

Summary: Intervention & Options

Department /Agency: Defra	Title: Impact Assessment of EU proposals for an EU School Fruit Scheme	
Stage: FINAL	Version: 9	Date: 28 November 2008
Related Publications: None		

Available to view or download at:

N/A

Contact for enquiries: Steve Gilson

Telephone: 020 7238 1044

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

The European Commission have published proposals for the introduction of a voluntary EU wide fruit and vegetables scheme for the supply of fruit and vegetables into schools.

However, the UK is not convinced as to the merits or appropriateness of funding and controlling this kind of initiative at EU level and from the CAP budget. Whilst not against the idea of such schemes per se – indeed England and Scotland already operate such a scheme – the UK feels that these schemes should be funded from Member States' own social programmes. (see 'Rationale for Government Intervention')

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

The Commission's aim is to reverse the decline in consumption of fruit and vegetables; help tackle obesity and related health issues; and to encourage good eating habits in young people.

Maintaining the existing arrangements would be more valuable to existing and future beneficiaries. Under existing arrangements those children receive a portion of fruit or vegetables each school day. The EU plans would only provide, on average, only one piece per week over a 30 week period therefore significantly reducing children's intake of fruit and vegetables. Furthermore, whilst the EU scheme envisages a greater educational input, via short sharp campaigns, in order to encourage behavioural change; our existing schemes - whilst not having the same degree of educational input - nevertheless have the same aims in relation to behavioural change but because they have a further aim, amongst other aims, of improving children's nutritional input on a daily basis this enables the possibility of change to be effected and sustained over a longer period.

What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option.

Tackling obesity is a complex issue where many factors and issues come into play. Diet is only one of the responses and within itself it has many different strands which can have an influence on the fight against obesity. The link, especially when taken in isolation, between increasing consumption of fruit and vegetables in resultant reduction in obesity is weak. The intended effects of the Commission's scheme are aspirational.

The EU's proposed scheme is voluntary on Member States but we are considering the impacts of implementation in this document. The options are to implement at Member State level or not.

When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects? On-going and monitoring and evaluation of schemes implemented under the proposals is a mandatory. Commission must report by August 2012 to Council and European Parliament on the overall scheme.

Ministerial Sign-off For final Impact Assessments:

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed by the responsible Minister:

JANE KENNEDY Date:

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option:	Description: EU Proposal
-----------------------	---------------------------------

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Cost to taxpayers of supplying and distributing fresh produce (see 'costs' section)
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs	
	£	1	
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
	£ 5.8m		Total Cost (PV) £ 17m
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' These include administration, inspection and enforcement costs to schools, LEA's and the RPA. Other costs not monetised are the costs associated with the educational and supporting initiatives proposed by the Commission, which could be significant. (see 'costs' section)			

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' Free provision of fruit and vegetables to schools (see 'benefits' section)
	One-off	Yrs	
	£		
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
	£ 5.8m		Total Benefit (PV) £ 17m
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' School children: there may be long-term benefits due to promoting healthier consumption [though these are difficult to monetise]			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks The scheme costings represent a transfer from taxpayers to schools
--

Price Base Year 2007	Time Period Years 3	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £ 0	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ 0
-------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	UK
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2009/2010 school year
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	RPA
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£ N/A
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	Yes
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	No
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	N/A
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	No
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro [£ n/a] Small [£ n/a] Medium [£ n/a] Large [£ n/a]
Are any of these organisations exempt?	

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices) see annex E		(Increase - Decrease)
Increase of £ n/a	Decrease of £ n/a	Net Impact £ n/a

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: Status Quo	Description: Current Scheme
-------------------------------------	------------------------------------

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS	Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Cost to taxpayers of supplying and distributing fresh produce (see 'costs' section)				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;">One-off (Transition)</td> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: center;">Yrs</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #ffffcc;">£</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>		One-off (Transition)	Yrs	£	1
	One-off (Transition)		Yrs			
	£		1			
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;">Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #ffffcc;">£ 37.5m</td> </tr> </table>	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)	£ 37.5m				
Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)						
£ 37.5m						
Total Cost (PV)	£ 109m					
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' These include administration, inspection and enforcement costs to schools, LEA's and the RPA.						

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS	Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' Free provision of fruit and vegetables to schools (see 'benefits' section)				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;">One-off</td> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: center;">Yrs</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #ffffcc;">£</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		One-off	Yrs	£	
	One-off		Yrs			
	£					
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;">Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #ffffcc;">£ 37.5m</td> </tr> </table>	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)	£ 37.5m				
Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)						
£ 37.5m						
Total Benefit (PV)	£ 109m					
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' School children: there may be long-term benefits due to promoting healthier consumption [though these are difficult to monetise]						

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

The scheme costings represent a transfer from taxpayers to schools

Price Base Year 2007	Time Period Years 3	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £ 0	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ 0
-------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	UK			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2009/2010 school year			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	RPA			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£ N/A			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	Yes			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	No			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	N/A			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	No			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro [£ n/a]	Small [£ n/a]	Medium [£ n/a]	Large [£ n/a]
Are any of these organisations exempt?				

