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Abstract

Provision of meat to public catering canteens in Sweden is done through public procurement processes according to the Law of Public Procurement. However, due to the lack of a harmonized assessment standard and policy for communication throughout the supply chain, there is no animal welfare certification or label that contracting authorities can use to verify animal welfare friendly meat, in order to verify that the meat they purchase comes from reliable sources. My question is; is there a future in which animal welfare friendly meat is provided as the norm, to consumers at public canteens? To answer this question, the aim of this thesis was *to identify a feasible way* for Swedish wholesale dealers who provide food to the public sector, *to implement meat originating from a source where animal-based assessments have been made* according to the Welfare Quality® project.

The findings showed that the top four critical elements to consider for an animal welfare friendly future are: 1. The *consciousness and attitude by each stakeholder* – a positive attitude among not only supply chain actors but also among the decision makers eases the process to bring animal welfare friendly meat. 2. The *local political vision* - in order for contracting authorities to work proactively towards bringing animal welfare friendly meat the political vision is fundamental. 3. *A united legislation on animal welfare friendly systems in EU* - based upon an animal-based assessment standard. 4. *The Law of Public Procurement and its stance on an animal welfare friendly production* – the requirements that can be set from an animal-based assessment system needs to be compatible with the Law of Public Procurement.

Further research on the specific findings is recommended in order to deeper evaluate the needs to implement animal welfare friendly meat to Swedish public catering canteens.
1. Introduction

1.1. Problem statement

Despite Swedish citizen concern for farm animal welfare (Eurobarometer 2007; Kjaernes et al. 2007), information regarding the animal welfare before and during slaughter, is rarely given to the consumer. The question whether the meat delivered to public canteens derives from an animal welfare friendly farm or not, will remain un-answered unless a verification of the meat can be done and a EU harmonized labelling policy will be at hand (Nocella et al. 2010), making it possible to do comparable assessment studies at farm. However, there are existing labelling schemes in EU focusing on an animal welfare that goes beyond existing legal standards; e.g., Freedom food, Neuland, Label Rouge and Tierschutzgeprüft (European Commission DG Sanco 2009). There is also the Swedish KRAV label that besides the demand of organic production makes production requirements that goes beyond the Swedish Act of Animal Welfare. But, these labels are used locally and can preferably statue as good examples on an exclusive market, whilst the larger production volumes are still under the general EU regulations or national legislation. Furthermore, the existing indicators used for legal standard controls, have been criticized for being “resource-based measurements”, meaning they are based on the resources and the environment surrounding the animals (Webster 2009; Rushen et al. 2011). This is why a new methodology has emerged among researchers, “animal-based measurement”, focusing on the outcome of the animal, considered to concrete and justify the animal welfare status. The animal-based assessment method differs from existing methods in the context that it is the animal itself who is at the centre of the measurements, thus giving us the result of the animal’s welfare status (Rushen et al. 2011; The Welfare Quality®). In addition, provisions to the public canteens are regulated through the Law of Public Procurement, of which the stakeholders within the supply chain need to contend with in order to distribute the food. However, is the Law of Public Procurement a strain or an asset in regard to providing animal welfare friendly meat to the public canteen consumers? And is there a future in which animal welfare friendly meat is provided as the norm, to consumers at public canteens?

This thesis will grasp the question of a feasible future of animal welfare friendly meat served at public restaurants, discussing the topics in the theory part following a result and conclusion part from the empirical study. The focus lies on the linkage between the Swedish wholesale dealers and the Swedish contracting authorities bringing food to public canteens.
1.2. Research questions

The overall question guiding this research was: Is there a potential future in which consumers at public canteens can be provided animal welfare friendly meat? This question is broken into two parts:

a) What major obstacles need to be overcome in order to ensure the wholesale dealers product range and selling policy makes animal welfare friendly meat available to public institutions?

b) What opportunities do the wholesale dealers have, to raise the offer of animal welfare friendly meat to the public institutions?

1.3. Aim

The aim of this thesis was to identify a feasible way for Swedish wholesale dealers who provide food to the public sector, to implement meat originating from a source where animal-based assessments have been made according to the Welfare Quality® project. In order to do that, the dynamic between the Swedish wholesale dealers and the Swedish contracting authorities was analysed to understand what opportunities there are for an implementation of such assessment program into the food supply chain. The wholesale dealers and contracting authorities both play a significant role in providing high quality food to children in schools, elderly in retirement homes, patients at Swedish hospitals, as well as the personnel employed within the public sector.

1.4. Scope and limitations

This thesis discusses possible developments on distributing animal welfare friendly meat, and it is not basing any assumptions on whether existing farm animal husbandry or methodologies in the assessment of animal welfare is good or bad. It holds the scope within the limitations of discussing distribution of meat to the Swedish public sector, which is covering a total of approximately 4% of the total sales of the Swedish food consumption during 2009 (Konkurrensverket² 2011). Due to the fact that the wholesale dealers are distributing food to markets other than the public sector, such as restaurants and catering organisations, their influence on the Swedish food market is significant. For the wholesale dealers to implement an animal-based assessment scheme and use a label communication policy according to it, could have meaning to other Swedish markets than the public sector. The complications in this research are identified, such as the current absence of a harmonized animal welfare assessment system, and the lack of actors’ experience in these issues.
The animal-based assessment welfare criteria used in this thesis are based upon the EU-funded five-year research project Welfare Quality®, which has not until October 2012, been implemented in any company or supply chain (Blokhuis, H, pers. com. 2012-10-22).

Qualitative interviews have been held with a primary, secondary and a complementary respondent group. The primary respondent group includes the Purchase Directors of three of the four Swedish wholesale dealers. The secondary respondent group comprises by the Diet Manager at Sigtuna Municipality and the Procurement manager at Växjö Municipality. And the complementary respondent group consists of the Coordinator of product safety and law at Svensk Dagligvaruhandel, the Coordinator of the cooperative “Bonnakött”, two officers at the Procurement and Competitiveness department at The Stockholm Executive Office. In total there are eight interviews and nine respondents.

The study unit within the Swedish food supply chain is illustrated in Figure 1:

![Figure 1. Study units in the food supply chain: the link between the wholesale dealer and the public and commercial catering sector, marked with white text. Source: Stigzelius, 2009.](image-url)

Through empirical evidence, this thesis will identify what mechanisms - of which some are the opportunities and some are the obstacles - are driving the development towards or against
adding animal welfare friendly meat into the public sector. My hypothesis is that the mechanisms are the ones described within the thesis framework: political decisions, supply chain structure, the Law of Public Procurement, consumers’ attitude, monitoring assessments, and communication and verification throughout the supply chain (see Figure 2). The theory and background chapter will introduce the reader to primarily concepts within the framework named a-d, as well as to give an understanding of the latest research within distribution of animal welfare friendly products.

**Figure 2.** The framework consists of suggested mechanisms, driving the development towards or against an animal welfare friendly food implementation, to Swedish public catering sector.
2. Theory and background

2.1. Embracing farm animal welfare into the concept of sustainability

*Animal farming* is often described in terms of the farm animal production’s positive or negative effects on the environment (Naturvårdsverket 2011; Steinfeld et al. 2006; Wivstad et al. 2009). The *animal welfare* on the other hand, in the discourse of food production, is used in terms of being a part of a moral, ethical or a social attribute (Lawrence & Stott 2009; Veissier et al. 2008; Kjaernes 2012; Hoffman et al. 2010; Maloni & Brown 2006). Lawrence & Stott (2009) elaborate upon the perception of that “animals are sentient beings”, which was accepted by the European Commission in the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1997, and that humans have the responsibility to the animals under our care and management, thus the authors claim that animal welfare is a high profile ethical concern. Kjaernes (2012) discusses the theoretical approaches to consumer responsibility and power in food consumption, and she also includes animal welfare as a societal concern, similarly to the issues of environmental sustainability, child labour, health and food quality, etc. There are also studies made on farmers’ perceptions on animal welfare of where two discourses could be distinguished (Veissier et al. 2008): one in relation to animals’ ability to express their natural behaviour, of where the farmers were underlining the moral obligations in front of economic concern, and two, in relation to animal health resulting in good or bad animal performance, thus good or bad economy for the farmer.

The sustainability concept not only embraces the environmental and societal aspects, but also economy. One general assumption is that higher animal welfare automatically means higher costs, as it may include larger space for each animal individual and higher demand on the amount of straw materials which also might have effects on the labour intensification (Hoffman et al. 2010). Although, the same authors continue to state that a more stringent animal welfare act does not necessary lead to a negative profitability, depending on production and breeding strategies. For the purpose of reaching the political consumer, Maloni and Brown (2006) include the concept of animal welfare when they discuss a corporate social responsibility, CSR, for the food industry.

Hence, the concept animal welfare will throughout this paper be described in terms of an ethical approach to sustainability, and is built upon the criteria developed within the Welfare Quality® project, described in the next Chapter, of which methods to measure animal welfare is influenced by “the outcome” of the animal itself.
The following OECD quotation embraces the importance of animal welfare, including social and environmental aspects, in reaching a sustainable consumption and production.

“Promoting sustainable consumption and production are important aspects of sustainable development, which depends on achieving long-term economic growth that is consistent with environmental and social needs”

(OECD, Promoting sustainable consumption, 2008).

2.2. a) Monitoring assessments at farm, resource-based vs. animal-based
Monitoring assessments at farm raise opportunities to improve the situation for the animals, human health and safety, as well as for the environment. Other important aims of monitoring are to reduce the gaps in knowledge, and improve political decision-making (Bracke et al. 2005). The monitoring systems in Sweden are based on the resource-based scheme, in which measurements on space allocation, group size and ammonia levels etc., are made, which are easy to measure but reflect more the risk to welfare than the actual state of animal welfare. Resource-based schemes are normally based on measurements on the resources and the environment surrounding the animals, not necessarily on the animal itself (Webster 2009). Therefore, systems development based on measuring the outcome of the animal, referred to animal-based measurement schemes, have in recent years been under progress, such as The Welfare Quality® research project. This way of measuring welfare differs from existing methods in the context that it is the animal itself at the centre of the measurements, thus giving us the result of the animal’s welfare status (Rushen et al. 2011; The Welfare Quality®). The reason for this development is that it is the animal itself that best can give us information about its coping with the physical and social environment. Also, presence of injuries, how fat or thin the animal is, if the animal is warm or cold, how fearful the animal is, even carcass-related measures like meat quality or broken bones, could be part of the animal-based assessments.

