

Comment Report (1<sup>st</sup> Round)  
CCD 095 Events



Prepared by TerraChoice Environmental Marketing

January 2009

Name	Interest category represented
A	Industry (event)
B	Industry (event)
C	Industry (event)
D	LCA
E	Industry (event)
F	General Interest (green power)
G	Government
H	Advocacy

- 149 sets of comments received from 8 organizations
- 1<sup>st</sup> round of public comment for Events criteria held from Nov 7 to Dec 5, 2008
- posted for public comment on [www.ecologo.org](http://www.ecologo.org)
- approximately 157 stakeholders notified by email

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
<b>General Comments</b>					
1	Scope	G	Moving the Certification from Outdoor Community events to Events is a great opportunity to make this certification more stringent. Having certification around all types of events provides opportunities to exercise a stronger control on all entrants, such as catering, transport and energy usage.	None	None
2		H	<p>"event" means an activity (or a series of related activities) with a fixed duration which occur(s) at a particular geographic location, including but not limited to: conferences, meetings, trade shows, concerts, festivals, and sporting events;</p> <p>Comment: does this include guest rooms in hotels? Also does it include the preparation and site inspection that are done before the event? What about off-site events, the tour programs etc.? I think you are still more focused on the event rather than conferences that use hotels, is CCD-095 also geared for events that use conference facilities and hotels?</p>	<p>The intent of the original criteria document was that accommodations (e.g. guest rooms in hotels) would not be considered part of the event, since event organizers would not necessarily have control over the accommodation choices of attendees. However, this intent is not clearly stated, as pointed out by this commenter. Therefore, this point will be clarified, as described below.</p> <p>In terms of off-site events (e.g. some conferences offer extra optional activities), these are also not considered to be part of the event, since event organizers would not likely have control over off-site activities.</p> <p>Based on the two points above, the following statement will be added to the definition of event: "Note that accommodations (e.g. hotel guest rooms) and optional, off-site activities are not included as part of the event and therefore are not required to meet the criteria".</p>	Expand definition of event.
3	Structure	H	For the points system, do you have an overall chart that lists the areas and the points allocated? A one pager is what I'm thinking that would be a very helpful visual to show where the values are. Sort of like what you get when you are taking a course and they tell you where you get marks etc.	We feel that the layout of the criteria document is fairly clear in terms of where points are allocated; therefore we don't feel that it's necessary to repeat this information in a chart format.	None
4		H	Also regarding the points, they seem to be based on reaching a percentage. But, what if the organizer has not benchmarked their starting point? How can we determine if the percentage is achieved?	Any references to percentages in the criteria document simply refer to a proportion of the items used at a particular event, and do not relate to previous events. Therefore there is no need to establish benchmarks.	None
5		H	How can you issue the EcoLogo before the event has happened and you haven't been assessed?	In order to be able to advertise its EcoLogo certification prior to the actual event, planning documentation would be submitted to an auditor prior to the actual occurrence of the event. At that point, the auditor would decide whether the event (as planned) would have sufficient points to pass. If so, the event would be granted certification in advance. As long as all of the planned actions were actually followed during the event, the certification would remain valid and no penalties would be incurred.	
6	Impact category name	H	It was suggested that the impact category called "Waste Reduction" be changed to "Waste Reduction and Diversion".	This is a valid suggestion, since some of the actions in this category do relate to diversion. However, this category title would be lengthy, so to simplify, it will just be called "Waste".	Change title of impact category.
7	Penalties for non-compliance (Question posed on forum: Do the penalties for non-compliance seem reasonable?)	A	Ultimately it depends on how valuable the EcoLogo Certification is. If this becomes the standard for organizations and events, then, yes, it is reasonable. Rather than donating the lost bonds to environmental non-profits, what about keeping it as a "Green Scholarship" where organizations can apply for the money to use toward greening their events, and using it for creative green initiatives?	Valid comment. The EcoLogo will consider implementing this solution at the next revision of the standard. Logistical issues need to be resolved before implementing the solution.	None
8		B	Any credible certification system has to have "teeth" that ensure the label is not abused. Conceptually, I think you are on the right track, particularly with the escalation of penalties the farther an event strays from points criteria for certification. As you'll read in my comment on point values and point requirements, however, I think the point requirements currently outlined are much too easy to achieve.	None	None
9		C	In order for any enforcement system to be effective there has to be a substantial cost to non-compliance. \$\$ amounts as penalties can be a deterrent and the removal of certification is also very effective. The monies from these penalties could effectively be put towards creating an online environmental awareness course open to everyone or providing environmental outreach to remote/smaller communities.	Valid comment. The EcoLogo will consider implementing this solution at the next revision of the standard. Logistical issues need to be resolved before implementing the solution.	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
10		E	We agree that most of the penalties for non-compliance seem reasonable. We do however; feel as though the penalty for being 6+ points below requirements may need to be reviewed. The rationale states "it is assumed that if an event or tour falls 6 or more points below requirements, the organizers have abused their certification and are then placed on the EcoLogo Fraud Advisory List". We do not feel that an assumption should be made in these cases and the actions should be reviewed (unless it is a blatant disregard for the actions required). Our concern lies in the fact that an event could fall 6 points below requirements based on the actions of non-affiliates (even after contracts have been signed, etc). The festival could do a number of things to ensure compliance on behalf of their non-affiliates, but with so many of them operating on site during a large event it would be difficult to "police" their activity. We feel as though a discretionary review should take place in these situations to investigate the categories/actions where the festival has proven to be non-compliant.	We believe the current version of the standard represents environmental leadership and that meeting the requirements are not unreasonable. The EcoLogo Program must make sure that only legitimate "green events" can use the EcoLogo logo during their event despite the fact that the final audit report will only be available after the event has occurred. Therefore we need to make sure that event organizers are confident enough that will pass the all criteria before applying to the program. Therefore, we believe that a breach of 6 points is high enough to ensure the integrity of the EcoLogo Program.	None
