4 and Art.5. of R.	Other	Allocation of aid (In the new framework one procedure will be set for allocation of aid)	COM					
26	Art. 12	Submission of document / report	Evaluation	COM	0,2 (every five years)				Evaluation (In the new framework one procedure will be set for evaluation)	COM					
27		Submission of document / report	Registration of evaluation reports received, check of deadline's respect, drafting of summary, translation procedure (if possible)	COM	0,2 (every five years)				idem	COM					
28		Other	Monthly analysis of SFS state of play - preparation of monthly statements per school year - preparatory meetings - presentation in the single CMD management committee - Circa publication	COM	12				Monthly analysis of state of play will be likely be applied in the new framework	COM					
29		Submission of document / report	Administrative treatment for monitoring reports: - yearly update of the monitoring report document - registration and filing - conversion into pdf file - publication	COM	1				Administrative treatment of monitoring reports will be likely applied in the new framework	COM					
30	Art. 15-1 a)	Other	Analysis of the results of monitoring report (Commission shall analyse the implementation of their School Fruit Scheme on an annual basis) + drafting of conclusions at EU level	COM	1	25		Submission of document / report	idem	COM	1				
31		Submission of document / report	Registration of strategies received, check of deadline's respect, check of completeness, translation procedure	COM	1	27	CAP 2020	Submission of document / report	Registration of strategies will be likely be applied in the new framework	COM					
32	Art. 15-3	Information labelling for third parties	Publication of the Member's State strategies, monitoring results and evaluation	COM	4 (on average every trimester)	28	CAP 2020	Submission of document / report	Publication of strategies will be likely be applied in the new framework	COM					
33	Art. 103 ga-9 Reg. 1234/2007	Other	The Community may also finance, under Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 1290/2005, information, monitoring and evaluation measures relating to the School Fruit Scheme, including raising public awareness of it, and related networking measures.	COM	1				Measures regarding raising public awareness of the new framework and networking activities will be likely be applied in the new framework	COM					
Costs for COM Calculation, analysis and monitoring (Total)				€1.049.688,00				€5.271.985,00							
Total Costs MS + Applicants + COM (Total)				€1.049.688,00				€5.271.985,00							

The result is the identification of the obligations on which each option could have an impact and the assessment of the increase or reduction of the relevant administrative burden as described in the following Tables (by actor and by group of activities).

Administrative burden

	Obligations	Baseline = CAP2020	Option 2	Option 3
Member States	General application: 1 strategy +accompanying measures 2 selection/approval of aid applicants - aid payment 3 monitoring 4 evaluation	SFS: 1, 3, 4 eligible accompanying measures SMS: 1 strategy (new obligation vs current); voluntary accompanying measures	Synergies for 1 common strategy – accompanying measures (obligatory for both schemes) 2 aid applicants/aid payment 3-4 separate AB ↓↓ OB ↓↓ Common accompanying measures AB ↑ OB ↑	1 one strategy instead of two 2 common procedure for aid applicants/aid payment 3, 4 one report AB ↓↓↓ Common accompanying measures AB ↑ OB ↑
	Public administration: administrative and on-the-spot checks	Similar checks but implemented separately	Synergies AB ↓ OB ↓	Common checks AB ↓↓ OB ↓↓
Aid applicants	Aid application: 1 aid application 2 keeping records	1, 2 separate	Synergies for 1 one instead of two aid appl AB ↓ OB ↓	Common aid applications 1, 2 one instead of two AB ↓↓ OB ↓↓
	Publicity (poster)	Separate poster obligation	One poster instead of two AB ↓ OB ↓	One poster instead of two AB ↓ OB ↓
	Products distribution	Separate distribution of several products	Separate distribution of several products =	Two products instead of several AB ↓↓ OB ↓↓
	Accompanying measures	SFS: eligible accomp measures	SMS: new obligation for	Enhanced common
Commission	General application: 1 strategy 2 monitoring 3 evaluation	1 two strategies per MS to deal with 2, 3 for SFS only	1 common strategy 2,3 separate =	1, 2, 3 common AB ↓↓ OB ↓↓
	Networking activities 1 web site 2 meetings with Member states 3 meetings with stakeholders	1,2,3 separate activities	Separate activities =	Common activities AB ↓↓↓ OB ↓↓↓
	AB: administrative burden	= no impact	↑ ↓ low increase/decrease	↑↑ ↓↓ medium increase /decrease
	OB: organisational burden		↑↑↑ ↓↓↓ high increase/decrease	

