

# Putting the Criteria into Practice

## A Description of the Criteria & Evaluation Matrix

Christopher Stopes

EcoS Consultancy, UK

# Outline

---

- Purpose
- How Criteria Matrix is used
- Structure - Application, Evaluation, Comparison: Criteria, Recommendation
- Critical cases - values & definitions
- Key questions

# Purpose

---

- Provide a structured approach to evaluation of inputs
  - Working within a defined procedure
  - Transparent
  - Available to all
  - Clear criteria, based on principles
- Allows differences between MS & regions in organic practice to be clearly stated & understood
- Assist in highlighting key issues
  - Enabling resolution of critical issues (for or against)
- Formulate clear recommendations for decision making

# How criteria matrix used

---

- Applicant MS - provides information on product for all criteria
- EU Expert Panel comments and provisionally evaluates according specified evaluation criteria - with scoring to highlight key issues (both positive and negative)
- All MS comment & evaluate (with scores to highlight key issues)
- Recommendation by MS
- Recommendation by Expert Panel to SCOF

# Structure

## Excel Workbook - 6 Worksheets

---

### 1. Read me first

Explanation of worksheets & description of process

### 2. Application

- Criteria 1 - 9
- Key issues
- Applicant statement
- Experts' comment

### 3. Screening

- Identify key issues
- May stop the application process

### 4. Evaluation

- Expert evaluation
- MS comment
- Score
- Recommendation

### 5. Comparison

- Compilation of scores
- Identify areas of disagreement

### 6. Definitions

- Defines all terms used in matrix
- Legal basis

# Application & Evaluation I

---

- Applicant (MS) submits completed application form
  - Every criteria specified - statement for each
  - Expert Panel comments where necessary
- Evaluation by Expert Panel
  - Statement for each criterion
  - Specific requirements - based on principles
  - Score (-2 to +2) for transparency, help participation, overcome language barriers in defining critical issues
- Evaluation by (all) member states
  - Comment & score
  - Identify key issues (particularly negative)

# Application & Evaluation II

What is the difference? Example – Hydrolysed proteins  
NB: Case study fully explained later

- 
- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Application</u> provides the facts about the input</li></ul> <hr/>           |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Evaluation</u> interprets facts &amp; offers a judgment</li></ul> <hr/>                |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Potential levels of impurities (e.g. Chromium in tannery waste)</li></ul> <hr/> |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Are the environmental effects minimal, is this an avoidable source of Cr?</li></ul> <hr/> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Source of the material derived from factory farming</li></ul> <hr/>             |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Is this use of material from factory farming acceptable?</li></ul> <hr/>                  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– How the substance is used within organic systems</li></ul>                      |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Does use conform to principles of fertility supply and rotation?</li></ul>                |
- 
- |         |  |                  |
|---------|--|------------------|
| • FACTS |  | • INTERPRETATION |
|---------|--|------------------|

# Evaluation criteria & scoring

---

- Required &/or recommended limits for each of the criteria
- Based on principles (Organic Revision Project)
- Scoring indicative - identify critical (positive or negative) issues
  - +2 Very good, beneficial
  - +1 Good
  - 0 Neutral - no effect
  - -1 Some negative impact
  - -2 Very poor, does not meet requirements
    - **-2 represents critical issue - use would require exceptional ??**  
**Really special reasons**
    - Scores are not additive, average not used, non-commensurate
- Experts evaluation statement & score
- MS comments & score

# Criteria – both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’

---

- Soft
  - Mostly qualitative
  - May be value based
  - Necessity
  - Economic importance
  - Perception (consumption, farming system)
- Hard
  - Mostly quantitative
  - Hazard (intrinsic properties of substance)
  - Risk (likelihood of harm)
  - Some may be critical (e.g. GM)

# Criteria - Summary

Matrix on website  
[www.organicinputs.org](http://www.organicinputs.org)

- Identification ✓ ✓
- Origin
- Manufacturing
- Use & necessity ✓
- Environmental impact ✓ ✓
- Human health impact ✓
- Animal welfare impact
- Socio-economic aspects
- Other information
- Key issues