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices) see annex E			(Increase - Decrease)
Increase of	£ n/a	Decrease of	£ n/a
Net Impact			£ n/a

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

BACKGROUND

This proposal provides for the introduction of a voluntary EU wide School Fruit Scheme for the supply of fruit and vegetables and related products into schools.

The proposals are principally for the funding of the purchase of the fruit and vegetables themselves (€90m per annum (£57.00m using the September exchange rate 1 Euro = £0.7869)), which will also cover certain logistical costs. In addition, there will be an extra €1.3m (£1.0m) which is allocated for networking amongst Member States in order to, amongst other things, pass on experience learnt from existing schemes including the funding of an annual conference. (The first conference will take place in Brussels on 15/16 December 2008).

The EU Commission have indicated that funding would be allocated to Member States on the basis of the number of school children in each Member State aged between the ages of 6-10 (although they are at pains to point out that Member States are not necessarily limited to schemes aimed at this particular age range). Funding would be co-financed by Member States at a rate of 50% (although this will be only 25% in regions eligible under the Convergence Objective).

The EU Funding cannot be used to replace existing national scheme funding, although there is some opportunity that funding could be available for the extension of existing schemes. However, current advice is that the EU would not regard an extension of the English scheme as meeting its criteria without for example building in more educational intervention

Member States wishing to take part in the scheme would need to submit a national strategy explaining how they would implement the scheme in their country. However, all schemes would have to include three essential elements - free distribution of produce in educational establishments, accompanying measures (e.g. how this would fit into the school curriculum) and monitoring and evaluation.

The proposal does not actually prescribe any particular age range at which such a scheme should be targeted, merely describing that it should be directed at "pupil in educational establishments". This policy is left for Member States to decide based upon their own analysis of the situation or indeed how they wish to incorporate it into existing schemes. However, the Commission's own preferred own target age range is 6-10 years old and they have used this range as a basis for a number of calculations and assumptions in their proposal.

Using this age range and the respective populations of EU school children in this age range, they have assumed that funding would theoretically provide for one piece of fruit or vegetable per child per week over a period of 30 weeks. (It should be pointed out that this is well below the coverage of England's existing scheme which targets two million schoolchildren aged below 4-6 years old and where each child is eligible for a free piece of fruit or vegetable each school day. England's scheme cost approximately £37.5m per annum for the supply and distribution of the produce). Again the Commission have not proposed any form of distribution and it would be for Member States to determine.

EU RATIONALE FOR THE SCHEME

General. In the Commission's White Paper on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity they stressed that there was a need for coherent activity at European level to tackle these issues and also stated that "a school fruit scheme would be a step in the right direction". Shortly afterwards in

September 2007, when the European Union adopted the reform of the EU Fruit and Vegetables Regime, a key objective was to reverse the declining consumption of fruit and vegetables. As part of the final declaration covering the agreement on reform, the Council invited the Commission to undertake the following: –

“In the light of the dramatic increase in obesity amongst School children, which has been highlighted in the recently published Commission White Paper “A Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related health issues”, the council invites the Commission to come forward with a proposals for a school fruit scheme as soon as possible based on an impact assessment of the benefits, practicability and administrative costs involved”.

In assessing the need for an EU School Fruit scheme, the Commission have looked, in particular, at the areas of falling consumption; the health issues; and also social and economic aspects. These and other aspects of the evaluation are summarised below.

Falling consumption. Evidence suggests that in recent years consumption of fruit and vegetables within the EU has been falling with a supposed average daily per capita consumption in the EU 27 in 2005 estimated at 380g and further estimates that this would fall to 360g per day by 2010 if the current downward consumption trends continue. As a result, the Commission argue that the majority of Europeans – and, in particular children - are failing to meet the World Health Organisation recommended level of 400g per day. (However, this appears not to be the case in the UK where data from Defra’s Expenditure and Food Survey suggests that purchases of fruit and vegetables are increasing <https://statistics.defra.gov.uk/esg/publications/efs/datasets/default.asp>.)

Health Issues. The Commission argue that weight problems and obesity in the EU are increasing, especially amongst children – an estimated 22 million children are overweight with 5.2m of these being classified as obese. This figure is estimated to rise by 400,000 per year leading to a range of health and social problems which in turn lead to a high cost to society and health budgets.

Social and economic aspects. The Commission argue that there is a strong link between low income, social factors and insufficient intake of fruit and vegetables (e.g. the lower the income the lower the level of consumption). Data suggest that the new Member States in particular would benefit most from increasing their consumption. One of the reasons for this is the fact that cardiovascular disease is more prevalent there and has an earlier onset than in the old EU 15. (However, although the EU have pointed out this fact in their impact assessment, there is very little in their proposals which would help the smaller new Member States over larger more developed States. In fact the latter will receive the lion share of the €90m budget).

Scientific evidence. The Commission argue that healthy eating habits learnt at childhood can be carried through for life. They undertook a review of scientific evidence surrounding existing schemes and also data from some 35 studies of existing school fruit schemes worldwide. Evidence pointed to the fact that such schemes were an effective tool to increasing the consumption of fruit and vegetables and that they can have a lasting impact on consumption. Studies also backed up their view that healthy eating habits are formed in childhood with high consumers of fruit and vegetables in childhood remaining high consumers whilst low consumers in childhood remain low as adults with knock-on negative consequences for their own children.