Administrative and organisational burden in the new framework

Activity	CAP 2020				New framework		
	No of processes SFS	No of processes SMS	Description	Frequency (per year)	No of processes	Impact on AB/OB	Comments
Strategy	6	6	drafting, notification, registration, check, translation, publication	1	6	++	
Aid allocation	3	0	SFS notification MS aid applications, Com Decision (SMS: no annual aid allocation/reallocation)	1	3/6	= Or -	
Aid application	4	4	selection and approval, aid applicants, filling in aid application, aid payment	na	4	++	
Checks	4	4	administrative checks, on-the-spot checks, report on checks, EU analysis	na	4	++	
Monitoring	6	1	drafting, notification, registration, check, EU summary, publication	1	6	-	
Evaluation	6	0	drafting, notification, registration, EU summary, translation, publication	10,2 (every five years) 1 MS evaluation is continuous	6	-	
Monthly analysis of state of play	3	0	drafting, presentation, publication	12	3	-	
Distribution of products	na	na	designing and implementation (link to strategy, checks, monitoring, evaluation etc.)	na	na	+	
Accompanying measures	na	na	designing and implementation (link to strategy, checks, monitoring, evaluation etc.) (voluntary for SMS)	na	na	- Or --	
Publicity	na	na	designing of poster/other instruments (depend on centralised/decentralised approach)	1	na	+	
Networking activities	4	3	website, meetings (Comm, MS, stakeholders)	1-10	4	++	

= no impact + positive impact (moderate burden reduction) ++ positive impact (high burden reduction)
 - negative impact (moderate burden increase) -- negative impact (high burden increase)

ANNEX 7 - MONITORING AND EVALUATION

CURRENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

Under the SFS MS have the obligation to monitor and evaluate their programme as set in Article 12 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 288/2009.

Monitoring reports are notified each year to the Commission through specific forms containing information on the budget spent, number of participating school/children, quantities distributed, etc. (see the following chapter on Monitoring of outputs). Annual MS reports concerning the on-the-spot checks are also foreseen.

As concerns the evaluation, it consists of MS evaluation reports and on an EU wide external evaluation. The first MS reports were sent in February 2012, covering the school year 2010-2011 while the next evaluation exercise will cover five years with MS evaluation reports to be notified in 2017. The EU wide external evaluation report was published by AFC – Co-Concept in October 2012, covering the school years 2009/2010 and 2010/2011. Further to this and in view to improve the quality and comparability of MS reports, DG AGRI has provided MS with some guidelines further integrated in 2013 with recommendations drafted together with the SFS Group of experts (see the following chapter on Monitoring of outputs). This is in line with CoA recommendations concerning medium-long term indicators.

Finally, following Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007, Article 184(5) a Commission report to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of the SFS has been adopted in December 2012, based also on the results of the evaluation exercise.

Public access is given to the monitoring and evaluation reports as well as to the MS strategies through the website dedicated to the SFS¹ and the DG AGRI evaluation website².

As concerns the SMS, monitoring consists of MS annual notifications on the EU budget used, national top-up, quantities of products distributed as well as the number of children participating (Art 17.2 of EC Reg. 657/2208 as amended in 2013 and on external evaluation). MS should also notify each year the EC regarding the on-the-spot checks (Art. 17.1 of Reg. 657/2008 as amended in 2013).

As concerns the evaluation, no obligation is foreseen for MS to evaluate their scheme while an external evaluation at EU level has been carried out. The report by AFC – Co-Concept will be published in autumn 2013, covering school years from 2004 -2012.

FUTURE MONITORING OF OUTPUTS AND EVALUATION

The arrangement for the monitoring process to meet the objectives identified in the impact assessment should be based on data collected each year from MS regarding the implementation of the programme.

¹ http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm

² <http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/>

A monitoring form should be designed based on the ones in use within the SFS and SMS as integrated with any other necessary information, having in mind that data collected during the annual monitoring exercise will constitute the basis to measure the immediate outputs but also to measure the long-term impacts.

