

# Methodology for the EEA's 'Early warning' assessments – Food waste reduction targets



Authors:

ETC CE: Nora Brueggemann (CSCP), Elisabeth Pernmyr (IVL)

EEA: Almut Reichel, Sanna Due, Beatriz Vidal



Cover design: EEA  
Cover image: by Marek Studzinski on Unsplash  
Layout: ETC CE

**Version: 1**

**Publication Date** December 2025

**EEA activity** Circular Economy and Resource Use

**Legal notice**

Preparation of this report has been co-funded by the European Environment Agency as part of a grant with the European Topic Centre on Circular economy and resource use (ETC CE) and expresses the views of the authors. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or opinion of the European Commission or other institutions of the European Union. Neither the European Environment Agency nor the European Topic Centre on Circular economy and resource use is liable for any consequence stemming from the reuse of the information contained in this publication.

ETC CE coordinator: Vlaamse Instelling voor Technologisch Onderzoek (VITO)

ETC CE partners: Banson Editorial and Communications Ltd, česká informační agentura životního prostředí (CENIA), Collaborating Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production (CSCP), Istituto Di Ricerca Sulla la Crescita Economica Sostenibile, Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e Ricerca Ambientale, IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, Norion Consult, Universita Degli Studi Di Ferrara (SEEDS), German Environment Agency (UBA), Teknologian Tutkimuskeskus VTT oy, Wuppertal Institut für Klima, Umwelt, Energie gGmbH, World Resources Forum Association.

**Copyright notice**

© European Topic Centre on Circular economy and resource use, 2025

Reproduction is authorized provided the source is acknowledged. [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (International)]

More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (<http://europa.eu>).

## Contents

Acknowledgements .....	4
Disclaimer on AI-Supported Content Development.....	4
Introduction.....	5
1. Current situation .....	7
1.1 SRF FWP-1.1 Distance to target .....	7
1.1.1 SRF FWP-1.1.1 Distance to target: Reduction of food waste generated in processing and manufacturing .....	8
1.1.2 SRF FWP-1.1.2 Distance to target: Reduction of food waste per capita, jointly in retail and other distribution of food, in restaurants and food services and in households.....	8
2. National strategies .....	9
2.1 SRF FWP-2.1 Existence and quality of a National Food Waste Prevention Framework .....	9
2.2 SRF FWP-2.2 Quality and use of an evaluation of the National Food Waste Prevention Programme.....	10
3. Economic instruments.....	11
3.1 SRF FWP-3.1 Economic measures to support actors in the food supply chain to prevent and reduce food waste.....	11
4. Other policy instruments.....	12
4.1 SRF FWP-4.1 Legislative measures to support donation or redistribution of surplus food.....	12
4.2 SRF FWP-4.2 Firm plans to support donation or redistribution of surplus food .....	13
4.3 SRF FWP-4.3 Measures to support food supply chain actors in using food no longer intended for human consumption as animal feed or for industrial applications.....	14
4.4 SRF FWP-4.4 Obligations for food supply chain actors to prevent or reduce food waste.....	14
4.4.1 SRF FWP-4.4.1 Measures targeting food supply chain actors in processing and manufacturing to prevent or reduce food waste.....	16
4.4.2 SRF FWP 4.4.2 Measures targeting food supply chain actors in retail and other distribution of food, restaurants and food services to prevent or reduce food waste .....	17
5. Other measures or initiatives for advancing food waste prevention .....	18
5.1 SRF FWP-5.1 Initiatives for advancing food waste prevention (bonus success factor) .....	18
6. List of abbreviations .....	19
7. References .....	19

## Acknowledgements

This methodology has been developed by the European Topic Centre on Circular economy and resource use (ETC CE) under the guidance of the European Environment Agency (EEA).

The ETC CE and EEA would like to thank the European Environment Information and Observation Network (Eionet) and the European Commission (DG Environment, DG Sante and the Joint Research Centre) for their valuable comments to a draft version of this document.