2.2.1. The Welfare Quality® project
Animal welfare is a multi-faceted issue covering scientific, ethical, economic and political dimensions, which requires an integrated approach that utilises conceptual and methodological skills from many disciplines (Lund et al. 2006). The five year EU co-financed
farm animal welfare quality project, Welfare Quality®, ending in 2009, was the largest European research project ever on the welfare of the animals, at a total cost of 17 million Euro and with participation of 44 institutes and universities in Europe and South America (Website: http://www.welfarequality.net/everyone/26536/5/0/22). The aims were “to deliver reliable, science-based, on-farm welfare assessment systems for poultry, pigs and cattle as well as a standardised system to convey welfare measures into clear and understandable product information” (Blokhuis et al. 2010). The mission was also to contribute to an improvement in animal welfare conditions. Based on the Farm Animal Welfare Council and the five freedoms, a new system for measuring animal welfare was outlined, with four principles divided into twelve criteria (see Appendix 7).

No company or supply chain has up until October 2012 implemented these criteria (Blokhuis, H., pers. com. 2012-10-22). The European Commission communication to the European Parliament on the new strategy of protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 (EC COM (2012) 6 final/2) gives the most updated information on the proceedings of development of the outcome of the Welfare Quality® project (Blokhuis, H., pers. com. 2012-10-22). Two strategic actions are clearly stated within the strategy:

1. A simplified EU legislative framework for animal welfare based on a holistic approach, considering;
   a) the use of outcome-based animal welfare indicators of where the Welfare Quality® project criteria associated by a risk assessment system will be examined,
   b) a new EU framework to increase transparency and adequacy of information to consumers on animal welfare for their purchase choice,
   c) a European network of reference centres and,
   d) common requirements for competence of personnel handling animals.

2. As an addition to the simplified legislative framework, in order to be better used or reinforced, the Commission proposes also to (the following points are interesting according to this paper, there are supplementary suggestions within the strategy);
   • develop tools, including relevant implementation plans, to strengthen Member States compliance,
   • support international cooperation and,
   • provide consumers and the public with appropriate information.
Moreover, the Commission will study the issue of *labelling concerning information to consumers* on stunning before slaughter, as provided for in the agreement on legislative proposal on food information (Recital 50 of Regulation (EC) No 1169/2011.).

These elements within the strategy are endorsed by the European Food Safety Authority, EFSA, which is an “independent source of scientific advice and communication on risks associated with the food chain” (EFSA), working at the European arena promoting animal welfare as one important part in their mission to improve the food safety within the union. In addition, DG Sanco has granted to further evaluate the feasibility, likely roles, benefits and effectiveness of a European coordinated network, defined in the strategy (Blokhuis, H., pers. com. 2012-10-22).

### 2.2.2. Implementation of an animal welfare friendly assessment system

Numbers of scientific papers, publications, reports and book chapters on the Welfare Quality® project have been performed by the members of the project and others throughout the years beginning already in 2001 (The Welfare Quality®). Inter alia, a scenario analysis was made by Ingenbleek et al. (2011) in order to help understand the uncertainties associated with an implementation of such animal welfare assessment system, which is not only related to measuring animal welfare, but also to the field of where an issue like this is influenced by economic, political, technological and socio-cultural factors interacting with each other. This makes the outcome of the implementation uncertain, as there are many things that can change direction, and a positive outcome is not guaranteed. Another conclusion was that implementing this system will “be a challenge which will require action, support and a willingness to ‘engage’ from a wide range of stakeholders”. Therefore other stakeholder groups except from consumers are important and “it is apparent that the roles of companies, brands and certification organisations deserve significant attention, as well as any relevant institutional change”. Reading the paper of Kjaernes (2012) these conclusions are in line with her discussion on the importance of various actors’ responsibility for improvements and progress in political rules and regulations concerning animal welfare. Bracke et al. (2005) give a figurative picture of a possible supply chain, where they compare the supply chain to the shape of an hour-glass. This illustrates the many producers and consumers in the upper and lower end, and the very few actors in between, constituting retailers and wholesale dealers. Bracke et al. (2005) point out that the few middle-agents have much power, and
imply the wholesale dealers’ important role in regard to the animal welfare development. There is also the discussion on profitability; however production would not necessarily penalize business gains (Nocella et al. 2010; Lawrence & Stott 2009). Hence, despite an eventual conflict in business philosophy between profit maximization and ethical and social issues among the dominating institutions of food in Sweden (Schwartz 2006), animal welfare is regarded as a component of added value (Roe & Buller 2008), and increasingly used as a component of product differentiation (Miele et al. 2005; Eurogroup for Animals 2010, p. 6). In Sweden, the environmental issues have become increasingly acknowledged during the latest decades and the use of CSR has gained ground. Therefore ethical concern such as animal welfare, is foreseen to have the same impact on changes in the food industry in a longer perspective (Schwartz 2006). However, is the implementation of an assessment system the only part to consider in terms of bringing animal welfare friendly food to public canteens, or can other mechanisms influence? The following parts of this Chapter will introduce to some other concepts within the framework: the structure of the Swedish food supply chain, the law of public procurement, and the consumers’ attitude towards animal welfare friendly meat.

2.3. b) The structure of the Swedish food supply chain
In contemporary agro-food supply chain, there is a large distance between production and consumption (Korthals 2006, p. 5) owed to the large development and intensification of the agro-food sector during the last fifty years. This might be one of the reasons explaining consumers’ interest in primary production, as the consumer has experience in neither the living animal at the production site, nor the slaughtering of the animal or the later processing and handling of the products. This is no exception for Swedish circumstances. This is also why consumers’ trust in supply chain actors and the product and information of the product, is important to consider for every actor within the supply chain (Nocella et al. 2010).

The food distribution to the end-consumer in Sweden is divided into two larger segments: sales to the private market, and sales to the public market. The everyday commodity market is constituted by three dominating food companies: ICA, Coop and Axfood: all together standing for approximately 90% of the total market share (Konkurrensverket 2011, p. 4). Sales to municipalities, country councils and contracting entities constitute the public market, where three million meals are served every day (The Swedish Environmental Management Council). The public organisations purchase their food through public procurement, of where
the distribution to a large extent (75%) goes through four wholesale dealers: Martin&Servera, Menigo, Dafgårds and Svensk Cater. Within these four organizations, Dafgårds and Svensk Cater stand for approximately 7-8% of the total market, making Martin&Servera and Menigo the two largest distributors to the public sector in Sweden. During 2009, the Swedish public sector had 4% of the sales of the total food consumption in Sweden, which means a total purchase of approximately 8,4 billion SEK. The volumes should estimate a higher value as the packages often are bigger and with a simpler design, and the prices are generally lower than consumer prices at retail markets (Konkurrensverket\(^2\) 2011, p.14). An important segment for the wholesale dealers is also private restaurants. The raw products to the different segments are often the same. The difference in food distribution between the segments lies upon the packaging and the labelling of the product. In general there are different production or packaging lines.

Due to the large amount of food suppliers as well as food assortment at the market, the different organisations in the public sector are dependent on a well-organized coordination of the transportation and distribution. Still, wholesale dealers fulfil an important position, as also to the result in effectiveness and costs.

The Swedish Competition Authority submitted the report “Konkurrens och makt i den svenska livsmedelskedjan”, elaborating on and analysing the competition and other market relations within the food supply chain (Konkurrensverket\(^1\) 2011). Reimagine the supply chain as the hour-glass, with many producers at one end, and many consumers at the other. Here, the *degree of competition* at the producers end influences the economic efficiency, the balance of power (between the chain actors), the product range, and also the price to the consumer. For instance, the likeliness for one single producer to have power is limited, due to that the degree of concentration at the producers end is low, meaning, there are in comparison to other actors in the supply chain, many small producers. One potential solution is to build a farmers cooperative with other producers in order to gain more power and to sell the products directly to customers, of which there are a few examples in Sweden. For instance Bonnakött, one of the respondents within this study, is an example of a farmers cooperative (Konkurrensverket\(^1\) 2011, p.4).
2.4. c) The Law of Public Procurement

A public organisation needs to go through the process of public procurement in order to purchase products and services. The processes are governed by the Law of Public Procurement, LPP (SFS 2007:1091). This law aims to benefit from the competition at the EU-market and shall ensure free trade of products, services and money at the EU inner market to enable the competition and to consider public funds in the best of manners (Konkurrensverket 2013). A prerequisite for this competition is that the contracting authority can accomplish the procurement in a manner that makes it possible for all kinds of companies in any EU-country to place an offer. The five principles that are underlying the basis in a public procurement can be found in Appendix 6.

The issue of the contracting authorities serving Swedish grown meat has been frequently debated during the last years in broadcasting media (Sveriges Radio, SVT), press, and trade industry organisations (The Federation of Swedish Farmers; Svenskt Kött), due to the large amount of imported meat served at Swedish public catering canteens. The number of radio spots when using the search words “svenskt+kött+offentlig+upphandling” at the website of Sveriges Radio was 627 (Sveriges Radio). The number of TV features when using the same search words at the website of SVT was 34 (SVT). The Federation of Swedish Farmers is currently active in the debate, and on their website it is possible to find related information (The Federation of Swedish Farmers). The trade organisation Svenskt Kött, have produced a booklet named “25 good examples” of where municipalities give advice based on their own experience on how to purchase meat with higher demands in animal welfare and protection (Svenskt Kött).

The Swedish Environmental Management Council is one of the Swedish governments’ key players in the action plan for a sustainable development and works continuously to facilitate a systematically and voluntarily sustainable development business for private and public organisations (The Swedish Environmental Management Council 2013). Its goal include to inform and to educate, and to develop the Environmental Management Council's procurement criteria that comprises environmental and social requirements.