Under the current SFS, monitoring arrangements foresee the annual reporting from MS through the following form:

SFS Annual monitoring report



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
Directorate C, Economics of agricultural market and single CMO
C.2. Olive oil, Horticultural products



School Fruit Scheme - Annex V of DG AGRI Working Document (Guidelines) - Annual Monitoring Report 2011/2012

(Note: all the blue cells and the check boxes should be filled in)

1 - Member State :

2 - Submission date :

3 - Coverage of the scheme : National : Region If regional, please enter the name of the region :

4 - Single contact point :

Name :	<input type="text"/>
Institution :	<input type="text"/>
Mailing address :	<input type="text"/>
Tel :	<input type="text"/>
Fax :	<input type="text"/>
E-mail :	<input type="text"/>

5 - Effective Budget :

	in €	2010/2011 (updated)	2011/2012	2011 / 2012	Budget (EU + MS) 100 %
A - Final allocation :				EU	#DIV/0!
B - EU funds used :				MS	#DIV/0!
B/A = EU funds used in % of the final allocation :		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
MS co-financing rate in % :					
C - Funding used other than EU = (1) + (2)					
(1) accompanying measures					
(2) co-funding = a)+b)+c)					
a) Public contribution (non EU)					
b) Private contribution					
c) Parental contribution					
B + C = TOTAL BUDGET (EU+MS)					

6 - Effective additionality : ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ If the MS has already a scheme in place

	2010/2011 (updated)	2011/2012
Budget (total in €) of the national/regional scheme :	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
N° of schools covered by the national scheme :	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
N° of children covered by the national scheme :	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Product distributed (in €)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

7 - Effective involvement of relevant stakeholders :

- Educational sector
- Public Health
- Agriculture
- Civil society
- Private sector

Name of the entity :

Name of the entity :

Name of the entity :

Name of the entity :

Name of the entity :

8 - Quantitative indicators (see Chapter 4) :

Number of participating schools in the target group

In % of the total schools of the target group in the MS

Number of participating children in the target group

In % of the total children of the target group in the MS

Target group ⁽¹⁾

Specific target group ⁽²⁾

Frequency of distributions ⁽³⁾

Duration of distributions ⁽⁴⁾

Average weight per portion grams

Average price per portion euros

Average consumption per child portions

<input type="checkbox"/>	Morning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Morning Break	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lunch	<input type="checkbox"/>	Afternoon	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
--------------------------	---------	--------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-------

Delivery time ⁽⁵⁾

Delivery system ⁽⁶⁾

⁽¹⁾ Please enter here the target group by indicating the age range. It could be for example children from 4 to 12.
⁽²⁾ When relevant and possible, please describe the type of social group involved (low social economic status, special needs etc ...)
⁽³⁾ Please describe, for example : once a day, once a week, twice a week, etc ...
⁽⁴⁾ Please enter here the number of weeks of the scheme
⁽⁵⁾ Please select the corresponding time, or precise in "other"
⁽⁶⁾ Please describe : distribution done by the school team, a supermarket, a small retailer etc ...

9 - Effective product :

List of products

Fresh quantities purchased/distributed (in tons) ⁽⁷⁾ tons

Fresh quantities purchased/distributed (in portions) ⁽⁷⁾ portions

Processed quantities purchased/distributed (in liters) ⁽⁷⁾ liters

Processed quantities purchased/distributed (in tons) ⁽⁷⁾ tons

Processed quantities purchased/distributed (in portions) ⁽⁷⁾ portions

Per category (fresh, processed) in %

fresh	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	%
processed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	%

⁽⁷⁾ Please fill in the appropriate cells

Additional criteria (examples) :

Child safety (allergic reactions etc...)

Juice restrictions

Additional checks on product safety

High quality (Integr Pest Managed product, Organic, other (specify)

Availability

Local	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seasonal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community origin	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organic	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

10 - Effective communication measures (art 5 reg. 288/2009) :

Poster

Other (specify)

11 - Effective accompanying measures :

	2010/2011 (updated)	2011/2012
Total funds used for accompanying measures (public + private)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
--> % of public funds	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
--> % of private funds	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Total children covered by the accomp. measures	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
in % of total children participating to the scheme	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

12 - List of effective accompanying measures :

Title	Promoting organisation	Local / Regional / National	Target group	Budget
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

13 - Other comments :

14 - Annex - list of products distributed :

For the SMS the following form is used to notify the Commission with data concerning the implementation of the programme:

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
ISAMM CM

ISAMM CM - Paris - Search Form - Communication Preview
Form | Hierarchy | Communication | Encoding Period | Administration

Communication Preview

Communication information

Name: School milk scheme - Annual Statistics Member state: Spain
 Business process: A&E for disposal Status: PREVIEW
 Sector: Milk and milk products
 Reference from: 00/00/2012
 Reference to: 06/02/2012
 Description:

Legal basis

Legal base type: Reference Article/Paragraph
 COMMISSION_REGULATION N 0867/2008 17(2)

a) Quantities broken down by categories and sub-categories on which aid has been paid

Remark : the description of the categories can be found in Annex 1 of Regulation (EC) no 607/2008 (OJ L 183 of 11.7.2008, p. 17)

Category I a)	Category I b)	Category I c)	Category II	Category III	Category IV	Category V
(in tonnes)	(in tonnes)	(in tonnes)	(in tonnes)	(in tonnes)	(in tonnes)	(in tonnes)

Other relevant information

Remark : please note that the "EU expenditure" and "National top up" have to be reported in 1000 EURO

b) Maximum permissible quantity (in tonnes)	c) EU expenditure (1000 EUR)	d) Approximate number of pupils participating	e) National top up (1000 EUR)
	€ 1000		€ 1000

Reset Save Delete Cancel

As concerns the evaluation, the following guidelines have been developed within the SFS with the help of the SFS Group of experts concerning the measurement of children intake. These guidelines should be taken into due account when setting the future evaluation methodology.



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate C. Economics of agricultural market and single CMO
C.2. Olive oil, Horticultural products

Brussels, 16 January 2013
agri.ddg2.c.2/GK/ad D(2013) 59090
Ares

DG AGRI and the Group of experts on the School Fruit Scheme's further non binding recommendations for the national evaluations of the Scheme

The SFS Group of experts focused, in its 3rd meeting on 5th and 6th July 2012, on the results of the evaluations notified by the Member States in February 2012 and on the (ongoing) external evaluation.

The Group has reminded that the importance of the SFS is evidence based and has concluded that there is no doubt on the necessity to continue the SFS in the next years, given the positive outcome obtained.

However, it is very difficult at this stage to compare the evaluation reports of the Member States/Regions due to their heterogeneous formats in terms of length, structure and also content (due to the different evaluation methods applied).

The Group considers it necessary to further complete the Guidelines provided by DG AGRI in September 2011 but also to simplify them where possible, in view to the next evaluation exercise 2012/2016 and the preparation of the evaluation reports due by end of February 2017.

1. Keep in mind the focus of the evaluation

Please note that the scheme is based on three "pillars", the first one is the distribution of products, the second one are the accompanying measures and the third is the monitoring/evaluation and information/communication. Thus, the entire Scheme should be evaluated, not only the distribution of fruit and vegetables but also the impact of accompanying measures on the implementation of the Scheme and the monitoring, evaluation and communication framework. The accompanying measures are as important as the fruit & vegetables distribution in order to improve and increase F&V consumption. These could be regarded as central questions for the evaluation of the School Fruit Scheme:

- To which degree has the School Fruit Scheme increased the consumption of fruit and vegetables at school and at home?
- Has a well functioning School Fruit Scheme been established?
- In which way have the parameters of the establishment of a Scheme influenced the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the Scheme?

The primary target group of the evaluation are children but also parents, teachers and headmasters (or other authority responsible for the SFS) should be included in the evaluation as explained more in detail in next chapters.

2. Consider the suggestions for the measurement of fruit intake development

The Group strongly recommends including in the target group of children to be evaluated the whole age-range of children participating in the scheme (target group as set in the national/regional strategy) and preparing the next evaluation based on the following elements¹.

Children do not live isolated, but are members of families with parents and siblings. The family's role in establishing/modifying eating patterns is very well acknowledged in the scientific community. The evaluation of the SFS should preferably also include parents/ F&V intake.

The degree to which the School Fruit Scheme has increased the consumption of fruit and vegetables at school and at home should (ideally) be measured by using a Baseline/follow up study and the Intervention/control group approach. This means to have at least two measurements of the consumption of the children and the parents, one at the beginning of the scheme before the distribution starts (zero measurement), and at least one as recent as possible after establishment of the Scheme (the last weeks of distribution).