## Disclaimer on AI-Supported Content Development

Parts of this document — including the formulation and refinement of the 'success/risk factors' (SRFs), associated assessment criteria, and questionnaire elements — were developed with the support of OpenAI's ChatGPT, based on user-provided materials, policy documents, and structured collaboration. While AI-assisted, all content has been reviewed, validated, and finalised by the project team. The AI tool served as a drafting and synthesis aid and does not bear responsibility for the interpretation or implementation of the final content.

## Introduction

This document outlines the methodology used for the EEA's contribution to the Early warning mechanism, in accordance with Article 11b of the Waste Framework Directive (WFD), as amended on 10 September 2025. The purpose is to identify potential shortcomings and enable corrective action ahead of the 31 December 2030 deadline for achieving the following targets as laid down in Article 9a(4) WFD:

- a 10% reduction in food waste generated in processing and manufacturing, and
- a 30% per capita reduction in food waste generated jointly by retail and other food distribution, restaurants and food services, and households.

Both targets are measured against the annual average amount of food waste generated in the baseline period 2021–2023, or another baseline in line with the WFD's provisions. The document also provides an assessment of each Member State's progress towards meeting these targets.

The methodology applies a set of 'success/risk factors' (SRFs), each of which is assumed to affect the likelihood of achieving the target. For each SRF, the robustness of the underlying data/information will be assessed qualitatively. Regarding numeric reported data, the EEA will rely on Eurostat's quality checking and validation process.

Each SRF is assessed using either threshold values or qualitative categories, classifying the factor as green, orange, or red:

on track target reached favourable	additional effort needed medium uncertain	unfavourable highly uncertain no information
--	---	--

The risk assessment should indicate whether a country is at risk of not meeting the target. The 'total score' is the sum of the individual points given for each SRF, where the assessment of each SRF results in 2 points (green), 1 point (orange) or 0 points (red), depending on the assessment of the SRF. As some SRFs are considered to have a higher impact on meeting the target, the points given to the SRF are multiplied by the defined weight of the SRF. This weighting factor is included in the description of the SRF. As some SRFs might not be applicable to all Member States (MS), only the SRFs relevant to the MS are taken into account to define the maximum score. A MS is considered to be 'not at risk' if its score is 50% or more of this maximum score. A MS is considered to be 'at risk' if its score is less than 50 % of this maximum score. Table 1 illustrates how the final overall risk is calculated.

**Table 1: Mock-up of how the final overall risk is calculated (general approach)**

Relevant success and risk factors	Assessment result	Points	Weight of the SRF	Score
SRF 1		2	1	2
SRF 2		2	2	4
SRF 3		0	1	0
SRF 4		1	1	1
SRF 5		2	1	2
...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...
Total score (= sum of scores of all relevant SRFs)				9
Maximum score (= highest total possible score of all relevant SRFs)				12
Assessment score (= total score divided by the maximum score)				75%
Final overall risk	Not at risk if assessment score > or = 50% of maximum score			Not at risk
	At risk if assessment score < 50% of maximum score			

The following table gives an overview of the set of success- and risk factors.

	Success/risk factor (SRF)	Relevance for 10% target on processing and manufacturing	Relevance for 30% target on retail and other distribution of food, in restaurants and food services and in households
Current situation and past trends	FWP-1.1.1 Distance to target: reduction of food waste generated in processing and manufacturing	x	
	FWP-1.1.2 Distance to target: reduction of food waste per capita, jointly in retail and other distribution of food, in restaurants and food services and in households		x
National strategies	FWP-2.1 Existence and quality of a National Food Waste Prevention Framework	x	x
	FWP-2.2. Quality and use of the evaluation results of the National Food Waste Prevention Programme	x	x
Economic instruments	FWP-3.1 Economic measures to support actors in the food supply chain to prevent and reduce food waste	x	x
Other policy instruments	FWP-4.1 Legislative measures to promote donation or redistribution of surplus food in place	x	x
	FWP-4.2 Firm plans to support donation or redistribution of surplus food	x	x
	FWP-4.3. Measures to support food supply chain actors in repurposing food no longer suitable for human consumption for use as animal feed or in industrial applications	x	x
	FWP-4.4.1 Measures targeting food supply chain actors involved in processing and manufacturing to prevent or reduce food waste	x	
	FWP-4.4.2 Measures targeting food supply chain actors in retail, food distribution, restaurants, and food services to prevent or reduce food waste		x
Bonus success factor	FWP-5.1 Initiatives for advancing food waste prevention (bonus success factor)	x	x