However, there is still a legislative debate whether these specific requirements are in line with the Law of Public Procurement (The Swedish Environmental Management Council 2013). For this reason, The Swedish Environmental Management Council asked for an independent statement.
by legal expert Niklas Bruun, who has concluded that there should be ‘legal conditions’ when considering the agreed consumer interest and the procurement interest for sustainable produced products and animal protection within the area of food (Bruun 2011). He mentioned also the importance of clear guidelines and established procedures on this specific matter. The problem comes down to a specific terminology in the legal area, namely the question whether the welfare criteria is an issue of total harmonization or minimum harmonization (Hettne, J, pers. com. 2013-01-16). Hettne has elaborated on the issue on a general level, within the Chapter “Strategic procurement - strengthening environmental protection and social responsibility of a competitive internal market?” in the yearly released book “Europaperspektivet” of which the 2013 volume will consider EU procurement issues (Europaperspektiv 2013). Hettne (2013) discusses public procurement as an element of importance in encouraging social objectives that are not of an economic nature towards the Europe 2020 strategy. In his report, there are two issues that can be of major interest for the future of demanding animal welfare friendly meat; First, the rules of harmonization that are often applied according to a common standard in EU. The contracting authorities need to consider these rules to certain levels, depending on if they are total-harmonized or minimum harmonized. A total-harmonization means that it is the common elements made by EU that are possible to demand, in order to protect the inner market. However, if the demands on animal welfare should be associated to minimum harmonization, it could be possible to set more stringent demands in national legislation as long as they are connected to the treaty provisions. Hence, the common principles like the non-proportionality and non-discrimination will continue to be important. Secondly, according to Hettne (2013), the new European public procurement strategy for 2020 involves tools to increase the possibilities in promoting products that are good for the environment and climate, while promoting positive social conditions. Also, environmental and social innovations are some of the most important driving forces for future growth, and these issues have increased in importance for strategic public procurement. However, there are many interests that need to be taken into consideration and the question regarding the harmonization level of animal welfare is still an issue for further evaluation.

2.5. d) Consumers’ attitude towards animal welfare friendly meat

As consumers increasingly care about ethical matters, such as safety of food, health, environmental sustainability, animal welfare (Harper & Makatouni 2002), local community, economic efficiency, child labour (Kjaernes, 2012), and even animal welfare production
methods (SANCO 2009), it becomes progressively more important to improve communication between the actors within the food supply chain. A conclusion is formulated by Korthals (2006, pp. 24) where he suggests that the food sector needs to incorporate new aspects into the entire supply chain, such as the production of the diversification of food, farming and styles through types of ethically acceptable coexistence, as well as the involvement of consumers preferences and values in the production, for the consumers to not feel protected by the state or influenced by strong market power.

Supposing stronger regulations and monitoring to reach a higher animal welfare standard incorporates higher costs, there is the question about who will pay, and how much they are willing to pay? Hence, attention has been made to consumers’ willingness to pay (Bennett & Blaney 2002; Nocella et al. 2010). Bennett & Blaney (2002) concluded in their study that additional information on social consensus concerning the moral dimensions of an issue leads to a higher level of moral intensity and a higher willingness to pay by respondents. In the study made by Nocella et al. (2010), the concluded remark was that willingness to pay among the respondents in five European countries were correlated to the measures of consumer trust for certified animal friendly welfare products. Also, the Eurobarometer (2007) presents that 63% of the citizens in Europe are ready to change their shopping place in favour of the more animal welfare friendly products, due to their perception of animal welfare friendly products to be healthier and of a higher quality. Nevertheless, the question has been raised towards whether estimated consumers’ willingness to pay is a true measure or just a message of attitude (DG Sanco 2010). However, these findings prove that communication and certification practices regarding improved animal welfare need not to penalize business returns but instead to increase profits, and hence the competitive livestock industry would also allow farmers to take the initiatives in the farm animal welfare debate (Nocella et al. 2010; Lawrence & Stott 2009). In addition, as long as there is a gap of knowledge, consumer decisions are driven mainly by price and directly verifiable characteristics of food products (EC 2012-2015), which shows the potential for information regarding animal welfare friendly meat.

2.6. Thesis contribution to the theme

Several studies have been made on consumers, farmers, and retail actors in the agro-food supply chain (Schwartz 2006; Ingenbleek et al. 2011; Bracke et al. 2005), as well as research in regard to the theme of animal welfare friendly food implementation which has developed
during the last decade, for instance, programs as the EconWelfare (Econwelfare) and Welfare Quality® (The Welfare Quality®). The topic is also frequently discussed in media, due to both the debate discussed in Chapter 2.4, and to the findings of other meat than described on the packages of various dishes in supermarkets and restaurants, during the winter/spring 2013, which has made the food industry to pay increasing attention to the matter of verification procedures. However, within the literature, the information provided concerning the wholesale dealer distribution of animal welfare friendly meat to contracting authorities is limited. This thesis will act as a bridge to fill this gap of knowledge, considering the opportunities and obstacles in order to bring animal welfare friendly meat to the Swedish public canteens. The thesis also suggests to considering the concepts within the framework, in future studies. The result may have direct or indirect implications on policy makers and public organisations in discussion to bring animal welfare friendly meat to Swedish public canteens.
3. Methods

3.1. Choice of method

3.1.1. Qualitative methodology

The aim of this thesis was to identify a feasible way for Swedish wholesale dealers who provide food to the public sector, to implement meat originating from a source where animal-based assessments have been made according to the Welfare Quality® project. Blaxter et al. (2010, p. 6), expresses that choosing what kind of method to use depends on several things, however, “the most significant of these is what you are interested in finding out” (p.6). The data collected for this thesis were focused on the obstacles and the opportunities experienced by the actors within the unit of the research field. In order to do that, their worldview must be analysed and understood, thus the qualitative approach with the semi-structured version was the most appropriate way to collect the findings, as the method normally focus on the understanding of the social reality depending on the participators interpretation of a certain environment (Bryman 2002, p. 250). Kvale (1997, p. 13) claims that all of the various existing conversations, have their unique rules and techniques, so too has the qualitative research interview dialogue. The qualitative method also aims to explain the qualities of a phenomenon, and by using this approach, knowledge about the phenomenon can be gained and set into a systematic structure (Olsson & Sörensen 2007, p. 65). A semi-structured interview model was chosen, which is defined as “an interview which aim is to receive descriptions of the respondents’ world of life, in order to interpret the meaning of the described phenomena” (Kvale 1997, p. 13). Thus, the interviews were performed in a manner of an open mind-set, of where the aim was to describe the situation from the respondents’ worldview. Further on, the semi-structured interview allowed for preparation of the majority of the questions in advance and depending on the answers given from the respondents, the use of following-questions was appropriate, which is an advantage when comparing to other methods, as this offered the opportunity to better understand the respondent. To have the possibility to use follow-up questions, and also to change the questions, was necessary in order to understand each respondents’ worldview as well as to the concern of the various target groups and their different conditions. Although, to use an interview guideline planned for in advance, gave the opportunity to follow the framework, as the theme is broad.

3.1.2. Individual or collective interviews technique

An individual interview is a dialogue between two persons (Olsson & Sörensen 2007, p. 80),
and the aim is to create an atmosphere so that reliability between the researcher and the respondent can be generated (Kvale 1997, p. 118). One aim with the collective interviews is to analyse how the individual respondents act within the group (Bryman 2002, p. 324). Other advantages with collective interviews is that much information can be collected in a short period of time, the respondents might feel they have mutual support from each other, and also, they have the possibility to highlight the most important issue (Bryman 2002, p. 327). However, after evaluating these forms of interview techniques, it was concluded that for this thesis, individual interviews were the most appropriate. This is based upon that it was important to build a good relationship to the respondent in regard to the specific topic which at the time was a difficult question to approach, and was simpler to do in individual interviews. Also, in collective interviews, a lot of information can be given at the same time, which could result in difficulties in transcription and understanding, also due to the fact that this research was completed by one person (Bryman 2002, p. 38).

Thus, the interviews were held individually with each primary and secondary respondent. The qualitative research methodology also supports the fact that the theory is generated from the results received during the empirical study, which gives an inductive character to the research (Bryman 2002, p. 249), of which was found interesting and fruitful for this study.

3.1.3. Back-casting methodology

Due to its character of problem solving, the use of back-casting methodologies has shown to be suitable for the highly complex problem area associated to sustainable development (Dreborg 1996). It aims also to better understand the future opportunities (Phdungsilp 2011). These opportunities that often are the outcome from studies to predict future scenarios, can be used either to challenge present systems, to adapt to the most likely future or to influence the future. The back-casting tool was launched as a method by Robinson (1990), and provides the researcher to work backwards, from a desirable goal, to the present and find suitable activities to reach the goal (Dreborg 1996). The Result Oriented Dialogue, developed by Pledger (2000) is a back-casting tool of which was used to compose one part of the semi-structured interview guideline. Thus, the aim of this study has a character of looking into future possibilities, and through the desirable goal setting, the respondents had the opportunity to imagine a possible future. In addition, the structure and steps included within this tool, gave valuable ways to formulate questions, as well as it through the analysis of the respondent answers, was a valued tool in categorizing the result.
3.1.4. Fact research on the Internet

In order to find information on the respondents’ commitment on the ethical and sustainable engagement, Internet searches were performed to find out the specific information on each respondent’s website. The findings are described under each respondent presentation within Appendix 3.

3.1.5. Critique of chosen method

In qualitative research method, there is the risk of distortion, as both the respondent and the researcher’s expectations and the human interaction might influence the answers within the study (Kvale 1997, p. 257-261). The individual interview process is time-consuming and a standardisation in the analysing part is difficult (Olsson & Sörensen 2007, p. 79). There is also the need of transcribing the interviews as well as interpreting the transcriptions, which can be difficult and time-consuming (Kvale 1997, p 155). An openness and receptiveness of what is said and not, is important during the interviews, as the expressions sometimes might have numerous meanings, which also can be somewhat difficult (Olsson & Sörensen 2007, p. 82). For this thesis, interviews were transcribed word by word, then the analysis and categorisation was made.

3.1.6. Ethical perspective

The ethical perspective incorporates certain criteria that were found pertinent to address with the respondents. The following criteria were chosen from the list in Kvale (1997, p.113);

- The advantages to participate in the study
- The confirmed agreement
- The confidentiality of the respondent
- The role of the researcher

These criteria were communicated in the beginning of each interview. The participating companies were all willing to be mentioned by their company names; however, I have chosen to collect the answers while referring to a specific acronym for each and every respondent.

3.2. Method implementation

3.2.1. Respondent selection

The target group of the research was based upon the aim of the research, “to identify a feasible way for Swedish wholesale dealers who provide food to the public sector, to implement meat originating from a source where animal-based assessments have been made
according to the Welfare Quality® project”. I found that the primary group to interview was the wholesale dealers. There were four wholesale dealers at hand, providing the total range of products to Swedish public canteens (The Swedish Environmental Management Council⁴; Konkurrensverket² 2011). The aim was to interview the purchasing director or the person in the organisation who was involved in purchase and/or quality, and to do one interview at each company. The second target group to interview was representatives from the contracting authorities in order to understand the dynamic within the study field. Two municipalities, Sigtuna municipality and Växjö municipality, were chosen for interviews. Sigtuna municipality was chosen because they had recently gone through a public food procurement of where they had put several demands on animal protection and welfare. Växjö municipality was chosen because of their collaboration with the small-scale producer and dealer Bonnakött, in order to understand how they have made it possible to engage smaller producers. Complementary studies were made interviewing The Stockholm Executive Office, in order to look into the policies and rules in procurement matters and Svensk dagligvaruhandel, to comprehend the situation from a consumers and trade organisation also well aware of the theme, as well as the small-scale producer and dealer Bonnakött in Växjö, for their views on an implementation of animal-based measuring procedures as well as to have opinions from a smaller distributor. The aim of the complementary interviews was for the purpose of triangulation.