Commission scheme options. In their earlier public consultation paper the Commission put forward a number of options but their resultant proposal only puts forward one option although this is a combination of three of the previous options. The options were:

- Option 1: Status quo. (e.g. no action at community level). They discounted this option as it would have no impact on demand or on consumption.
- Option 2: Networking. (Limited community support involving the useful exchange of information/good practice between Member States). Although this contained useful elements it was again discounted as an option by itself due to the fact that it would have no impact on demand or on consumption.
- Option 3: Supporting initiatives (e.g. prompting consumption but excluding purchase of the products). It was felt that this would have more benefits than options 1 and 2, but was discounted for similar reasons to option 2.
- Options 4: Driving initiatives. (e.g. establishment of, and funding for, a framework scheme at EU level based on common criteria including purchase of produce). It was thought that this would lead to the development of a viable option and in line with their evaluation of the scientific evidence on existing schemes would be an efficient way to sustainably increase consumption of fruit and vegetables amongst the young.

Commission conclusions. To achieve the goal of increased consumption, a more intensive use of existing Commission instruments would be possible and would be a positive step. The Commission felt that option 4 would be the most effective way of achieving the objectives of increasing consumption and improving health. However, they also decided that its effectiveness would be increased if complemented by options 2 and 3. Therefore they have put forward a package of proposals which cover:

- Purchase of fruit and vegetables
- Accompanying educational measures – Member States need to set out in a National Strategy how this will be carried out.
- Networking activities
- Promotion of agriculture products
- Monitoring and evaluation of individual schemes.

RATIONALE FOR GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN SUCH SCHEMES

There is a strong economic case for public intervention to increase fruit and vegetable consumption (particularly amongst children):

- Current consumption of fruit and vegetables is sub-optimal. Higher consumption generates positive externalities in the form of public health benefits and lower future healthcare costs. Because healthcare costs are borne by society as a whole (and not the individual), fruit and vegetables may be “under-consumed” by individuals who do not take these wider benefits to society into account.
- Fruit and vegetables may be under-consumed because individuals, particularly children, are not sufficiently **aware** of the future health benefits of such consumption. This is partly due to imperfect information in the marketplace: fruit and vegetables are advertised and marketed much less strongly than less healthy snacks and foods, which tend to be supplied by large oligopolistic firms. In addition, a key insight of behavioural economics is that individuals tend disproportionately to discount distant costs, such as the future health problems sown by a poor but pleasurable diet in the present.

The recent Cabinet Office report into food, “Food Matters – Towards a Strategy for the 21st century” (available at http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/~media/assets/www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/food/food_matters1%20pdf.ashx) recognised that on these grounds intervention was justified – “The

potential health benefits mean that there is a very strong case for another drive to achieve the 5 a day target or better” (page 78).

These arguments are not lost on the UK Government and England and Scotland already operate these types of schemes. (Full details are at Annex A). However, as we make clear elsewhere in this IA, the issue of tackling obesity is a complex one and any schemes in isolation is not going to provide all the answers. They must form be part of bigger policy objectives if they are to be successful. Examples of other policy areas involving health initiatives in schools are set out in Annex B.

DOES THE RATIONALE FOR GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION MEAN THAT EU INTERVENTION WOULD BE ALSO APPROPRIATE?

The case for intervention at European level is far weaker. The conditions set by the subsidiarity principle (the necessity test) state that community intervention is justified where:

- trans-national aspects exist that cannot be satisfactorily regulated by Member States;
- action by Member States alone would conflict with the requirements of the treaty (e.g. discriminatory treatment of a stakeholder group);
- A lack of community action would significantly damage Member States’ interests.

The Commission’s IA argues that consumption of fruit and vegetables below the WHO minimum recommended level of 400g/day is a common phenomenon across most member states. The IA also argues that obesity is a Europe-wide phenomenon. According to the subsidiarity principle neither is in itself an argument for community intervention. The Commission also propose that a lack of EU action would

- lead to a risk of discrimination between producers in those countries that do not have access to a SFS as a market outlet (which could have negative implications for their competitive position and innovation);
- incur health costs of obesity related diseases which would not only be borne by Member States as cross-border healthcare has been reinforced by the ECJ;
- reduce the extent of transfer of good practice techniques amongst Member States.

The arguments above, put forward by the commission in favour of the presence of trans-national elements, are not particularly convincing. The Single Market guarantees that all producers would have access to Member State school fruit and vegetable schemes as a market outlet, irrespective of whether a SFS existed in a producer’s Member State. Health benefits in the form of reduced public expenditure would tend to accrue to Member States individually in the same way that obesity costs are currently borne by Member State health budgets. Lastly there is little evidence to suggest that the transfer of knowledge and best practice would be impeded if SFS were operated at a Member State rather than a Community level.

In the absence of significant and demonstrated externalities, discrimination and trans-national spill-overs arising from Member States taking actions themselves, the case for community expenditure and action (even a voluntary scheme) to promote fruit and vegetable consumption over and above member state initiatives appears weak in principle.