The early warning methodology is not intended to evaluate compliance with specific legal obligations imposed on economic operators or Member States, nor with voluntary or mandatory commitments outlined in the Directive. Instead, it focuses on assessing progress toward the reduction target by examining the presence, and coverage of contributing factors. These factors include dedicated policies and instruments designed to support, enable, or drive both binding and non-binding obligations under the Directive. Importantly, the assessment does not require exhaustive overviews with details of all existing or planned measures. Member States are instead encouraged to provide sufficient evidence that meaningful efforts—whether mandatory or voluntary—are being made to achieve the food waste prevention targets.

## 1. Current situation

### 1.1 SRF FWP–1.1 Distance to target

#### Description and relevance

The distance to the target at the most recent data point is a key factor in assessing the likelihood of meeting it. Generally, the closer a Member State is to the target, the higher the probability of achievement, assuming current trends continue. This SRF assesses the likelihood of Member States reaching the 2030 food waste reduction targets, using the average amount of food waste generated in 2021–2023 as the baseline for comparison.

The SRF evaluates the gap to the 2030 target using data for reference year 2024 (as no later data will be published at the time of the assessment) compared to the baseline. The methodology takes into account the average annual reduction required, expressed in percent, to reach the target from the baseline.

#### Source

Eurostat, Food waste and food waste prevention by NACE Rev. 2 activity - tonnes of fresh mass [*env\_wasfw*]

#### Considerations for the assessment

According to the WFD, Article 9a(5), MS may use an earlier baseline than the 2021–2023 average. In the early warning assessment, a different baseline can be used in case this has been formally accepted by the European Commission (in case of a baseline before 2020) or notified (in case of 2020 chosen as baseline) according to Article 9a(5). In order to be taken into account in the early warning assessment, this information must be available to the EEA by the end of 2026 at the latest.

According to Article 9a(6) WFD, the European Commission should establish a tourism correction factor for the generation of food waste. However, as the methodology is due by 17 October 2027, such a correction factor will not be taken into account in this assessment.

**Specific for the EEA-EFTA States:** Due to delays inherent in the EEA Agreement, the new reporting rules enter into force later in time for the EEA EFTA States than for the EU Member States. The EEA EFTA States will therefore be assessed based on the reporting rules legally in force at the time of the assessment, or upcoming reporting rules in case of voluntary reporting.

### 1.1.1 SRF FWP-1.1.1 Distance to target: Reduction of food waste generated in processing and manufacturing

#### Description and relevance

This SRF assesses the likelihood of a MS achieving the 10% food waste reduction target by 2030, based on the average amount of food waste generated in processing and manufacturing in 2021-2023. MS may also choose to use an alternative baseline, see above.

#### Assessment

Decrease in food waste generated by more than 1.5% in 2024 compared to the baseline	Decrease in food waste generated by 0.5%–1.5% in 2024 compared to the baseline	Decrease in food waste generated by less than 0.5% in 2024 compared to the baseline OR Data according to reporting rules not available
---	--	--

**Note:** The threshold of 1.5% is derived from a linear path for meeting the target between the baseline value and the target value in the period 2023-2030.

#### Weight

1

The weight is set to 1, as only limited data are available compared with other methodologies for assessing SRFs on the distance to target.