3.2.2. Interview guideline

The interview questions were prepared in advance with interview guidelines (Appendix 2): one for primary respondents, and one for secondary. The format was the same, one general part and one section with the steps of the Result Oriented Dialogue (ROD). The part of the interview based on the steps of the ROD was the only part that was equal to the primary and secondary target groups. However, during the interviews with the consumer and trade industry organisation as well as with the Stockholm Executive Office, the template was not used, and instead the discussions regarded specific topics.

3.2.3. Interviews

The four wholesale dealers were contacted by an e-mail sent to the Chief Executive Officer, the CEO, as well as to the key personnel, which was also the procedure when contacting the municipalities, with the only difference being that the person intended for the interview was contacted directly. Meetings were confirmed by phone or/and by e-mail to the respondents
respectively. I found the contact information about the wholesale dealers as well as the other respondents at their websites.

Dates set for each interview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary respondent group</th>
<th>Wholesale dealer 1: March 11, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wholesale dealer 2: March 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wholesale dealer 3: April 20, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wholesale dealer 4: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary respondent group</th>
<th>Institutional actor 1: December 4, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional actor 2: January 10, 2013 (in written), January 29, 2013 (telephone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complementary respondent group</th>
<th>Institutional actor 3: December 14, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer and trade industry organisation: April 20, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small-scale Producer/Dealer: December 12, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary goal was to meet with every respondent and have individual interviews, although some interviews were made over telephone, and one over e-mail combined with a telephone interview due to a geographically long distance. In order to achieve the best result, i.e., to focus on the respondent, every interview was recorded and transcribed, even the ones over telephone through the use of the software program “Quick Time Player”. The recording made it possible to gather every word from the respondent and the risk of losing something was eliminated. Transcribing eased the analysis of what people have said and the researcher can repeat the answers from the respondents (Bryman 2002, p. 310-311). The face-to-face interviews took place at the respondents’ specific offices where there was a calm setting and atmosphere.

Every interview started with an introduction to the subject and information of the ethical perspective. Most of the respondents were talkative and had a descriptive way of answering the questions and explaining their situation. This was helpful for the researcher’s personal understanding of the subject, but for the interpretation of the result and the analysis of the results, these conversations made it more complex. For this reason, the use of the steps within
the ROD was an advantage, as the answers from these questions became easier to interpret. Every interview session lasted for 60-90 minutes and ended with a request on follow-up on e-mail or by telephone, of which the respondents were in favour.

### 3.2.4. Respondents

Below is a summarized table of the various target groups and categories of actors that were interviewed, the number of interviews done, as well as the name of the organisation as subject to the theme. The presentation of the results has a nature of anonymity while each company within the primary, secondary and complementary target groups does not necessarily go in line with the number of each in the table. A closer description of the respondents within this research, are presented in Appendix 3.

**Table 1.** Each respondent category, number of interviews and the name of the organisation that has been interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Category of actor</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td>Wholesale dealer (W1-3)</td>
<td>3 (1 with each)</td>
<td>Svensk Cater Menigo Servera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sigtuna Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Växjö kommun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Institutional actor (I1-2)</td>
<td>2 (1 with each)</td>
<td>‘Bonnakött’ cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary</td>
<td>Producer and dealer (C1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stockholm Executive Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary</td>
<td>Institutional actor (C2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary</td>
<td>Consumers and trade industry organisation (C3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Svensk dagligvaruhandel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of interviews</strong></td>
<td>9 persons in 8 organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Results

The Result Chapter is presented in three parts;

4.1. Tables of the interview responses in shorter sentences, including triangulation with complementary respondents. The complete responses can be found in Appendix 4. 4.2. The analysis interprets the tables from 4.1. 4.3. An evaluation of the critical elements to consider in terms of bringing animal welfare friendly food to public canteens. The elements were judged according to their macro level quality, meaning, from a wider or larger perspective.

4.1. Summary of the result

Table 2. Questions and answers; primary respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Additional information from respondents during the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many actors are there between you and the farmer?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>W1: 2</td>
<td>W3: Important to have control on business, animal welfare and quality – therefore close relationship is favourable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W3: 2-4</td>
<td>W2: Easier in countries with large production units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W3: Legal requirements on beef down to country scale. Customer requirements on e.g., locally produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W2: Yes.</td>
<td>W3: In our process of supplier control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W3: Yes, in general.</td>
<td>W3: The supplier control includes questions and audits to control that the supplier follows the law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additionally 8-10 audits/year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Are you undertaking the control by yourselves?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>W1: We may demand any certificates</td>
<td>W2: Easier in countries with large production units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from our traders.</td>
<td>W3: Legal requirements on beef down to country scale. Customer requirements on e.g., locally produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. How do you verify that the products are ethically produced?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>W2: Through certificates and audits</td>
<td>W3: The supplier control includes questions and audits to control that the supplier follows the law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>done by ourselves.</td>
<td>Additionally 8-10 audits/year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What kind of animal welfare demands can you require today?

W1: As of Swedish regulations
W2: Larger producers are following the law in their country
W3: We check that the supplier is following actual law.

Table 3. Questions and answers; secondary respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No. of respondents &lt;2</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a) How important is the pol. agenda in your organisation?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I1: It is important with an agreed vision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b) What kind of collaboration w. decision makers do you have?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I2: It is important for a municipality that the political arena has agreed on the topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do you think the supply chain structure influences the range of products and various actors influence?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I1: Much is controlled by middle-hands. Middle-hands offer the products with the largest profit. Regulations and public procurement is the largest concern. I2: The range of products is not that influenced. Situation of competition between wholesale dealers and minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: You have to start there.</td>
<td>1: A dialogue/collaboration with the wholesale dealer will increase the possibilities to get the right products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increased competence in purchasing structures, would that increase the wanted range of products?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1: A dialogue/collaboration with the wholesale dealer will increase the possibilities to get the right products.</td>
<td>I2: Benefits will come from a transparent and strategic purchasing system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I2: Totally correct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is your view on animal welfare and food?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I1: An added value. We do what we can to influence a good treatment.</td>
<td>I2: Important but tricky questions b/c of LPP and the sprawling law judgements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I2: Important but tricky questions b/c of LPP and the sprawling law judgements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: How would e.g., the WQ-project and the LPP influence e/o?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I2: It would work together with the LPP.</td>
<td>I2: Like as with the organic products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I2: Absolutely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What is the importance of controlling procedures through the supply chain?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I2: Very important.</td>
<td>I2: It verifies that you get what you asked for. Today there is no harmonized audit organ, instead this is up to every supplier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Back-casting model, question number 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No. of resp. &lt;6</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. What stakeholders are the most critical in order to reach the goal?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>W1: Most critical: free trader. Least critical: trader bound to a specific country. W2: Most critical: the consumers, the authorities, the producers. Middle critical: wholesale dealers, slaughter-houses W3: Everyone is critical. I1: Everyone is critical. I2: The politicians. C1: Everyone is critical.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Back-casting model, questions 1, 3-6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History influencing factors</th>
<th>Present opportunities</th>
<th>Future hinderers</th>
<th>Future threats</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural hazards (W1)</td>
<td>Natural hazards (W1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (W1, W2, C1)</td>
<td>Price (W2, W3)</td>
<td>Price (W3, C1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/consciousness (W1, W2, I1)</td>
<td>Increased awareness (W2, W3)</td>
<td>Knowledge must increase! (C1)</td>
<td>Attitude (I1)</td>
<td>United goal in EU (W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United goal between supply chain actors/collaboration (W1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consumers’ attitude and likeliness of the products (good taste!!! (C1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets of Broad range of</td>
<td>Assets of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals (W1)</td>
<td>Animals/farmers willingness to invest (W2, W3)</td>
<td>Products to offer /farmers willingness to do it (W3, C1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation (W2)</td>
<td>(LPP) Law of public procurement (too stringent today) (I1)</td>
<td>No legal guidance /No standard setting on macro level (EU) (W2, I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation (W2)</td>
<td>- Laws/regulations need to allow animal welfare production/distribution (W3)</td>
<td>- United goal in EU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling procedures (I2)</td>
<td>- Clear decisions on product, price and demands (I1)</td>
<td>- Good knowledge of purchasing systems within the format of LPP (I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing processes (I2)</td>
<td>- Control of production/supply (C1)</td>
<td>- Purchasing control (I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/communication (C1)</td>
<td>- The large adaption to new standards with a minimalistic flow (I1)</td>
<td>Market transparency (I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics is working in southern parts (good freezer trucks) (W1)</td>
<td>Freezer trucks in Sweden (no good freezers) (W1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 6.** Triangulation by C2 and C3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Public procurement / Controlling procedures:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In general it is very important with monitoring/controlling, if you do not follow-up – you have actually payed for something you have not received if you do not follow up. Through the procurement you may control the development to go in a certain direction, or, it is an actor to steer in the right direction, why serious suppliers will become very important.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Public procurement:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The current debate in justice, is that if there is a difference in demanding requirements that go beyond whether they belong to the minimi directive or if they are harmonised. Some claim there is a difference, some claim it is not.” “To know exactly what kind of demand is total harmonized and which belongs to minimi directive, is not clear, which is a problem”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Attitudes / Policy making</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C3.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need of a paradigm shift in consciousness: on one hand there is a discussion on nature reserves, where consideration is taken on the environment, on the other hand it is about land of production where there is just production. To build a system based on affluent consumers is too vague. There is a need of another support during a development. Absolutely essential to not end up in an appeal to the consumer – there is no rational reason to choose the more expensive - only a question of values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to support the organic agriculture in order to support the conventional. You may do the same thing with animal welfare branding which takes the lead and help the conventional production. So the question is how; through a regulation or through economic support. Probably the trade industry needs warranties; one chain or trade will have to start and more chains will follow. The risk of using a regulation is that the welfare branding is too squared. It would be best if it was used on a voluntarily basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Animal welfare branding:

**C3.**

If the branding would have a voluntary ground, various systems would develop which could be a disadvantage for the consumers. Meanwhile, it is important that when you say that we have an animal welfare friendly production, there must, according to the Marketing Act, be possible to verify. In Sweden there is strong animal welfare legislation, although we know that good handling of animals exist also in other countries. This is why the implementation of legislation is important in the entire EU.