## Existing requirements

✓ = Pesticide evaluation

✓ = Article 7 of 2092/91

# Evaluation Criteria Example:

## 5. Environmental Impact

---

- **Principle:** manufacture, use & disposal of the substance do not result in or contribute to, harmful effects on the environment & at least maintain or ideally improve agroecosystem health
  - **5.01 Manufacturing:** The manufacturing process should not result in, or contribute to, harmful effects on the environment (scores: No harmful effect = 0, harmful effect = -1 or -2)
  - **5.03 Effects of impurities:** Levels of contaminants such as xenobiotics (e.g. antibiotics, pesticides, biocides, persistent substances or other substances of concern), microorganisms & heavy metals should be minimal & not pose environmental risks at normal application rates (scores: no risk = 0, risk = -1 or -2)

- # Identification

Principle: Product must be clearly identifiable

---

1.0 Name

1.1 Characterisation

**1.2 Legal status & status in organic farming standards**

1.3 Purpose & intended use

# 2. Origin

Principle: Plant, animal, microbial or mineral origin; other maybe exceptionally included; must not be of GMO origin

---

2.01 Materials

2.02 GMO origin

2.03 **Factory farming**

2.04 Plant material

2.05 Renewable resources

# 3. Manufacturing

Principle: Physical treatment, microbial, enzymatic; exceptionally simple chemical process; no GMO

---

3.01 Manufacturing methods

3.02 **Use of GMOs**

# 4. Use & necessity

Principle: Necessary for intended use, only if methods in Annex 1 insufficient for nutrient supply, crop protection or other purposes

---

4.01 Traditional use

4.02 **Alternative methods**

4.03 **Efficacy**

4.04 Economic importance

4.05 Likely extent of use

4.06 **Resistance**

# 5. Environmental impact

Principle: Manufacture, use & disposal do not result in or contribute to, harmful effects on environment, & at least maintain or ideally improve agro-ecosystem health

---

5.01 Manufacturing

5.02 Environmental fate

5.03 **Environmental impact of use**

5.04 Effects of impurities

5.05 **Release of biocontrol agents**

5.06 Effects on animals

5.07 Effects on plants

5.08 **Effects on soil**

# 6. Human health impact

Principle: Lowest negative impact on human health & quality of life;  
contribute to production of healthy food

---

6.01 Impacts on human health

6.02 Risks of manufacturing process

6.03 **Risks of application**

6.04 Residues

6.05 **Risks from residues**

# 7. Animal welfare impact

Principle: Lowest negative impact on animal health & quality of life

---

## 7.01 Effect on animal health and welfare

# 8. Socio-economic effects

Principle: Lowest possible impact on society, including public perception by stakeholders

---

**8.01 Public perception: consumption related**

8.02 Public perception: farming practice related

8.03 Public perception: other stakeholder views

8.04 Effects on rural development

8.05 Social justice

**8.06 Cultural, ethical, religious issues**

# 9. Other information

## 10. Key issues

---

9.01 Other supporting information - annex all relevant

10.01 Key issues in favour

10.02 Key issues causing concern

# Recommendation - by MS & Expert Panel

---

- A Recommended for inclusion with no restriction or conditions of use
- B Recommended for inclusion with restriction or conditional requirements - these must be stated
- C Not possible to complete evaluation - further information required
- D Not recommended for inclusion or recommended to withdraw

# Comparison & final recommendation

---

- The Comparison Worksheet includes Expert Panel and MS score
- Shows differences between MS and Expert Panel
- Highlights critical issues between MS & with Expert Panel
- Help prioritise critical issues to resolve - positive & negative
  - Organic practice varies, principles should be consistent
- Recommendation by expert panel to SCOF
  - 1. Product in Annex II - Yes/No
  - 2. If yes - in Annex IIA, B or F
  - 3. If yes - state any specific restrictions or conditions of use

# Values

---

- **Public perception** (Criteria 8 - socio-economic)
  - Consumption related
  - Organic farming system/practice related
  - Other views - Ethical, environmental, fair trade, animal welfare
- Hard to quantify but essential to maintain (or develop) confidence in the ‘integrity’ of organic - risk from inputs
- Organic varies - different regions & traditions
  - Ultimately it is a ‘political’ decision
  - Take account of the full range of views - minority
  - Give justification for decision

# Key questions

---

- Evaluation guidelines & limits - appropriate?
- Scoring - a help or a barrier?
- Can the application & evaluation procedure respect:
  - wide range of conditions,
  - traditions,
  - organic systems,
  - values & attitudes of all stakeholders?