### 1.1.2 SRF FWP-1.1.2 Distance to target: Reduction of food waste per capita, jointly in retail and other distribution of food, in restaurants and food services and in households

#### Description and relevance

This SRF assesses the MS' likelihood to achieve the 30% food waste reduction target in 2030 compared to the average amount of food waste generated jointly in retail and other distribution of food, in restaurants and food services and households per capita in 2021-2023. MS may also choose to use an alternative baseline, see above.

#### Assessment

Decrease in food waste generated by more than 4.3% in 2024 compared to the baseline	Decrease in food waste generated by 2%–4.3% in 2024 compared to the baseline	Decrease in food waste generated by less than 2% in 2024 compared to the baseline OR Data according to reporting rules not available
---	--	--

**Note:** The threshold of 4.3% is derived from a linear path for meeting the target between the baseline value and the target value in the period 2023-2030.

#### Weight

1

The weight is set to 1, as only limited data are available compared with other methodologies for assessing SRFs on the distance to target.

## 2. National strategies

### 2.1 SRF FWP–2.1 Existence and quality of a National Food Waste Prevention Framework

#### Description and relevance

A dedicated national food waste prevention framework provides the overarching structure for coordinated, long-term efforts to prevent and reduce food waste. Its effectiveness depends not only on high-level ambitions, but also on a clear governance structure that defines responsibilities and assigns an entity or mechanism for implementation and monitoring. Benchmark examples show that successful frameworks are typically supported by a central coordinating body or mechanism, often with dedicated funding, stakeholder engagement, and a clear implementation plan. This SRF assesses whether a Member State has such a structured and actionable framework in place.

Frameworks adopted before 2018 that have not been revised (beyond minor, factual, or technical adjustments) may be outdated and fail to reflect current priorities or realities. A revision does not require a complete overhaul but should include adjustments or new priorities that reflect evolving food waste policies and the latest data.

A good national food waste prevention framework follows the “Target, measure, act” principle and includes all of the following aspects (criteria):

- Clearly defined quantitative food waste reduction targets that are sector-specific (e.g. processing, retail, households). (These might deviate from the targets in the revised Waste Framework Directive);
- A designated coordinating body or mechanism with a defined mandate;
- Clear allocation of responsibility for the target(s)’ implementation (e.g. national vs. regional level, roles and responsibilities among key actors);
- Availability of a multi-year budget or resources dedicated to the coordination and implementation of the framework.

Note: The specific measures which might be included in the framework are assessed in the following SRFs.

#### Source

Questionnaire

#### Assessment

The framework in place is not older than six years, or has been revised since 2018, AND meets the 4 criteria mentioned above.	There is a framework in place that is not older than six years (including revisions since 2018), BUT it meets only 2 or 3 of the 4 criteria mentioned above.	The framework in place is older than six years and has not been revised since 2018 OR The framework only meets 1 / does not meet any of the criteria mentioned above OR There is no dedicated national food waste framework in place.
---	--	---

#### Weight

1

### Considerations for the assessment

Countries may apply different terms—such as “strategy,” “action plan,” “programme,” “roadmap,” or “framework.” To qualify for ‘green,’ however, the approach must be actionable, with measurable steps, clear governance, and dedicated resources.

In cases where multiple documents exist (e.g. a Food Waste Prevention Programme combined with a strategy, action plan, or roadmap), the framework will be assessed as an integrated system. This ensures that all components collectively meet the criteria required for effective implementation.

## 2.2 SRF FWP–2.2 Quality and use of an evaluation of the National Food Waste Prevention Programme

### Description and relevance

Regular and transparent evaluation is essential for policy credibility and shared learning. National food waste prevention programmes should therefore not only be adopted but regularly assessed to ensure they remain relevant and effective. This SRF assesses the evaluation of the national food waste prevention programmes that each MS had to develop in line with the Waste Framework Directive (Art. 29 (2a), before the WFD revision in 2025).