The relatively small size of the budget militates against effectiveness and the Commission appeared not to have taken into account the high start up costs of any scheme. Therefore, the Commission need to be realistic about what their budget will achieve spread across 27 Member States. (In the UK, our Department of Health has operated a scheme in England only and only to children aged 4-6 years old yet this has cost £37.5m). However, this fact should not be seen a call for additional money. The Commission’s own impact assessment says that experience will show if the budget is sufficient. The Commission will be obliged to undertake a review of the scheme by August 2012. In negotiations, the UK have requested that in its report, the

Commission should review the individual schemes that Member States have implemented and assess their nutritional impact and value for money.

EVIDENCE FROM SCHOOL FRUIT SCHEME EVALUATIONS

Details of schemes that currently operate in England and Scotland can be found at Annex A. Below is some evaluation of those schemes.

England: Department of Health commissioned evaluations into the UK school fruit and vegetable scheme. Quoting the 2007 evaluation - A Further Evaluation of the SFVS (available at http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_078170) - "On the basis of a full-scale evaluation of the SFVS, we concluded that the scheme did significantly impact on children's fruit consumption but that it did not have any wider impact on diet, and that increased consumption was not sustained when children's participation in the scheme came to an end" (page 63). In addition "No strong indication that fruit and vegetable had displaced processed foods...the decrease in the quantity of snacks was not statistically significant" (page 8). Also, the 2005 (pilot) evaluation (available here <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research-areas/pims-data/summaries/evaluation-of-the-new-opportunities-funds-national-school-fruit-scheme.cfm>) stated "it would appear that for some children the SFVS fruit and vegetable had replaced those ordinarily consumed outside school" (page 56), raising issues of displacement. From reading these reports it seems clear that much of the increase in fruit and vegetable consumption amongst children came about through increased vegetable content in school dinners rather than the SFVS scheme itself.

The London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine undertook a review of the evidence on school-based fruit and vegetable schemes (published Dec 2007) which looked at 35 studies in different countries. Although 24 studies reported a significant positive intervention effect on F&V intake at follow-up, "*only one study managed to produce positive results in both reducing obesity and increase F&V intake*". (page 14). The paper is available here www.lshtm.ac.uk/ecohost/projects/fruitandveg/schoolfv.pdf

Scotland. The evaluation report found that both local authority professionals and school staff members perceived that the national Free Fruit in Schools initiative had been very successful. Indeed, it was argued that it was one of the most successful initiatives of its kind, and that it should be allowed to continue. The view of the vast majority of respondents was that the initiative had resulted in an increased consumption of fruit and an improvement in healthy eating practices more generally in pupils attending schools of different sizes, serving catchment areas from the relatively affluent to the relatively deprived, and from urban to rural settings. For example, 90% of school respondents thought that the initiative had brought about an improvement in general eating habits, and almost 60% perceived that pupils were now consuming more fruit and vegetables as part of their school meals.

A minority of local authority and school respondents held more negative views. It was said that the initiative was disruptive for schools, the fruit supplied to schools was not always of the highest quality, the storage facilities within schools were not always adequate and school staff should be paid to compensate them for preparing and distributing the fruit. However, the overwhelming consensus was that problems were more common in the early phase of the initiative, and that once these difficulties were addressed a routine had been established which allowed the smooth operation of the scheme. In addition, it was also emphasised that such minor difficulties were a price worth paying as the benefits of the initiative far outweighed any negative features.

The full evaluation report can be found on the Scottish Government website at:
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/47121/0020887.pdf>

COSTS AND BENEFITS

Sectors and groups affected. As the proposal suggests this initiative is specifically targeted at school children. In their proposals and the accompanying assessments, the Commission have used an age range of children aged 6-10 years old as a basis of their assumptions and budget calculations. However, the proposal does not limit Member States as to this target range and they would be free to develop schemes to cover any particular age range for children in educational establishments.

EU producers of fruit and vegetables and the supply industry could also be affected. However, purchase of produce for the scheme is unlikely to alter the market in fruit and vegetables to any degree, especially in the short term.

Benefits

Benefits accrue to schools in the form of free provision of fruit and vegetables. However it is unlikely that schools will reap the full benefits of the transfer due leakages in the form of organisational costs, inefficiencies in distribution etc.

A scheme could provide short and longer term benefits in the health of the children and have a positive impact on future health costs to the nation. It is estimated that if the UK did nothing about such issues then by 2050, 90% of today's children would be overweight and at risk from serious disease with a potential cost to the NHS of £50 billion by 2050.

UK Government has already taken action but obesity and health are complex issues and can be affected by many issues. Dietary issues are only one part of the equation and there are many separate strands to the question of diet and healthy eating. Whilst there is evidence that such schemes do have some benefit, they need to be part of a wider joined up policies to have maximum long lasting impact.

In terms of the very specific benefits of the EU money available we have considered what could be achieved with the UK's allocation (estimated to be €11,171,000) if we sought to extend one of the existing schemes that the UK operates, namely the Department of Health scheme that operates in England. As the money is co-financed there would be a combined contribution (EU + UK) of £18,543,000. This would potentially allow for the provision of produce to 878,906 pupils for a school year. Currently each year group in primary schools averages 630,000 pupils and therefore the funds would allow free produce to be given to at least one additional year group over the current scheme. Alternatively, the money could be used in a very targeted way to deliver maximum benefit in areas of deprivation or social need.