Welfare Quality® criteria/indicators:

**C3.**

Probably the indicators within the Welfare Quality® are good to use in terms of verifying a good animal breeding. It would be good if the indicators could be a tool and established and if the production could see the value in having the opportunity to do the right things in a correct way. Then, it would also be a matter of economy. If doing this the right way, it could contribute to a positive development. Who is running the case is important.

4.2. Result analysis

From the result I have concluded the below factors to be the elements that answers the research questions a) and b), thus, drives the development towards or against an animal welfare friendly food policy. The analysis is made within the context of the research questions. After each element analysis, the elements are weighed in order to find the most important features.

Analysis from table 2-3:

*The structure of the supply chain*

The question whether the amount of middle-hands is an obstacle or an opportunity, seems to be more related to each middle-hands attitude towards animal welfare friendly meat, however, the more middle-hands, the longer distance it is between the consumer and the producer. But, as some contracting authorities have mentioned, perhaps *the structure of the supply chain* might be an opportunity for the wholesale dealers as they can control who their suppliers are
and what kind of products they get. Deeper analysis into the question of the profit-making, knowledge sharing and product quality, need to be made to draw conclusions.

**Traceability**

There are possibilities to trace the meat according to the wholesale dealers, however the contracting authorities consider this as an obstacle that needs to be solved, e.g., the process of how to do it is not yet clear, and there is no third accredited audit company assuring the quality aspects of the products. Instead this is up to each buyer to take responsibility in following up the products, or to trust the supplier. Therefore, an *interaction* between the contracting authorities and the wholesale dealer is favourable in order to knowledge sharing but also, in turn give the wholesale dealer the opportunity to raise the offer of animal welfare friendly meat to their customers, because they probably would better understand the customer needs. Also, one of the complementary respondents verify that “if you do not follow-up – you have actually paid for something you have not received”. I assume that the better traceability and controlling procedures there are in each linkage within the supply chain, the greater opportunity there is for animal welfare friendly meat to be implemented.

**Political vision**

The *political vision* at contracting authorities is important in order for them to work proactively with animal welfare. This conclusion opens up for citizens, lobbyists and others to take initiatives to inform politicians in order to raise their knowledge. Because, as one of the complementary respondents say; “There is a need for paradigm shift.” And “To build a system based on affluent consumers is too vague. There is a need of another support during a development. Absolutely essential to not end up in an appeal to the consumer – there is no rational reason to choose the more expensive - only a question of values”. The political vision, if it is favourable for an animal welfare friendly meat, ought to be an opportunity for the wholesale dealer, however, if the political vision does not support this matter, it instead become an obstacle as the wholesale dealer might have to provide products that are related to other values instead.

**Purchasing knowledge**

Once the agreed vision is set, increased competence in *purchasing* would enable the municipality to define the desired products, within the framing of the *LPP*, that (according to one contracting authority) is squared, although one of the complementary respondents mean that “through the procurement you may control the development to go in a certain direction,
or, it is an actor to steer in the right direction, why serious suppliers will become very important”. However, a well implemented purchasing system would enable the contracting authority to give clear requests which give the wholesale dealer the opportunity to better understand the buyers need and so be able to offer animal friendly products, as the contracting authorities in this study, both claim that animal welfare is an important question.

WQ® indicators
So will the indicators within the WQ® project most certainly have a positive effect on the purchasing processes as well, why this would be an opportunity for the wholesale dealer to offering products according to these criteria, as long as there are enough farms and animals connected to it. This is confirmed by one of the complementary respondents; “It would be good if the indicators could be a tool and established and if the production could see the value in having the opportunity to do the right things in a correct way”.

Branding
Likewise, a branding of animal welfare friendly meat would be an advantage for the purchasing system, according to one secondary respondents, however, according to one of the complementary respondents, it is also important how a branding is implemented and used as a regulation or by voluntary initiatives. In either way, the follow-up and controlling procedures would then be more tightened up, as the Marketing Act would demand verification of what a brand promises a customer. The organic brand might be a good guidance. A branding would likewise the indicators and a certification is favourable for the wholesale dealers, as long as there are enough animals.

Analysis from table 4-5:
Natural hazards
Natural hazards, global diseases and conflicts can, according to one respondent, cause determinant losses and have a negative effect on the WQ® progress and animal welfare friendly meat supply. In regard to the climate changes and the catastrophes that we see in many countries, also global epidemic outbreaks like the bird flu, swine flu and SARS, is something that we need to take seriously. This ought to cause obstacles for the wholesale dealers to deliver animal welfare friendly products, but perhaps also products from other herds.
The price
Despite our market economy, the price would probably be an obstacle, due to among others the traditionally low food prices, a growing population and in the beginning – a smaller amount of animals and perhaps other production costs. The wholesale dealer may influence the pricing; however, more than one actor within the supply chain is responsible for the pricing. The pricing would still probably hinder more rather than ease the sales of animal welfare friendly products.

The consciousness/attitude among stakeholders
The attitude may also be difficult to solve by the wholesale dealers alone, however, they could probably do much lobbying in order to raise the consciousness among consumers and customers. This can be both an opportunity and an obstacle for the wholesale dealers. As the respondents have answered, incentives must be raised in order for farmers to do this and customers need to know the differences and would like to have it. And importantly, the products need to taste good!

The asset of animals; incentives for farmers to do this
It is important for farmers to have the willingness to adapt to the new WQ® monitoring system, and they would eventually need incentives to do that. The wholesale dealer might be able to influence through knowledge sharing; however, the conversion ought to lie on a European macro level. This might take time and therefore this could be an obstacle for the wholesale dealers.

Legislation
- of animal welfare friendly systems
The obstacle for the wholesale dealer in the development phase, lies within the field of legislation and political decisions, where 1) an animal welfare friendly monitoring system will have to be addressed at EU-level, and 2) the system needs to be communicated towards all stakeholders in order to raise knowledge and increase consciousness (Bennett & Blaney 2009), thus a strategic communication policy is needed. The legislation of monitoring systems and productions systems needs to be harmonized in EU. A united goal in EU is important. The wholesale dealers can influence the politicians for a change; however, the responsibility ought not to lie on the wholesale dealers alone.
- an adaptation of LPP to work with the indicators within the WQ®

In regard to the procurement processes, the LPP, the Act of Animal Welfare and other welfare regulations need to cope with the indicators within the WQ®, which they according to one respondent, certainly could do. This would be an advantage for the contracting authorities within the procurement processes and it would be to compare to what the organic legislation cope with LPP today. However, as for the above legislation issues to change, the responsibility should not lie on the wholesale dealer alone.

**Implementation of a solid purchasing system**

This is the most fundamental factor to consider in order to gain control, to raise awareness, and to receive the products that are asked for, according to one respondent. However, this is probably not something that the wholesale dealer can influence, and the question is, how important is this factor, from the wholesale dealer’s perspective and the products they can provide.

**A market transparency; communication between stakeholders**

All wholesale dealers have mentioned the importance of good relationships with their suppliers and customers. The municipalities insist that an honest and open communication with the wholesale dealers is important in order to receive the best products, and the wholesale dealers mean that often they have or would like to have good relationships with their suppliers. Communication and a more transparent culture ought to increase the wholesale dealer’s opportunity to raise the offer of animal welfare friendly meat.

**Logistics**

One of the wholesale dealers expressed the importance of well functional freezer trucks for the deliveries of meat. If the logistics is lacking the needed conditions for the meat to be transported reasonable distances, this might have bad effects on any food delivery, so with the animal welfare friendly meat.

**Critical stakeholders (not an element as such, but important to consider respondents’ view)**

Question number two in the back-casting questionnaire showed that three respondents answered that each and every stakeholder is equally critical, which means that these three respondents all think that the responsibility to reach this goal is equally divided and that
everyone needs to make the effort for this to happen. Two respondents mentioned “the authorities/the politicians” as the most critical stakeholder in order to reach the goal by 2020.

4.3. Evaluation of the most critical factors to consider for an animal welfare friendly food implementation

Table 7. The critical elements towards an animal welfare friendly food implementation, of where 5 is most critical and 1 is the least:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor/Importance</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The structure of the supply chain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traceability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political vision (locally)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ® indicators</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural hazards</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness/attitude</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets of animals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation; animal welfare friendly systems (EU)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation; LPP cope with WQ® indicators</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of a solid purchasing system</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market transparency; communication flow between stakeholders</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanation of the result from table 7:

*The vision by local politicians:* If local politicians, for instance at Swedish municipalities, would encourage this kind of products, it would ease the processes for the wholesale dealers to be able to provide this meat. If the local politicians do not have those values, the wholesale dealers would have to reject the customer, or to provide other meat.

*Consciousness/Attitude:* Of all elements, this is probably the most critical one. If one or several stakeholders have a negative attitude toward an animal welfare friendly development, it would hinder the entire supply chain, not only to be an obstacle for the wholesale dealers. A positive attitude would ease the processes.

*Legislation; animal welfare friendly system EU level:* If EU sets animal welfare regulations that would promote a production in line with the aim of the WQ® project, it would enable the wholesale dealers to provide this meat.

*Legislation; the Law of Public Procurement:* Changes of the regulations in the LPP allowing environmental and social aspects to a larger extent would increase the wholesale dealer’s opportunity to provide animal welfare friendly meat.
5. Discussion

Swedish citizens consider animal welfare important (Eurobarometer 2007; Kjaernes et al. 2007; Harper G. C. & Makatouni A. 2002); however, it is difficult for a consumer in a Swedish public canteen to obtain meat products derived from animal welfare friendly farms, due to lack of a EU harmonized labelling policy (Nocella et al. 2010). I would like to open up for the question regarding the possibility for animal welfare friendly meat to become the norm in Swedish public canteens, and have focused on studying the linkage between the Swedish wholesale dealers and the Swedish public catering sector. The aim of this thesis was to identify a feasible way for Swedish wholesale dealers who provide food to the public sector, to implement meat originating from a source where animal-based assessments have been made according to the Welfare Quality® project. The Theory and background Chapter had a feature of a conceptual approach, giving insight into the subject of bringing animal welfare friendly meat to public canteens, by giving the reader information on the framework concepts, see Figure 2, p 8.