A good evaluation and revision of a programme is subject to the following criteria:

- It reviews **dedicated indicators** related to food waste prevention actions (e.g. policy instruments, actions, campaigns, audits, or programmes delivered)
- **Food waste monitoring data** (e.g. national sources or as reported to Eurostat) was considered in the evaluation process to reflect on progress or adjust priorities;
- The evaluation results are **publicly available** (e.g. report, dashboard, or official summary);
- It has led to **revisions or adjustments** in the strategy or its implementation (including, for example, evaluation of individual actions or campaigns, if these informed the overall review).

A robust evaluation strengthens accountability, supports learning, and reinforces long-term commitment to food waste reduction by helping MS understand what works, what doesn't, and why.

### Source

Questionnaire.

### Assessment

The evaluation of the national food waste prevention programme meets at least 3 out of the 4 criteria outlined above	The evaluation of the national food waste prevention programme meets 1 or 2 out of the 4 criteria outlined above	The national food waste prevention programme has not been evaluated OR The evaluation did not match any of the mentioned criteria
--	--	---

### Weight

1

### 3. Economic instruments

#### 3.1 SRF FWP-3.1 Economic measures to support actors in the food supply chain to prevent and reduce food waste

##### Description and relevance

This SRF focuses on actual implementation of structured, operational measures in the form of economic instruments that influence business practice, moving beyond strategy content or aspirational commitments. Effective economic instruments are characterised by administrative simplicity including clear eligibility criteria and low administrative burden. This means that information about the instruments is easily accessible and the process to benefit from these instruments is also clear to food supply chain actors. Examples of such instruments that specifically target food waste include:

- Grants, subsidies, and loans (e.g., financial support for businesses to invest in food waste reduction measures, such as process optimization, waste tracking systems, or donation infrastructure; these can include non-repayable funding or low-interest loans)
- Public procurement incentives
- Differentiated waste tariffs that incentivize food waste prevention

**Note:** While these economic instruments may not always directly prevent food waste from occurring, they play a key role in creating an overall system that addresses food waste throughout the value chain.

##### Source

Questionnaire

##### Assessment

There are one or more economic measures in place supporting actors in the food supply chain to prevent and reduce food waste	There are firm plans* to introduce economic measures supporting actors in the food supply chain to prevent and reduce food waste	There are no economic measures supporting actors in the food supply chain to prevent and reduce food waste
--	--	--

\*Firm plans are plans with legislative proposals in place and a publicly announced start date (within the next two years) introducing the aforementioned economic measures.

##### Weight

1

## 4. Other policy instruments

### 4.1 SRF FWP–4.1 Legislative measures to support donation or redistribution of surplus food

#### Description and relevance

Food donation and redistribution are key operational routes for preventing food waste. A well-designed national framework can play a crucial role in enabling safe and efficient surplus food donation. This includes structured diversion of surplus at the processing and manufacturing stage (e.g., overproduction, off-spec batches, or near-date products) as well as supporting donation efforts at the “last mile”—that is, the final step of transferring surplus food from retail, distribution, restaurants, or food services to charitable organizations or other recipients.

This SRF goes beyond simply asking whether a policy, strategy, or legal framework for food donation and redistribution exists. It examines whether such frameworks actively remove structural barriers that prevent donation from being scaled up. The assessment builds on barriers identified in the EU guidelines on food donation (2017/C 361/01), including:

- Legal (liability protection)
- Regulatory (date labelling, food hygiene rules)
- Fiscal (VAT treatment)
- Logistical challenges
- Awareness gaps

The SRF also considers how policies support the prioritisation of food redistribution for human consumption, followed by use as animal feed and, lastly, for non-food purposes, in line with the EU food use hierarchy.