Costs

Costs of operating the EU proposed scheme in England

These costings include only the cost of supplying and distributing produce

UK Scheme - 1 piece F&V everyday for 39 weeks

EU Scheme, Commission Proposal - 1 piece F&V everyweek for 30 weeks

Cost current UK Scheme per annum (£m)

37.5

Cost current UK Scheme per Week (£m)	0.96
Cost current UK Scheme (£m) - one piece per day over 30 weeks	28.8
Cost EU proposal (£m) - one piece per week over 30 weeks	5.8

These costs are an under-estimate as they do not include the educational and supporting initiatives proposed by the commission. These include training and awareness-raising activities, the production of specific promotional material and site visits.

Cost of operating the scheme in other parts of the UK

If a decision was taken to implement the EU scheme, it is unlikely to be operated across the UK as a single scheme; rather it is more likely that it would be operated separately within England, Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland. As way of an illustrative example, a breakdown for the costs for operating the scheme in one country – Scotland - is shown at Annex C.

Other key non-monetised costs

We have consulted the RPA. The RPA's view was that the scheme would add little administrative burden to them as the scheme could be operated alongside the current EU Milk Scheme, for example the claim form for the school milk scheme could include an extra section for the school fruit scheme. In addition the RPA suggested that the IT system would need only a small adjustment to accommodate the school fruit scheme. However the RPA highlighted that inspection costs were particularly uncertain as little was known about the inspection regime. Consequently these costs have not been monetised.

Costs to Exchequer

The proposal would increase the EC Budget by €91.3m per year from 2009 onwards. The UK contributes to the EU budget as a whole. The UK's estimated gross contribution for 2009 is 15.8%.

Specific Impact Tests

Competition Assessment

The scheme is unlikely to have negative effects on competition.

Small Firms Impact Test

The scheme is unlikely to have impacts on small business.

Legal Aid

The scheme does not create new criminal sanctions or civil penalties.

Sustainable Development

The proposed Regulation is in accordance with the shared UK principles of sustainable development.

Carbon Impact Assessment

The scheme will have no significant effect on carbon emissions, as it will have minimal impact on the existing production of fruit and vegetables and related processed products. There may, of course, be individual winners and losers in terms of increased or reduced trade opportunities, and therefore, some change to the carbon footprint of individual businesses, but the overall impact for the industry is unlikely to alter substantially.

Other environment

The scheme will have a minimal impact on the production of fruit and vegetables and therefore is unlikely to have any significant implications with regard to climate change, waste management, landscapes, water and folds, habitat and wildlife or noise. It could be argued that there may be a small increase in packaging waste through the delivery of such produce to schools.

Health Impact Assessment

There increasing evidence that a diet rich in a range of fruit and vegetables is beneficial to health and lowers the risk of a range of diseases, particularly some cancers and heart disease. The body of evidence recommends an increase in intakes of fruit and vegetables of at least 400g (around 5 portions) per day. Evidence show that eating at least this amount could lead to estimated reductions of up to 20% in overall deaths from chronic diseases such as heart disease, strokes and cancer. Experts suggest that it is only. Experts suggest this it is the second most effective strategy to reduce the risk of cancer after reducing smoking.

More details are set out in Annex D

Race/Disability/Gender/Age etc.

The scheme would not impose any restriction on the grounds of disability or gender, but it is obviously specifically aimed at school age children in educational establishments

Human Rights

These proposals are consistent with the Human Rights Act 1998.

Rural Proofing

The scheme is not likely to have any different effect in rural areas, as rural schools are included within the scheme

Unintended consequences

None is anticipated at this stage.

MONITORING

Monitoring and evaluation will be an obligatory part of any individual scheme, at Member State level, that is approved by the Commission. Member States will be required to set out beforehand that they have systems in place to carry out this effectively.

The Commission will need to report to the Council and the European Parliament by August 2012 on the operation of the scheme. The report will, in particular, need to consider the extent to which the EU scheme has promoted the establishment of well-functioning School Fruit Schemes in Member States and the impact of the scheme on the improvement of children's eating habits.

Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Type of testing undertaken	<i>Results in Evidence Base?</i>	<i>Results annexed?</i>
Competition Assessment	Yes	No
Small Firms Impact Test	Yes	No
Legal Aid	Yes	No
Sustainable Development	Yes	No
Carbon Assessment	Yes	No
Other Environment	Yes	No
Health Impact Assessment	Yes	Yes
Race Equality	Yes	No
Disability Equality	Yes	No
Gender Equality	Yes	No
Human Rights	Yes	No
Rural Proofing	Yes	No

Annex A: Current School Fruit and Vegetable Schemes in the UK

England

Department of Health's 5 A DAY Programme and its School Fruit and Vegetables Scheme.

The School Fruit and Vegetable Scheme (SFVS) provides fruit and vegetables to all 4 to 6 year old children in Local Authority-maintained infant, primary and special schools.