Using the qualitative method resulted in obtaining eventual opportunities and obstacles for the wholesale dealers, Table 7, in order to provide animal welfare friendly meat. However, I found that depending on the direction the elements found, can be both an obstacle, but also an opportunity, why these are difficult to split. For this reason, I have chosen to mention them in terms of critical elements to consider, for the purpose of providing animal welfare friendly meat. The most critical elements to consider are, due to their macro perspective character;

- Local political visions.
- Each stakeholders’ consciousness and attitude. See Korthals (2006, p.1) where he suggests that the entire supply chain should be involved, as consumers together with other stakeholders all have responsibilities in making the food sector more ethically acceptable.
- A united legislation of animal welfare friendly systems in EU, which can be related to the study by Nocella et al. (2010) discussing a harmonized labelling system.
- The LPP needs to cope with an animal welfare friendly production, meaning, the public procurement regulations should be allowed to demand animal welfare friendly products based on WQ®. This is in line with the discussions on the new European public procurement strategy for 2020, as it involves tools to increase the possibilities in promoting products based on, i.e., social considerations (Hettne 2013).
The framework mechanisms cope well with the critical elements found in the study, why future studies may undertake the framework for deeper evaluation.

Even if the structure of the supply chain as a whole, was not among the most important features comparing to other elements, I would say, that the role of the wholesale dealer is yet interesting, as their position in the narrow part of the “hour-glass” (Bracke et al. 2005), should give them a fair opportunity to take the lead in change toward an animal welfare friendly society.

The study holds the following qualifications: The respondents of the primary group covered a total of 75% in comparison to the secondary respondent group of where only two out of 290 municipalities acted as respondents, and then there are 20 country councils and approximately 500 contracting entities in Sweden. This imbalance could be revised to bring a more valid result in order to make a deeper analysis. Also, despite the prepared questionnaire, the questions during the interviews tended to increase in variation, depending on the relationship gained to the respondent as well as all the new knowledge gained with each new interview. Finally, there was the lack of respondent knowledge and awareness of the Welfare Quality® project, which in turn can give difficulties in analysing the responses.

With the purpose of improving the studies in future research, I recommend deeper analysis of each framework element with each primary respondent, to gain further knowledge in obstacles and opportunities. Also, the qualitative methodology can be supplemented by using a quantitative methodology towards the secondary respondent group. This would help to cover a larger part of these respondents as well as more questions can be posed with each respondent. I would also recommend interviewing every actor from production to consumer within the supply chain, including political decision makers, in order to receive an even more complete picture in opportunities and obstacles.

In order for the consumers to have the correct information about animal welfare and production methods, as well as for the industry to meet and co-operate, I would recommend to build a European information centre likewise stakeholders network of reference, as already taken into consideration into the European Commission communication to the European Parliament on the new strategy of protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 (EC COM (2012) 6 final/2).
6. Conclusion

The findings showed that the top four influencing opportunities and obstacles in order to provide animal welfare friendly meat are: local political visions on animal welfare friendly food supply to their citizens; the consciousness and attitude by each and every stakeholder; a united legislation on animal welfare friendly systems in EU; and that the Law of Public Procurement and its stance on an animal welfare friendly production. Correspondingly, these elements cope well with the expected framework mechanisms that are driving the development towards or against an animal welfare friendly food implementation. However, the study shows that there are also other elements to consider except from the top four, such as: traceability, the WQ® indicators, the branding thus communication to consumers, the price, the assets of animals and farmers that are interested, a market transparency and supply chain actor communication as well as an implementation of a solid purchasing system at contracting authorities. In addition, the wholesale dealer’s position within the supply chain give them a valuable opportunity to take the lead in change as well as that a collaboration with other stakeholders would benefit the animal welfare friendly meat development.

For future research I recommend deeper analysis of each framework element with each primary respondent, as well as supplementary studies by using a quantitative methodology in order to interview more respondents, primarily among the secondary respondent group, but also each and every actor within the supply chain. This will help to receive more detailed information around each question, with the purpose of making deeper analysis. I also recommend interviewing political decision-makers.

Furthermore, for policy and practitioners of animal welfare, I recommend the introduction of a European information centre, in order to provide information about the animal welfare status and production methods to consumers, for them to be involved and to be able to influence. In addition, an introduction of a stakeholder network of reference would help the practitioners to exchange experiences, co-operate and to develop strategies.

The findings of this study, accompanied with the recommendations, can complement existing animal welfare research projects such as the Welfare Quality®. The findings and recommendations ought to help to control and improve an animal welfare friendly food implementation in the future.
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Appendix 1: List of definitions and abbreviations

This list of definitions and abbreviations, describes the definitions and abbreviations that I have used within this thesis. Other definitions may exist.

Definitions

Animal welfare

- The UK government appointed a technical committee (the Brambell committee) which in 1965 resulted in The Brambell report, which has become known as the “Brambell Five Freedoms”. The Farm Animal Welfare Council (FAWC), today the Farm Animal Welfare Committee, is the UK government’s advisory body on farm animal welfare, and has developed the five freedoms, which are now the guidelines of the current codes of recommendation for the welfare of all livestock species. The freedoms are the following (FAWC, 2013);
  - Freedom from hunger and thirst – by ready access to fresh water and a diet to maintain full health and vigour
  - Freedom from discomfort – by providing an appropriate environment including shelter and a comfortable resting area
  - Freedom from pain, injury and disease – by prevention or rapid diagnosis and treatment
  - Freedom to express normal behaviour – by providing sufficient space, proper facilities and company of the animal’s own kind
  - Freedom from fear and distress – by ensuring conditions and treatment that avoid mental suffering

- “The welfare of an individual is its state as regards its attempts to cope with its environment” (Broom 1988).
- “The welfare of an animal is determined by its capacity to avoid suffering and to sustain fitness” (Webster 1994).

Sustainability and sustainable development

- Sustainability: The likelihood an existing system of resource use will persist indefinitely without a decline in the resource base or in the social welfare it delivers (Walker, B. & Salt, D. 2006, pp. 165).
- Sustainable development: “Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. Source: Our Common Future (1987).
Animal welfare friendly meat / Sustainable animal production

Where concern has been taken to farm animal welfare through an animal-based measurement system, here, in this text according to the criteria developed by the Welfare Quality® project.

Abbreviations

CSR Corporate Social Responsibility
OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
LPP The law of Public Procurement
EU European Union
EEA European Economic Area
SVT Sveriges Television
EFSA European Food Safety Authority
CTI Consumer and Trade Institution
N/A Non Applicable
Appendix 2: Interview guideline

Intervjudesign fullsortimentsgrossist

Del ett: Generell inköpsstruktur idag

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hur många led i er leverantörskedja finns till gården där djuret är uppfört?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Går det att härleda ursprung om man vill?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gör ni någon uppföljning själva?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vilka krav på djurvålfärd kan ni ställa?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Del två: Med målet att använda en certifiering/märkning för djurvålfärd, enligt Welfare Quality® projektet enligt Back-casting:

1. Enligt SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-bound)
   Ponera följande målbild:

2. Historik
   Finns det någonting i matsystemets historia såsom tex prisbilden, attityder, kundens intresse, utbud, leveranssäkerhet, inköpsstrukturer, politiska motiv, lagar/regler, annat? Som du idag tror kan komma att påverka detta mål negativt?
   På vilket sätt kan xx påverka detta negativt? Både i leverantörsledet och konsumentled.

3. Nuvarande situation
   Om man utgår från dagens marknadssituation, och det du berättade om förut när det gäller era intressenter i leverantörs- och kundled, vilka intressenter anser du i sammanhanget är…:
   Viktiga/kritiska:
   Medelviktiga/kritiska
   Mindre viktiga/kritiska:

4. Tillgångar
   I dagens situation: vilka möjligheter ser du just nu som kan bidra till att nå detta mål/Vad fungerar bra?

5. Hinder
   I dagens situation: vilka hinder ser du just nu för att nå detta mål?

6. Utmaningar
   I framtiden: vilka hotbilder/utmaningar ser du att nå detta mål?

7. Success factors
### Del ett: Generella frågor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nummer</th>
<th>Fråga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hur fungerar ert samarbete med politikerna, är det viktigt med en gemensam målbild?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>En generell bild av leverantörskedjan är: producent, slakteri, fullsortimentsgrossist, upphandlande enhet, konsument. Flertalet producenter i ena änden och flertalet konsumenter i andra och väldigt få aktörer i mitten. Är det någon aktör som kan påverka mer än den andra?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Påverkar beställarens kunskap om beställningsförfarandet de produkter man blir offererade? Dvs ökar de produkter man vill ha i omfattning då kunskapen hos beställaren ökar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hur ser ni på frågan kring djurvälfärd och mat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hur skulle en implementering i enlighet med WQ-projektet påverka lagen om offentlig upphandling och vice versa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Skulle en märkning av djurvänliga produkter göra det enklare vid en beställning och att göra ett förfrågningsunderlag?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hur viktigt är det med kontrollfunktion genom hela kedjan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| 2. Historik | Finns det någonting i vårt ‘matsystemets’ historia som du tror kan påverka detta mål negativt? såsom tex prisbilden, attityder, kundens intresse, utbud, leveranssäkerhet, inköpsstrukturer, politiska motiv, lagar/regler, annat? |
| 3. Nuvarande situation | Om man utgår från dagens marknadssituation, vilka intressenter anser du i sammanhanget är viktiga, medelviktiga, mindre viktiga, för att uppnå målet? Viktiga/kritiska: Medelviktiga/kritiska: Mindre viktiga/kritiska: |
| 4. Tillgångar | I dagens situation: Som strategisk utvecklare inom offentlig upphandling, vilka möjligheter ser du idag som kan bidra till att nå detta mål, om man tittar framför allt på länken grossist upphandlande organisation, vad fungerar bra?? |
| 5. Hinder | I dagens situation länken grossist – upphandlare: vilka hinder ser du idag för att nå detta mål, vad fungerar inte bra? |
| 6. Utmaningar | I dagens situation: om du blickar framåt - vilka hotbilder/utmaningar ser du i framtiden för att nå detta mål? |
| 7. Success factors | Ponera att vi nu befinner dig ett halvår efter 1 januari 2020 och man har nått målet 80%. Vilka faktorer skulle du säga var de största framgångsfaktorer – som gjorde att grossisterna nådde målet? (Du kan även ta upp interna organisatoriska faktorer.) |
Appendix 3: Closer description of the respondents

**Martin & Servera AB:** At the time of the interview, the name of the organisation was Servera R&S AB. Since then Martin Olsson and Servera R&S made a joint-fusion and the mutual owner is Axel Johnson AB and the family Oldmark (Martin&Servera). Today, the company Martin & Servera AB has 35 sales offices, 15 warehouses and 2500 employees in Sweden. They deliver food to restaurants and to the public sector. Their corporate responsibility lies within the area of environment through the ISO 14001, in quality through ISO 9001 and HACCP (Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point), they are certified against the MSC Chain of Custody (Marine Stewardship Council) and they work with the code of conduct according to ILO (UN) as well as an own code of conduct where they also mention animal welfare and their position regarding this issue (Martin&Servera). In 2009 Martin & Servera sales to the public sector was 2400 million SEK (Konkurrensverket²).