The following **measures** have been identified as most relevant for food waste donation and redistribution:

1. Liability protection for food donors to encourage safe redistribution of surplus food.
2. Fiscal measures, such as value-added tax (VAT) exemptions, to incentivise food donation.
3. National funding schemes (e.g. implementing European Social Fund Plus (ESF+) to support food waste donation and redistribution initiatives.
4. IT platforms and tools that facilitate food donation and redistribution.
5. National guidelines for food donation, complementing existing EU guidelines.
6. Instruments ensuring surplus food is channeled first to those in need before other uses.

For the purpose of this SRF:

- The focus is on policy frameworks that support food donation and redistribution, as outlined in the EU food donation guidelines (2017/C 361/01). It does not cover the sale of surplus food on secondary commercial markets (e.g. e-platforms).
- Food donation refers to the delivery of surplus food free of charge to charitable organisations such as food banks or other non-profit actors, typically for social purposes.
- Food redistribution is broader. It includes donation but also other forms of diverting surplus food for human consumption, such as discounted resale through social supermarkets or recovery networks. It also covers redistribution from centralised food banks to other charitable organisations.

#### Source

Questionnaire

## Assessment

National policy, strategy, or legal framework in place supporting food donation and redistribution, which addresses at least 4 of the 6 measures mentioned above	National policy, strategy, or legal framework in place supporting food donation and redistribution, addressing at least 2 of the 6 measures mentioned above	National policy, strategy, or legal framework in place supporting food donation and redistribution, but it only addresses 1 or none of the 6 measures mentioned above OR There is no national policy, strategy or legal framework in place supporting food donation and redistribution
--	---	--

## Weight

1

## Considerations for the assessment

This SRF focuses on the donation and redistribution for human consumption, not animal feed or bio-based processing. Mandatory obligations or mandatory agreements for donations are not covered under this SRF but under SRF 4.4.

## 4.2 SRF FWP-4.2 Firm plans to support donation or redistribution of surplus food

### Description and relevance

Are there firm plans to introduce or improve the national strategy or policy framework addressing the most relevant measures for food donation or redistribution within the next two years? This SRF is only relevant for MS that do not have a 'green' assessment in SRF 4.1, unless these MS have firm plans to even further introduce additional measures. 'Firm plans' are plans with legislative proposals in place, and a publicly announced start date (within the next two years).

### Source

Questionnaire

## Assessment

Firm plans in place to introduce or further improve the national policy, strategy, or legal framework supporting donation and redistribution of surplus food, which address at least 4 of the 6 measures mentioned above	Firm plans in place supporting donation and redistribution of surplus food, which address at least 2 of the 6 measures mentioned above	Firm plans in place supporting donation and redistribution of surplus food, which address only 1 or none of the 6 measures mentioned above OR No firm plans to introduce national policy, strategy or legal framework supporting donation and redistribution of surplus food	N/A (for MS which already have national policy, strategy or legal framework supporting donation and redistribution of surplus food in place, and which address at least 4 of the 6 measures mentioned above, with no firm plans for further improvement)
--	--	--	--

## Weight

1

## 4.3 SRF FWP–4.3 Measures to support food supply chain actors in using food no longer intended for human consumption as animal feed or for industrial applications

### Description and relevance

In line with the food use hierarchy, prevention efforts should prioritise avoiding food waste at source, followed by food donation and redistribution. The hierarchy also includes repurposing food waste for animal feed and transforming food-based materials into value-added products, either for food (e.g. upcycled ingredients) or for non-food purposes (e.g. cosmetics, biomaterials). As the use of food no longer intended for human consumption as animal feed is primarily regulated at EU level, this SRF does not assess national legislation. Instead, it evaluates whether adequate support mechanisms are in place to enable companies and organizations to channel food no longer intended for human consumption into animal feed or industrial uses as a means of waste prevention.