Background to the scheme. There was clear evidence from eminent health bodies that eating five portions of fruit and vegetables a day could help protect against chronic diseases such as heart disease and certain cancers. The 5 A DAY programme was first announced in the NHS plan in July 2000 as part of a bigger framework focusing on disease cancer prevention and tackling health inequalities. The programme was set up to improve access to, and increase consumption of fruit and vegetables particularly amongst children and low income groups.

One of the five major planks of the Programme was the establishment of a School Fruit and Vegetables Scheme, and pilots started in November 2000. The SFVS has covered all English regions since 2004. As a result, nearly two million children in over 16,550 schools are receiving free fruit and vegetables under the scheme.

Estimated Costs. The scheme costs approximately £37.5m per annum (although this is expected to rise by about £4m to take account of rising purchase and distribution costs).

Outcome – consumption. The FSA Consumer Attitudes Survey 2007 showed that 79% of people are now aware that they should eat at least five portions of fruit and vegetables a day, up from 43% in 2000. Fruit and Vegetable consumption has increased but not as quickly as awareness of the message. Since the SFVS was fully rolled out in 2004, the Health Survey for England shows there has been a considerable increase in fruit and vegetable consumption among children aged 5-7 which bears out the finding of the 2006 Evaluation.

The future. “Healthy Weight Healthy Lives” A Cross Government Strategy for England (published January 2008) highlighted, increased fruit and vegetable consumption as a priority area for improving diet. Promoting 5 A DAY particularly to low income families is a key component of the comprehensive marketing strategy that will support the delivery of the strategy. The Cabinet Office Strategy Unit report “Food Matters” also called on DH to increase its activity on promoting the 5 A DAY programme and addressing the barriers that were preventing people from achieving their 5 A DAY.

Scotland

Free fruit in Scottish schools initiative

The free fruit in schools initiative provides one portion of fruit, three times per week during the school term, to every pupil in primaries 1 and 2 in local authority managed schools. The initiative was implemented in most Scottish schools by December 2003. In February 2005, Scottish Centre for Social Research (ScotCen) was commissioned by the then Scottish Executive to evaluate the implementation of the Free Fruit in Schools initiative in Scotland.

Estimated costs. Annex C shows the estimated cost of implementing a free fruit scheme in Scotland which would provide 1 piece of fruit to pupils aged 6-10 once a week.

Future plans. Under the terms of the concordat with local government it will be for local authorities to determine how to take this forward locally. According to School Meals in Scotland 2008, published in June 2008, and which uses data collected in early 2008, 55% of Scottish schools under the control of local authorities had extended the scheme in some capacity. Only 4 local authorities had not extended the scheme in some way. The full School Meals in Scotland 2008 publication can be found on the Scottish Government website at:

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/06/24125730/0>

Wales and Northern Ireland

There are currently no formal schemes operating in these countries.

ANNEX B: CURRENT HEALTH INITIATIVES IN SCHOOLS

1. National Healthy Schools Programme

The National Healthy Schools Programme is a joint Department of Health (DH) and Department of Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) initiative, which promotes a whole school/whole child approach to health. The ambition of the programme is for all children and young people to be healthy and achieve at school and in life. The programme provides opportunities at school for enhancing emotional and physical aspects of health which will contribute towards improved health, reduce health inequalities, increase social inclusion and raise achievement for all.

The Government set a challenging target for all schools to be working towards National Healthy Schools Status by December 2009, with 75% of schools achieving National Healthy Schools Status by the same date. Schools with more than 20 per cent Free School Meals Entitlement and Pupil Referral Units are targeted as a priority. The Programme works through a network of 150 Local Healthy Schools Programmes based within Primary Care Trusts or Local Authorities.

Increasing emphasis on schools' role in promoting pupil wellbeing is articulated within a series of government strategies, e.g. The Children's Plan which describes government's vision of a school in 2020 (21st Century School). A new statutory duty for schools to promote wellbeing of their pupils means the programme provides a framework for schools to respond to health education objectives.

Healthy Schools is a highly successful non-statutory national programme: currently with 97% of schools participating (21,189 schools with an estimated headcount of 7million pupils) and 68% schools with National Healthy Schools Status (14,957 schools engaging approximately 4 million pupils – (figure from DCSF as at October 2008).

Schools are required to satisfy a set of criteria under four core themes – healthy eating, physical activity, Personal Social and Health Education (PSHE) and emotional health and well-being (EHWB) to achieve National Healthy Schools Status. These four themes cover the essential elements needed by a school in order to promote healthier lifestyles in children and young people, and provide a platform for schools to build on other areas of health improvements.

The National Healthy Schools Programme (Healthy Schools) is primarily aimed at eligible state-maintained schools including academies, primary and secondary schools, and those nurseries and sixth form colleges attached to primary and secondary schools.

A Healthy School's role is to create an environment which promotes PSHE (life skills), Physical Activity and Healthy Eating. Healthy Schools are able to provide *universal not targeted interventions*, but the national programme emphasises the value of working with external expert partners [public, private or third sector] and the importance of effective, efficient referral systems. This is supported through the partnership of the Local Healthy Schools team based in either their Local Authority or their PCT. It is through these networks that schools can raise specific health issues (such as obesity, teenage pregnancy, wellbeing) and recognise that children can be best helped if the school is supported with information on where to refer Children & Young People (CYP) and their families, e.g. care pathways. Locally, through their Healthy Schools team, schools can access advice and support from a number of professionals including - Physical Activity leads; PESSCL lead (PE and School Sports); Youth Sport Trust; SEAL/CAMHS (Children's Mental Health); Local Obesity Lead; School Nurses; School Food

Trust (an NDPB); Planning/Transport; Extended Schools (which includes services and out of school activities such as cookery, sports, dance).