Measurements should preferably cover at least classes from three grades (for example I, II, III grade of primary school) and where possible also subsequent grade in order to follow pupils a year after they have stopped participating in the Scheme. In fact, long term positive effects can be observed if the Scheme is implemented in each participating school as long as possible and not for one year only².

It is crucial to assess the intake development by a scientifically sound method. This can be obtained by setting a statistical representative sample of participating schools, as well as a number of schools not participating to the SFS which will represent the control group. As concerns the sample size and according to the Group, the number of sample schools should depend on the size of the country/region and on financial considerations but it should be statistically representative in terms of socio economic factors. .

Member States can decide how to carry out consumption measurements. However, to compare the countries, the Group recommends using **Food frequency** questionnaires. They should be duly adapted to pupils of different age, namely 2-6/7 and 7/8-11 years old. Moreover, the questionnaires should be scientifically based and validated. Questionnaires should not be too long and complex. Questionnaires are recommended to measure children' consumption at home and at school and parent's consumption both for F&V and if possible

¹ As concerns the implementation of the Scheme, the Group strongly recommends extending the target group to younger children covering when possible 2 to 11 years old pupils. However, the choice of the target group remains under the responsibility of the Member States.

² The Group strongly recommends implementing the Scheme in each participating school as long as possible.

for energy dense food. For children 2 to 6/7 years old it questionnaires should be filled in by the parents and/or carers or kindergarten staff.

Complementary tools such as **24 hours recall, 3day food diary or similar** are also recommended in order to better know the food of children as a whole.

Alternatively, more robust measures can be used, such as:

1. *Weighed measures*. Food is measured before and after consumption to determine the weight of food eaten.

2. *Direct observation*. The amount of foods consumed by children is estimated by trained observers.

These are objective and highly reliable measures of food consumption that do not rely on verbal recall or other subjective assessments, and can be used across all age ranges.

3. *Food waste* can also be measured, to show economic and environmental impacts.

The measurements should include at least the following indicators:

- F&V (and if possible energy dense food) consumption by children
- F&V (and if possible energy dense food) consumption by parents
- Knowledge of the children on the type, need and health benefits of consuming fruit and vegetables. (for 2 to 6/7 years old children knowledge of products: how many f&v they know/can recognize). This has not to be confused with “nutritional education” in which more medical aspects are considered as energy and nutrients content in F and V.
- Preference of the children towards fruit and vegetables (do the children like consuming fruit and vegetables, do they think they consume enough fruit and vegetables, do they want to consume more?).
- Preferences of the children on the way of distribution of the fruit and vegetables (in pieces, packed in plastic, in the form of juice etc.) where applicable.
- Reasons for consuming/not consuming F&V
- Conduct of parents towards consumption (variety, time and frequency, availability of fruit and vegetables at home, what they give to children for snacks). (can be measured through questionnaires for parents)
- Consumption of other food in the school (is other food available, like from vending machines) (availability at school can be measured through questionnaires for teachers/school headmasters).

In case no zero measurement was carried out before the start of the Scheme this can be solved:

By carrying out a zero measurement before

- the start of the Scheme in schools that just launched the fruit and vegetables distribution under the Scheme
- By supplying data on a comparable control school or control schools in the same country or region where the Scheme was not carried out or
- By adding an extra measurement once the Scheme is running to see whether changes occurred after the establishment of the Scheme.

3. Please provide indicators to assess the well-functioning of the Scheme

Commission Regulation 288/2009 laying down the detailed rules for the School Fruit Scheme requires:

- Establishment of a well-functioning distribution scheme of fruit and vegetables to children,
- Establishment of adequate accompanying measures.

Whether a well functioning School Fruit Scheme has been established (with or without major problems and challenges) can be (not exhaustively) checked by a number of information:

- The effort needed to establish the School Fruit Scheme Strategy,
- Estimated necessary total funding for a well functioning School Fruit Scheme,
- The effort to realise the necessary co-financing and the description of the co-financing framework,
- Description of tasks and responsibilities of stakeholders in the Scheme (stakeholders involved, their tasks and responsibilities in particular Ministry of agriculture, ministry of health, ministry of education, territorial decision makers),
- Description of the accompanying measures distinguishing the participative activities (kitchen classes discover of tastes, garden in the school, visits to farms, visits to markets etc.) from the others (lectures, exhibitions, competitions, etc.),
- Appreciation by the different stakeholders of different accompanying measures,
- Description of the organisation of deliveries: who are the suppliers, which are the authorised products, what are the recommendations for types of products (fresh, seasonal, organic...), adequate prices and conditions of deliveries (reasonable cost and conditions in view of market conditions),
- Uptake and appreciation of the School Fruit Scheme by the schools and the sector,
- Description of the evaluation system of the School Fruit Scheme including the methods used to assess the intake evolution,
- Description of the communication and information actions for the School Fruit Scheme.