The support mechanism may include:

- Publicly available guidelines describing safe and legal processes supplementing EU rules on food to feed - (2018/C 133/02)
- Centralized helpdesk or advisory service for food business operators
- Facilitation platforms (e.g. match-making platforms linking food business with feed producers or industrial users)
- Trainings for food business operators in the redistribution of surplus food

### Source

Questionnaire

### Assessment

Support mechanisms are in place	The MS has firm plans* to introduce support mechanisms	There is no supporting mechanism in place AND , there are no firm plans* to introduce such mechanisms in place
---------------------------------	--	--

\*Firm plans are plans with legislative proposals in place and a publicly announced start date (within the next two years) introducing the aforementioned support mechanism.

### Consideration of assessment:

Having a support mechanism is enough to score green.

### Weight

1

## 4.4 SRF FWP–4.4 Obligations for food supply chain actors to prevent or reduce food waste

### Description and relevance

This SRF assesses whether food supply chain actors in processing and manufacturing (in relation to the 10% reduction target) and in retail and other distribution of food, in restaurants, and food services (in relation to the 30% reduction target) are subject to specified enforceable or structured obligations to prevent and reduce food waste in their operations. More specifically, these measures or tools can take the form of

- Legal obligations for companies, such as mandatory diagnosis or prevention plans, donation requirements, or reporting duties, which include:

- A clear and enforceable duty to act on food waste;
- Monitoring or reporting requirements to track compliance;
- Sanctions or enforcement mechanisms in case of non-compliance.
- Structured negotiated voluntary agreements or public-private partnerships between business and government, which include:
  - clear and quantified reduction targets;
  - monitoring or reporting;
  - accountability mechanisms (for instance public oversight or follow-up mechanisms).

**Source**

Questionnaire

**Considerations for the assessment**

Structured voluntary agreements or public-private partnerships should involve public-sector participation, include quantified reduction targets or other clear objectives, have some form of monitoring or progress tracking and actively support implementation rather than merely stating intent.

For further information see European Commission: Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety, *Reducing food loss and waste – Examples of voluntary agreements and other forms of collaborations across Europe – Deliverable of the EU platform on food losses and food waste*, Publications Office of the European Union, 2024, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2875/212278>

#### 4.4.1 SRF FWP-4.4.1 Measures targeting food supply chain actors in processing and manufacturing to prevent or reduce food waste

##### Assessment

<p>A legal requirement with specific obligations targeting supply chain actors in processing and manufacturing to prevent or reduce food waste in place AND / OR A structured negotiated voluntary agreement or public-private partnership is in place, covering the sectors processing and manufacturing</p>	<p>A legal requirement with specific obligations targeting supply chain actors in processing and manufacturing to prevent or reduce food waste exists but is not yet fully implemented, enforced or operational AND / OR A structured voluntary agreement or public-private partnership covering the sectors processing and manufacturing exists but is not yet fully implemented, enforced or operational OR There is a firm plan* to introduce a legal obligation targeting supply chain actors in processing and manufacturing to prevent or reduce food waste, but it is not yet fully implemented, enforced or operational OR There is a firm plan* to set up a structured voluntary agreement or public-private partnership covering the sectors processing and manufacturing</p>	<p>There are no legal obligations targeting food supply chain actors in processing and manufacturing to prevent or reduce food waste, nor any structured voluntary agreement or public-private partnership covering these sectors</p>
---	---	---

\*Firm plans are plans with legislative proposals in place and a publicly announced start date (within the next two years) introducing the aforementioned measures as specified in SRF FWP-4.4.