Healthy Schools are well placed to bring together a number of activities they have set in place during their process of acquiring Healthy School status. Local Healthy Schools teams work with schools to help them identify what they may already be doing which contribute to addressing health needs within their school. Some of these things are:

- a. National Healthy Schools Status (which includes many of the items below)
- b. Whole school food policy which actively promotes healthier eating choices supported by lessons/curriculum
- c. Whole school Physical Activity policy, which is broader than PE and sports as it looks at opportunities throughout the school day for children to be active and to get their recommended 60 minutes a day. This is particularly important for those who consider themselves non-sporty.
- d. Anti-bullying policy to address issues around self-esteem and victimisation of overweight and obese children
- e. Healthy packed lunches for those who are not eating the improved healthier school dinners
- f. School dinners meeting national nutrient and food standards
- g. School Fruit & Veg Scheme for primary schools
- h. Provision of two hours a week Physical Activity offer
- i. School Sports Coordinator role in enhancing PE and sport opportunities
- j. Active Travel & School Travel Plan which will engage parents/families in supporting their children to walk or cycle or scooter to school
- k. Curriculum (healthy eating, physical activity, SEAL, PSHE)
- l. Support for parents on Healthy Eating and Physical Activity
- m. Cooking Clubs or classes (for children and/or parents)
- n. School Nurse – individual support for children and Parents
- o. Provision of good quality PSHE and SEAL
- p. Before and after schools clubs (including breakfast clubs)
- q. CAMHS – Child and Adolescent Mental Health

2. Obesity - the *Healthy Weight Healthy Lives* strategy

The Department of Children, Schools and Families and the Department of Health are jointly responsible for tackling child obesity and achieving the goal to reduce the proportion of overweight and obese children in the population to 2000 levels by 2020, as set out in the *Healthy Weight, Healthy Lives: A Cross-Government Strategy for England* (Jan 08) and the Public Service Agreement 12 child obesity indicator target, to reduce the rate of growth in the prevalence of obesity in children under 11. This means a maximum of 18.1% by 2011 - in contrast to the forecasted trajectory over the Comprehensive Spending Review period from 16.1% in 2006 to 18.7% in 2011.

Key facts

- 18.3% of all 2-15 year olds classified as obese in 2005.
- 16.8% of boys and 16.9% of girls aged 2-10 were classified as obese in 2005. In 1997, the respective figures were 11.1% and 10.7%.
- Obesity is responsible for 9,000 premature deaths a year in England. It reduces life expectancy by, on average, 9 years.

Relevant policy initiatives undertaken by the Department of Children, Schools and Families that are making key contributions to the Strategy cover issues such as school food; cookery lessons. For example:

- Setting tough nutrient standards for school food and investment of £650m between 2005-11 to transform school food.
- From September 2001 making Food Technology will be compulsory for every 11-14 year old –with food technology lessons involving practical cooking lessons and classes on diet and nutrition.
- Development of school lunchbox policies, so that those not yet taking up school lunches are also eating healthily.

3. The School Food Trust

The School Food Trust is a body independent from Government and has the remit of transforming school food and food skills. It works closely with the Department for Children, Schools and Families; Department of Health; the Healthy Schools Programmes (see above); and the Food Standards Agency. It was originally set up as a non departmental body in 2005 with £15m of funding by the then Department of Education and Skills to promote the education and health of children and young people by improving the quality of food supplied and consumed in schools. In 2007 the Trust was registered as a charity.

The Trust is charged with helping stakeholders ensure that all young people eat better at school and has set itself the following objectives in order to achieve this agenda:

- Ensure all school meals meet the food-based and nutrient-based standards for lunch and non-lunch food
- Increase the uptake of school meals
- Reduce diet-related inequalities in childhood through food education and school based initiatives
- Improve food skills through food education, and school and community initiatives.

The aims of the Trust are being recognised as increasingly important in view of the links being made to children's diet and their long term health but also in relation to their role in schools where there is evidence that when children eat a balanced diet they find it easier to concentrate in the classroom and their behaviour significantly improves.

4. Growing Schools

Growing Schools (<http://www.growingschools.org.uk/>) was established in 2001 following a meeting between HRH Prince Charles and Educational Ministers to help reconnect young people with nature. It emerged amid concerns that young people had become distanced from nature and that pupils of all ages needed to understand the connections between the food they saw in supermarkets and the land that produced it. It was also felt that young people needed to understand the interdependence between urban and rural environments, along with learning about the countryside, wildlife and the people it sustains.

The Growing Schools programme is funded by the Department of Children Schools and Family and is managed by Farming and Countryside Education (FACE). The programme aims to give

all children the opportunity to connect with the living environment, whether it is an inner city window box or a vast country estate, a school vegetable plot or natural woodland. Interacting with living plants and animals provides a very rich, hands-on learning experience in which both formal and informal education can flourish.