4. Please describe possible impact of the parameters of the Scheme

Parameters on the establishment of the Scheme that should ideally be supplied in the evaluation to judge its effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the Scheme include:

- Types of educational establishments participating and their reasons,
- % targeted children enrolled
- Frequency of distribution (by week, precise the number of weeks in the year),
- Diversity of products delivered (fresh/processed, number of different products, type of fruits and vegetables),
- Cost of the products and of their distribution,
- Parental financial contribution (% of the total budget),
- Public co-financing (% of the total budget),
- Private co-financing (% of the total budget), other than parental contribution

- Work burden and financial burden for the school,
- Socio-economic environment of the school,
- Supporting information to children and parents,
- Accompanying measures (% of the total budget)
- Number of portions distributed/child/year in average
- Total direct cost/child/year
- Cost per portion
- Cost and time required for the evaluation

5. Please provide the lessons learned and suggestions for modification

As the national evaluations have as a purpose to continuously improve the Scheme, address common problems and share good practices in all the Member States, suggestions for the possible improvements in the functioning of the Scheme are very welcome!

Therefore please include in your evaluations:

- Main lessons learned in the evaluation period,
- Which challenges have to be addressed in the coming school years,
- Recommendations for necessary research,
- Any recommendations for modifications at EU level, both in the practical implementation rules and in the basic conditions of the Scheme.

ANNEX 8: BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bonjour P. (2001) Invest in Your Bones: How diet, lifestyles and genetics affect bone development in young people. International Osteoporosis Foundation; <http://www.iofbonehealth.org/calcium>
2. CEPS study "Measurement of administrative burdens generated by EU legislation – AB quantifications of SFs and SMS", 2011.
3. Court of Auditor's Special report No 10 of 2011 'Are the School Milk and School Fruit Schemes effective?'
4. De Sa and Lock (2007), "School-based fruit and vegetable schemes: a review of evidence"
5. Evaluation of the US Fresh Fruit and Vegetables Programme, Food and Nutrition Service, US Department of Agriculture, March 2013.
6. External evaluation of the European School Fruit Scheme, 8 October 2012, AFC Consulting Group AG and Co Concept. http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/school-fruit-scheme-2012_en.htm
7. External evaluation of the European School Milk Scheme, draft final report submitted in September 2013. Conclusions and recommendations are in Annex 5.
8. FAO overview of worldwide school milk programmes (2005); <http://www.fao.org/economic/est/est-commodities/dairy/school-milk/en/>
9. Food intake of European adolescents in the light of different food-based dietary guidelines: results of the HELENA Study, Public Health Nutrition, 15(3), 2011.
10. INRA report, "Dietary behaviours and practices, determinants, action, outcomes", June 2010.
11. Institute of Medicine, 2013). <http://frac.org/initiatives/hunger-and-obesity/why-are-low-income-and-food-insecure-people-vulnerable-to-obesity/>
12. Joshi, Azuma and Feenstra (2008): "Do Farm-to-School Programs make a difference?"
13. JRC scientific and policy reports, Study "Short Food Supply Chains and Local Food Systems in the EU. A State of Play of their Socio-Economic Characteristics" http://agrilife.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/SFSChainFinaleditedreport_000.pdf
14. Rabobank Industry Note 384, May 2013.
15. "The benefits of farm to school", National Farm to School Network; www.farmtoschool.org.
16. Trends in food intake in French children from 1999 to 2007: results from INCA dietary surveys. British Journal of Nutrition (2010), 103, 585-601.

17. White Paper on a Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related health issues', COM(2007) 279 final, 30.5.2007.

WHO: Food and nutrition policy for schools, Copenhagen 2006.

http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0019/152218/E89501.pdf