**Menigo Foodservice AB:** Menigo is owned by Brakes Group and is represented at six locations in Sweden, have 900 employees, and they sell to restaurants, service retail stores, and chain customers (hotels, conference centres etc.) (Menigo), and to the public sector. In 2009 the sales to the public sector was 2000 million SEK (Konkurrensverket²). Menigo’s dedication within environment and quality gives its expression through their environmental management system ISO 14001, their code of conduct according to ILO (UN), certification in MSC (Marine Stewardship Council), a HACCP plan (Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point), the IP Sigill products from Sweden and GLOBAL GAP-products from other parts of the world.

**Svensk Cater AB:** Svensk Cater AB is owned by Euro Cater A/S which in turn is owned by Altor Fund II at 50% and employees in the organisation by 50%. In total Svensk Cater has offices at 20 locations in Sweden, 500 employees and their turnover is 2800 million SEK (Svensk Cater). Primarily their sales is focused to private restaurants, although during the latest years, they have also contracts with approximately 10 municipalities and their sales to the public sector was 200 million SEK during 2009 (Konkurrensverket²).

**Sigtuna Municipality:** Sigtuna municipality with 42 000 inhabitants has recently gone through their food procurement of which they have used enlarged demands on animal welfare. To raise the demands on animal welfare needs deeper knowledge of the procurement process
and regulations and for this reason Sigtuna was interesting to interview.

**Municipality:** Växjö municipality with over 80,000 citizens works continuously in collaboration with the inhabitants, the enterprises and the university for a better environment and a less impact on negative climate changes (Växjö municipality). Växjö municipality’s latest procurement of food incorporated collaboration with the smaller meat producer and cooperative Bonnakött, in the Växjö region, which made this interview interesting.

**The Stockholm Executive Office (Statsledningskontoret) at Stockholm municipality:** The executive office has the overall responsibility for controlling, monitoring and development of the Stockholm city operations. They analyse and strategically follow the development as to provide advices and suggestions to the city council. This means they are also strategically responsible for the competition and public procurements of food.

**Bonnakött:** Bonnakött is a farmers cooperation based in the county of Småland in Sweden. It consists of 27 farmers, and they are all associated to the certification of KRAV. The brand guarantee that the animals are locally raised and that they all have been outside during the grazing season. Good animal welfare and a good housing environment during the winter season is also a demand on each and every of their members. The target group is conscious consumers who appreciate a good commodity with the knowledge of the origin. The cooperation does not compete with price, as a lower price always will be paid by someone, often by the animals themselves, or the environment (Bonnakött).
### Appendix 4: Detailed findings from which the result summary and analysis of question a) and b) have been formed

**Questions to primary respondents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>How many actors are there between you and the farmer?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- W1: “We are often number three. The farm, the ‘trader’ and us. When dealing with chicken meat, it is the farmer, the slaughter house, then us”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- W3: “There is a variation. There is the farmer, the slaughter house, the butchery, and sometimes the refinement processes, the wholesale dealer, the restaurant and the consumer. We would like to come as close to the farmer as possible and there are many producers today who has the entire supply chain towards us (slaughter house, refinement, butcher house etc.), and in that case there are only us and them and there is a tight relationship, which is an attractive way to work.” “It is important for us to have a good control of the business itself as well as the animal welfare and the quality. They are equally important to us.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Is it possible to trace the origin of meat today?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- W1: “Of beef, yes!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- W2: “Yes, it is possible. It is easier though with countries of where there are larger production units, than for instance in Sweden with many and smaller producers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- W3: “Yes, in general. The traceability is both a legal requirement, but also a requirement from our customers. It depends on the requirements. Of beef there is a legal requirement in regard to the country. If you as a customer demand locally produced, it is easier for instance with Swedish products of where you have the possibility to trace down to the farm, but more difficult for south America where they do not have the instruments to tag the meat locally”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Controlling procedures: Are you undertaking the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- W1: “If we would like to, we could have all the certifications from our traders. For instance, we always...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
control (of quality, origin, etc.) by yourselves? demand salmonella certificate on fresh products.”

| 3 Controlling procedures: | • W2: “Through certificates and audits done by ourselves or a third part.”
| How do you verify that the products are ethically produced? | • W3: "In the process of supplier control there is a specific procedure in which we pose a number of critical questions in order to see that the supplier is following the law and to get a picture of the supplier. We also follow up with a visit. Every year we also do 8-10 audits of each producer.”

| 4 What kind of animal welfare demands can you require today? | • W1: “We require the same demands as of Swedish regulations”
| | • W2: “We know that the larger producers are following the regulations in their own country”
| | • W3: “We have an (inhouse) regulation which controls that the producers are following actual law, which is being done in the beginning of a co-operation as a so called supplier control”

Questions to secondary respondents:

| 1 How important is the political agenda in the municipality? | • I1: “It is important for a municipality that political decision makers agree and have the same vision, that it shall be a certain percentage organic and fair trade for instance, that is the guideline we need to be able to crate a data requirement. Without that guideline it is difficult.” “Decisions made that go beyond the parties are important. And this is such a decision. It is important with food and then it is important with an equal view of the vision and the guidelines and that it needs to cost a little. We never talk money, but we talk quality and raising the quality for the citizens.“
| What kind of collaboration with | • I2: “It is important for a municipality that there is an agreement within the political arena, that you have the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>A general image of the supply chain is many producers, many consumers but very few actors in between, how do you think this structure influences the range of products and various actors influence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decision makers do you have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>same vision. When that is set I can produce the specifications of our demands”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **I1**: “I think that a client like us would like to buy lots of products, and if the producers would be given the correct information, they would be able to produce and deliver. Although, much is controlled by middle-hands who are offering products that might not quite harmonize with the products that we wanted, because of LPP. LPP is squared because everyone should have the possibility to answer and those who answer respond with the products of where the largest profit is, and scan the whole world after the cheapest products, which not always result in the best products. So there are too few wholesale dealers and by that there is a monopoly which is sorry for the producers…” “The great concern is the regulations, everything is a question of public procurement, and we would like to contact the producers directly, but then there is the problem with the logistics and other regulations like the food law for instance.” “The wholesale dealers are controlling much of the range of supply and the possibilities for us as customers”.

- **I2**: “The range of products is not that influenced by the structure as a wide range of products can be offered. Rather the situation of competition as the wholesale dealers have scale benefits in comparison to minor producers/actors which influences who the supplier is in a procurement. The procurement client can although make actions to open up to a wider range of suppliers through;
  - Split the procurements into smaller parts so that minor actors have the possibility to place an offer.
  - Introducing a centralised logistics terminal in order for a supplier to only deliver to one place, instead of many hundreds.
3. **Is it possible to increase the wanted range of products if you as a customer increase the knowledge of how to require the right demands?**

- **I1:** “I mean it is important to start there, we have now chosen a way and we will continue to sharpen the requirements at our next procurement, but you will have to understand that what we wish for is a collaboration and a dialogue, because I am convinced that you may get help from your wholesale dealer, and you can have a dialogue with them, in order to get the right products.”

- **I2:** “Totally correct – and, if the municipality has a clear structure and a system of where everything is transparent, then you will have the benefit of statistics to be used at the next procurement, and you would also have a better competition in price. It will be clearer in knowing what to suborder from the agreement.”

4. **What is your view of animal welfare and food?**

- **I1:** “It is an added value. We are an eco-municipality, which means that in every decision we also consider social and ethical demands. Of course the animals shall have a good life during their lifetime and in the last moment so a lot of what we do can influence a good treatment of the animals.”

- **I2:** “Important questions but tricky because of LPP and sprawling law on the Administrative law level and Appeal level.”

5. **How would the implementation like the WQ-project and the Law of Public Procurement influence each other?”**

- **I2:** “If this would be a valid system that would be applicable for everyone, and that we know that this is a way to measure the welfare of the animal, and that the wholesale dealers are aware, I believe this would work together with the law of public procurement”. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Respondent 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Would a branding of animal welfare friendly meat make it easier in the data requests?</td>
<td>I2: “Absolutely, it is clear and it works with our purchasing system as the products would be marked and then easy to trace through the whole chain, just like it is with organic products”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>What is the importance of controlling procedures through the whole chain?</td>
<td>I2: “It is very important, it verifies that you get what you asked for”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions to 6 of 8 respondents, according to back-casting model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Respondent 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is there anything in the food system history that today would have a negative influence on this goal?</td>
<td>W1: “Several factors, this brand may be too expensive, depending on what market strategy the customer has. And the amount of animals in Sweden, must take the animals from other countries as well. Also the attitude.”</td>
<td>W2: “If this will drive another cost structure meanwhile the legislation does not support this system and instead this will be an optional system, then the pricing will be skewed. The consumer consciousness is also important.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I1: “Very difficult. The consumer needs to decide, someone needs to inform the consumer of the various benefits, and this is from a global view, it is a greater picture than just the public sector, the transition takes several years and someone needs also to pay as it demands more resources. The consumer needs to decide, how do we want to consume, what added values do we want, how will the world look like in 100 years. A consumer change in attitude will have the largest influence.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I2: “Is it possible to connect this question to success factors? To take control of your purchasing system. You need to get your staff to understand how to work and to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
run the purchases, and this needs to be embedded with politicians as well as with your management.

- C1: “The price above all. There is a tradition that the food shall be cheap. You have a budget. There is a competition of the money and there is a budget to keep. Those who work for this within the municipalities do not get any ‘carrots’, they are only doing it because of their own interest.”

2 If looking from the market situation of today, what stakeholders do you consider to be the most critical, middle critical and the least critical, in order to reach the goal?

- W1: The most critical stakeholder is the free trader who purchase the entire animal and who we are dependent upon when buying the specific parts of the animal. They are not bound to anything and can act on the entire market. The least critical is the traders that focus on one single country. For instance traders that are bound to a specific owner may have problems with the profitability. These stakeholders might not be so critical.

- W2: The most critical stakeholders are the consumers and their attitude, as they decide what to buy; the authorities that can promote a development into this direction; the producers and their willingness to produce these products. The middle critical stakeholders are the wholesale dealer as we may provide all products, however the consumer can still choose others to buy from; the slaughter-houses as they do what others ask them to and the client can go to someone else if the slaughter-houses would refuse to buy and sell the specific products.