The Growing Schools programme supports the Learning Outside the Classroom Manifesto (www.lotc.org.uk) and shares its conviction that every young person should experience the world beyond the classroom as an essential part of learning and personal development, whatever their age, ability or circumstance.

Growing Schools also meshes very well with the Sustainable Schools agenda (<http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/sustainableschools>). *(This programme supports schools on their journey to sustainability, introducing the principles of sustainable development and offers guidance on how these principles can be embedded into school life).* It provides a practical approach to its core theme of care – for oneself, for each other and for the environment.

Annex C: Estimated costs of implementing EU School Fruit Scheme In Scotland

Assuming 100% uptake in the 6-10 age group

Assumptions – note:
these costs do not
include
administration,
inspection or
enforcement costs

Estimated Cost of a Piece of Fruit (Per Portion):	£0.17
Number of Pieces of Fruit per Week	1
Uptake	100%
Attendance Rate	94.9%
Number of Weeks per Year	38

Cost Projection for Implementing EU School Fruit Scheme Across Scotland for Ages 6-10 (roughly P1 - P5)

Thousands of pupils at September by stage in publicly funded primary schools (2006-based Scotland Level Pupil Projections)

Year	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	Total Cost (£m)
2008/2009	53.6	52.1	51.1	52.1	53.3	1,607,428
2009/2010	54.7	53.4	51.9	50.9	51.9	1,611,106
2010/2011	55.3	54.5	53.2	51.7	50.7	1,627,045
2011/2012	56.2	55.1	54.3	53.0	51.5	1,655,859
2012/2013	56.8	55.9	54.8	54.0	52.7	1,680,994
2013/2014	57.1	56.5	55.6	54.5	53.7	1,700,612
2014/2015	57.4	56.8	56.3	55.4	54.2	1,717,164

2015/2016	57.5	57.1	56.6	56.0	55.1	1,730,651
-----------	------	------	------	------	------	------------------

ANNEX D: HEALTH IMPACTS OF EATING FRUIT AND VEGETABLES

It is thought that increasing consumption of fruit and vegetables can significantly reduce the risk of many chronic diseases. It has been estimated that eating 5 portions of a variety of fruit and vegetables a day could reduce the risk from chronic diseases such as heart disease, strokes and cancer by up to 20% (Department of Health 2000. The NHS Plan: Department of Health).

It has been estimated that diet might contribute to the development of one third of all cancers, and that increasing fruit and vegetables consumption is the second best most important cancer prevention strategy (the main one being smoking) (Department of Health. 2000. NHS Cancer Plan. London. Department of Health). In 1998, the Department of Health's then Committee on Medical Aspects of Food Policy and Nutrition reviewed the evidence and concluded that higher vegetable consumption would reduce the risk of colorectal cancer and gastric cancer. There was also weakly consistent evidence that higher fruit and vegetables consumption would reduce the risk of breast cancer. These cancers combined represent about 18% of the cancer burden in men and about 30% in women.

Higher consumption of fruit and vegetables also reduces the risk of coronary heart disease and strokes. (Department of Health. 1994. Nutritional Aspects of Cardiovascular Disease. London HMSO). Furthermore, a 2001 study found that each increase of 1 portion of fruit and vegetables a day lowered the risk of coronary heart disease by 4% and the risk of stroke by 6% (The effect of fruit and vegetables intake on risk for coronary heart disease. *Annals of internal medicine.* 134: 1106-14). Evidence also suggests an increase in fruit and vegetables intake can help lower blood pressure. (appel L, Moore T, Obarzanek E et al. 1997. A clinical trial of the effects of dietary patterns on blood pressure. *New England Journal of Medicine;* 336: 1117-23. & John J, Ziebland S, Yudkin P, Roe L, Neil H 2002. Effects of fruit and vegetables consumption on plasma antioxidants concentrations and blood pressure: a random controlled trial. *The Lancet;* 359: 1969-74.).

Research suggests that there are other health benefits too, including the delaying of cataracts, reducing the symptoms of asthma, including bowel function, and helping to manage diabetes. As well as the direct health benefits, eating fruit and vegetables can help achieve other dietary goals including increasing fibre intake, reducing fat intake, help maintain a healthy weight, and substituting for foods with added sugars (as frequent consumption of foods with added sugars can contribute to tooth decay).

Why are fruit and vegetables so healthy? The reason why fruit and vegetables are beneficial is because of their array of compounds, e.g. vitamins and flavonoids, glucosinilates and phyto-oestrogens . Some of the vitamins and Phytochemicals are also antioxidants, destroying free radicals in the body. These free radical are known to have a role in causing cancer as well as other harmful effects.

ANNEX E: Impacts on Admin Burdens Baseline

Admin Burdens

According to the Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) website, “the Standard Cost Model (SCM) simplifies administrative costs and defines them as the costs of administrative activities that businesses are required to conduct in order to comply with the information obligations that are imposed through central government regulation” (<http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file44503.pdf>, page 12).

As the School Fruit Scheme is voluntary, it is not strictly an obligation. Schools do incur a cost if they wish to participate in the Scheme, but this is optional and they are able to recoup these costs through the EU subsidy they receive.

In