##### Weight

1

#### 4.4.2 SRF FWP 4.4.2 Measures targeting food supply chain actors in retail and other distribution of food, restaurants and food services to prevent or reduce food waste

##### Assessment

<p>A legal obligation targeting food supply chain actors in retail and other distributors of food, restaurants and food services to prevent or reduce food waste is in place AND / OR</p> <p>A structured voluntary agreement or public-private partnership covering the sectors retail and other distribution, restaurants and food services is in place</p>	<p>A legal obligation targeting food supply chain actors in retail and other distribution of food, restaurants and food services to prevent or reduce food waste exists but is not yet fully implemented, enforced or operational OR</p> <p>There is a firm plan* to introduce a legal obligation targeting food supply chain actors in retail and other distribution of food, restaurants and food services to prevent or reduce food waste OR</p> <p>There is a firm plan to set up a structured voluntary agreement or public-private partnership covering the sectors retail and other distribution, restaurants and food services</p>	<p>There are no legal obligations targeting food supply chain actors in retail and other distribution of food, restaurants and food services to prevent or reduce food waste, nor any structured voluntary agreement or public-private partnership covering these sectors</p>
---	--	---

\*Firm plans are plans with legislative proposals in place and a publicly announced start date (within the next two years) introducing the obligations or the structured voluntary agreement as described in SRF FWP - 4.4.

##### Weight

1

## 5. Other measures or initiatives for advancing food waste prevention

### 5.1 SRF FWP-5.1 Initiatives for advancing food waste prevention (bonus success factor)

#### Description and relevance

This SRF awards MS that have implemented national measures or initiatives that contribute significantly to food waste prevention and that are not yet covered under any of the previous SRFs. These initiatives may include (but are not limited to) education or training programmes targeting specific sectors (e.g., hospitality, schools, retailers); consumer-targeted campaigns that go beyond awareness-raising to actively change behaviour (e.g. planning, storage, portioning, misunderstanding of date labels); pilot projects or programmes testing new technologies or behavioural interventions to reduce food waste; IT platforms or apps introducing novel mechanisms for preventing or redistributing surplus food.

The assessment is based on the following criteria:

- The measure/initiative is coordinated at national or (multi-)regional level and its findings, methodologies and lessons learnt are actively shared – ensuring broad applicability and scaling potential. Or, if the measure/initiative is a pilot project on local or regional level and its findings, methodologies and lessons learnt are actively shared to enable scaling across the whole country.
- The measure/initiative has a documented quantitative or qualitative impact on food waste reduction, either measurable or supported by expert judgement.

#### Source

Questionnaire

#### Assessment

MS has implemented at least one additional measure or initiative to advance food waste reduction that meets all criteria.	MS has implemented at least one additional measure or initiative to advance the food waste reduction that meets one of the two criteria.	N/A
---	--	-----

#### Weight

1

#### Considerations for the assessment

This SRF provides an opportunity to gain additional points in the overall assessment. Importantly, MS that do not have such initiatives will not be penalized, as this SRF will simply not be taken into account in their scoring.

## 6. List of abbreviations

EEA	European Environment Agency
EC	European Commission
ETC CE	European Topic Center on Circular Economy and Resource Use
JRC	Joint Research Centre
MS	(EU) Member States (European Union)
SRF	Success/risk factor
WFD	Waste Framework Directive
Questionnaire	One of the key sources for collecting information mentioned in the methodology is a questionnaire to MS, designed by the EEA and ETC CE to collect information on a voluntary basis.

## 7. References

- EU Platform on Food Losses and Waste (2020), *Food Redistribution in the EU: Mapping and Analysis*. [https://food.ec.europa.eu/document/download/9192a03b-02e4-4cae-864f-7511a7937454\\_en?filename=fw\\_eu-actions\\_food-donation\\_ms-practices-food-redis.pdf](https://food.ec.europa.eu/document/download/9192a03b-02e4-4cae-864f-7511a7937454_en?filename=fw_eu-actions_food-donation_ms-practices-food-redis.pdf)
- European Commission (2017), *Notice on EU food donation guidelines* [2017/C 361/01]. [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52017XC1025\(01\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52017XC1025(01))
- European Council (2025), Compromise text on the revision of the Waste Framework Directive, <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-7258-2025-INIT/en/pdf>
- European Commission: Joint Research Centre (2023), Reducing consumer food waste – Recommendations for policymakers, Publications Office of the European Union, <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c097a3cc-721f-11ee-9220-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>