- W3: No one is more or less critical. All actors in the chain are important but from different angles. To select someone who is not critical is not possible.

- I1: All stakeholders are equally important. It is a question of attitude at the human being itself. Do we want this kind of production and meat or not.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I2:</strong> The politicians are the most important actor as we live in politically managed organisations. The responsible people in Sweden need to work with this question against EU, in order to have a guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1:</strong> All actors are equally important and communication through the entire chain is important. Mass media is important in order to influence the consumers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> What opportunities do you see today that can contribute to reach this goal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W1:</strong> “The logistics is working, the trucks from southern countries have good freezers.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W2:</strong> “This is a hot subject for the moment, many are discussing it.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W3:</strong> “Just what is happening for the moment, an increased awareness. As a wholesale dealer, we need to have the possibility to offer these products, and to make them to be a natural part of our range of products, then we will have to better in marketing these and to specify the benefits”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I1:</strong> “We decide what kind of products we will have in the procurement. We decide what we are willing to pay for it. To be very clear of our demands towards our stakeholders.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I2:</strong> “We have actually made a lot of things and we have thought it through thoroughly, which afterwards feels very good”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1:</strong> “Information and communication between us and the municipality; the opportunity lies within the fact that we have the entire supply chain and can control and manage along the road. There is a difference for the purchaser who needs to buy from the entire world, it can be a problem with certificates etc.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you consider hinder the development today?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>• W1: “Freezer trucks in Sweden are not working, diseases and conflicts that influence assets and demands, nature hazards.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• W2: “That the customer does not want to pay and the probable scenario that this will be on a European level, not only Swedish.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• W3: “The price as well as it needs to cost more, in all stages. The commodity products shall be safe and there need to be a good animal welfare and good quality.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I1: “There is one obstacle. The LPP. It is squared. The guidelines are interpreted very differently at the courts today, there are more to do.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I2: “Controlling procedures do not work and the fact that the wholesale dealers are not positive to a centralised logistic terminal as this impinge on their field.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• C1: “There is no demand if there is no knowledge about it, which means that knowledge must increase. Everyone does not know what is good and bad for the animals.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
purchase outside the boarders due to the LPP, is that relevant?”

- I2: “What is the actual problem… There are no guidance today and if it was possible to regulate this through laws and regulations it would be good, or if there was a voluntary tool and voluntarily for everyone, then it would facilitate daring to stronger demands in the data of requirements.”
- C1: Information. From both directions as there are processes to go through (decision processes); the cost and price – a higher price will be a challenge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Imagine that we are six months beyond the 1st of January in 2020, and the goal of 80% has been reached. What factors would you say were the largest success factors?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1: No one succeed alone, we need a common goal picture in the entire supply chain. Collaboration is therefore important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2: A united goal picture in the entire EU, which means that we had a united way to look at these demands and a united way to implement them into the system – that is why we succeeded! At the producers end as well as at the consumers end.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3: One part is the access of these products at the producers. If we can provide a broader range of these products, it will have an effect on our customers. There might be a narrow range today and the conventional features a large dominance. The laws and regulations providing other directions should enable larger access of products and more business, it would be a chain reaction.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1: You have more transparency and more knowledge of LPP, what is possible to do. The courts need to make a stand, one cannot judge the same thing differently because of different courts. They should ask for help from the EU-courts.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2: Control of purchasing activities and certified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments from primary respondent on the next steps:

W3.

“I would like to state that we have these products today and we are trying to market them all the time – it is about to pass the threshold and find customer who are willing to pay for it, new and old customers who would like to work for what these products stand for. We have the products and the channels. It is also about the consciousness that on certain markets you are prepared to pay a little bit more, and if the volumes increase, the price will decrease. One key is that there need to be a profit for the producers, they need to get their share in order to invest and dare to produce.”

Comments from secondary respondents on public procurement:

I1.

“Before you start the procurement process, you need to decide what to buy and how. Then you may choose to split the document of procurement in several smaller or larger parts, for instance fresh food or fruits and greens or eggs as an own category etc. What you risk is to not get any answers from the distributors or producers on only one category, for instance eggs, as the distributor does not want to win the smaller contract with only eggs if not also winning the main contract, because of the many delivery places that the whole sale dealer/producer needs to handle. So, if we should have a single category for only fresh meat, who would answer that? We would need to scan the market within the near by area and invite the producers for a dialogue and take that way instead. Although, then there are the regulations within the LPP, making it difficult as you have to keep in mind the five principles.”
I2.

“We have somehow succeeded to bring in local and minor actors into our deal and the split into minor procurements as well as the centralized distribution system might be the reasons, as a smaller organisation now only need to deliver to one place and not to the 450 distributions sites that we have in our municipality.” “But, there is a larger cost on having the distribution as the prices from the distributors are not lower. Although, the e-purchasing management system that we have developed is covering that cost.”

Information from complementary respondent on public procurement:

C2.

“The current debate in justice, is that if there is a difference in demanding requirements that go beyond whether they belong to the minimi directive or if they are harmonised. Some claim there is a difference, some claim it is not.” “To know exactly what kind of demand is total harmonized and which belongs to minimi directive, is not clear, which is a problem”.

“The law of public procurement is a tool you can use to steer the development in a certain direction, and it is very important for us to have serious suppliers.” Sweden (Swedish law on animal welfare) has stricter regulations, leading to higher costs, meanwhile the authorities cannot require these demands, which discriminates the Swedish farmers.” “The law of public procurement came in force in order to get rid of protectionism, why i.e., subjective requirements are not permitted according to the regulations.” “It is not about Swedish meat because under the same conditions, the animals have an equal welfare whether it is in Germany or Denmark.”

Comments from complementary respondents on controlling procedures:

C2.

“In general it is very important with monitoring, if you do not follow-up – you have actually payed for something you have not received if you do not follow up. Through the procurement you may control the development to go in a certain direction, or, it is an actor to steer in the right direction, why serious suppliers will become very important.”

Comments from complementary respondent on attitudes and regulations:

C3.

If considering the animal welfare, the animals will produce well. It is a matter of using, not
misusing. There is a need of a paradigm shift in consciousness: on one hand there is a
discussion on nature reserves, where consideration is taken on the environment, on the other
hand it is about land of production where there is just production. To build a system based on
affluent consumers is too vague. If there will be an excess of goods the trade industry will be
blamed that the products cannot be sold, which can be the case when the market is small.
There is a need of another support during a development. Absolutely essential to not end up
in an appeal to the consumer – there is no rational reason to choose the more expensive -
only a question of values.

It is important to support the organic agriculture in order to support the conventional. You
may do the same thing with animal welfare branding which takes the lead and help the
conventional production. So the question is how to get there; through a regulation or through
economic support (to not misuse the animals). Probably the trade industry needs warranties;
one chain or trade will have to start and more chains will follow. The risk of using a
regulation, is that the welfare branding is too squared. It would be best if it was used on a
voluntarily basis.

Comments from complementary respondent on animal welfare branding:

C3.

If the branding would have a voluntary ground, various systems would develop which could
be a disadvantage for the consumers. Meanwhile, it is important that when you say that we
have an animal welfare friendly production, there must, according to the Marketing Act, be
possible to verify. In Sweden there is a strong animal welfare legislation, although we know
that good handling of animals exist also in other countries. This is why the implementation of
legislation is important in the entire EU.

Comments from complementary respondent on welfare quality criteria/indicators:

C3.

Probably the indicators within the welfare quality are good to use in terms of verifying a
good animal breeding. It would be good if the indicators could be a tool and established and
if the production could see the value in having the opportunity to do the right things in a
correct way. Then, it would also be a matter of economy. If doing this the right way, it could
contribute to a positive development. Who is running the case is important.
**Appendix 5: Volumes of imported/exported meat in Sweden**

The below presented numbers will describe the volumes of meat there is for consumption in the EU member states.

On a yearly basis, about two billion birds and 300 million mammalian, are used for economic reasons within the livestock production in EU and the value of animal farming is 149 billion euro (EC COM (2012) 6 final/2).

Table 6. Import and export of meat in 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of meat</th>
<th>Import 2011</th>
<th>Export 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>78 900</td>
<td>3 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork</td>
<td>91 200</td>
<td>35 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>37 200</td>
<td>43 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SJV, Jordbruksstatistisk årsbok 2012*

Sweden imported 78 900 tons of beef, 91 200 tons of pork and 37 200 tons of poultry meat during 2011 from, described in falling ranges where the first indicates the departure country selling most; Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Poland and Finland (SJV, Jordbruksstatistisk årsbok 2011). The Swedish export of meat in 2011 were 3 200 tons of beef, 35 600 tons of pork and 43 600 tons of poultry meat, where the most important receiving countries of our products in falling range are Finland, Denmark, Poland, Germany, Belgium and Great Britain.
### Appendix 6: The five principles within the Law of Public Procurement

Table 1. The five principles to consider during the process of public procurement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>non-discrimination</strong></td>
<td>Discrimination of suppliers within the EU is prohibited. A local company cannot get advantages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>equal treatment</strong></td>
<td>All suppliers should be treated equally, e.g., have access to the same information at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>transparency</strong></td>
<td>The contracting authority’s or institution’s obligation to create transparency through providing information on how the procurement will be conducted. For example, the submission of tenders and contract documents must be clear and contain an entire list of requirements that will be contracted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>proportionality</strong></td>
<td>The requirements shall be appropriate and necessary, to achieve the aim. The requirements for the supplier and in the specification must have an obvious link with and be proportionate in relation to the subject matter of the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mutual recognition</strong></td>
<td>Diplomas and certificates issued by EU authorised authorities, may also be applied in other EU/EEA countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Konkurrensverket
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### Appendix 7: The Welfare Quality® project assessment criteria

Table 1. The four principles and the twelve criteria developed by Welfare Quality®.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare principles</th>
<th>Welfare criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Good feeding           | 1. Absence of prolonged hunger  
                         | 2. Absence of prolonged thirst                                                  |
| Good housing           | 3. Comfort around resting  
                         | 4. Thermal comfort                                                              |
|                         | 5. Ease of movement                                                            |
| Good health            | 6. Absence of injuries  
                         | 7. Absence of disease                                                           |
|                         | 8. Absence of pain induced by management procedures                            |
| Appropriate behaviour  | 9. Expression of social behaviours  
                         | 10. Expression of other behaviours     
                         | 11. Good human-animal relationship  
                         | 12. Positive emotional state                                                   |