11		E	We also feel that a period of two years of ineligibility is fair rather than a three-year period. This would allow motivated festivals time to review their procedures and continue to improve their greening efforts.	We believe the current version of the standard represents environmental leadership and that meeting the requirements are not unreasonable. The EcoLogo Program must make sure that only legitimate "green events" can use the EcoLogo logo during their event despite the fact that the final audit report will only be available after the event has occurred. Therefore we need to make sure that event organizers are confident enough that will pass the all criteria before applying to the program. Therefore, we believe that three years is long enough to ensure the integrity of the EcoLogo Program.	None
12		G	The issue of providing a bond upfront could be problematic for government departments and agencies that may not have the financial mechanisms in place to allow them to do this. This should be examined further, as governments are a large player in the conference/event industry.	This is a valid concern. All clients must pay fees in advance for the right to use the EcoLogo Logo, for auditing, etc. We are confident that we can find a solution to accommodate special situations in the fee structure of the EcoLogo Program.	None
13		H	The penalty process is a bit frightening to me because I have no idea how well I would do (points-wise) to start with. Is there any "grace period" to rectify or is the penalty only applicable if someone is using your logo and hasn't passed the certification process?  The points penalty system above is very scary to me and would be an immediate deterrent in event attempting to gain CCD-095A certification. The reason is that it gives no room for first attempt, or the chance to rectify or the chance to work towards. If you fail badly (which could easily happen as I would have no sense of how well I would score) you are penalized.	In order to be able to advertise its EcoLogo certification prior to the actual event, planning documentation would be submitted to an auditor prior to the actual occurrence of the event. At that point, the auditor would decide whether the event (as planned) would have sufficient points to pass. If so, the event would be granted certification in advance. As long as all of the planned actions were actually followed during the event, there should be no uncertainty or concern about being penalized.	None
14		H	[Notes: For the purposes of determining penalties (using the table above):  (a) For Events (CCD-095A), "Total No. of Points Below Requirements" is equivalent to:  (5-x) + (6-y) + (3-z), where:  o x = Points obtained in Waste Reduction Category (if less than 5);  o y = Points obtained in Materials Category (if less than 6); and  o z = Points obtained in Energy, Carbon and Transport Category (if less than 3)]  Comment: I think this is complicated, can you just say what the passing grade is?	This formula is not intended to indicate what the passing grade is. It is used to determine what penalties would be incurred if an event does not meet the criteria. Determining whether an event meets the criteria simply depends on whether it obtains sufficient points in each of the three impact categories. Calculating penalties is slightly more complex, but this formula is included for verification purposes only, and it is assumed that the average user will not need to perform these calculations.	None
15	Ensuring compliance by non-affiliates  (Question posed on forum: In order to meet those criteria which include non-affiliates (e.g. condiments, tableware), it will be necessary for the event organizers to implement a means of ensuring that non-affiliates comply with the requirements (e.g. contracts signed in advance). Will this pose problems, and if so, what are alternative solutions?)	B	If the ultimate goal of a green event is to have participants experience environmentally friendly/responsible options and services at every turn, thus ensuring a consistently green event experience, then event organizers will have to work well in advance of event day to ensure that non-affiliates are in compliance.  I do not think it is unreasonable or overwhelming to expect event organizers to attend to this task in a proactive and timely fashion.	None	None
16		C	I agree with [commenter B]. If it is clearly spelled out for suppliers and vendors in contracts prior to them signing up for an event then the expectation is that they will be in compliance. Event organizers can have a checklist of requirements for the non-affiliates and a list of acceptable suppliers this will help to achieve the mandate.	None	None
17		E	We feel as though there will be some resistance from our non-affiliates, but we see this as something we will implement (and require) over a period of time. Some ideas to help in this area include signed contracts, requiring non-affiliates to purchase these items from us to help ensure they are using approved supplies and creating an internal audit/review on site as well as a penalty structure for any non-affiliate found to be non-compliant with requirements outlined in the signed contract.	Valid comment.	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
18		G	The verification program needs to include verification of non-affiliates for domains such as waste reduction and material category.	In each of these categories, the criteria statements specify whether or not each requirement applies to non-affiliates.	None
19		C	There can be provisions written in that whatever the verification team finds during an event...if it were an honest mistake and is corrected during the verification then partial points can be obtained for an item. For instance it is difficult to always ensure that a vendor over a three day festival maintains the compostable dishes...a vendor may not act appropriately however if the festival organizer can show that the previous day an inspection was conducted and the vendor was compliant and now isn't then it should be acceptable for the organizer to take swift action to discipline the vendor possibly by shutting him/her down for the remainder of the festival, having a supply of compostable dishes for the vendor to switch out for the remainder of the festival and pay a fine etc. As long as immediate and effective action is taken to correct the non-conformance it should be recognized by the verification team as a minor variance rather than a major.	None	None
20	Third-party verification of environmental claims  (Question posed on forum: Note that in order for claims (e.g. percent recycled content) to be accepted by EcoLogo, these claims must be verified by an independent, third-party certification organization, e.g. EcoLogo, Green Seal, FSC, etc. Knowing this, do the recycled content requirements still seem reasonable?)	B	Absolutely. There is much too much abuse of green terminology, claims and labels. For this, or any other, green event certification to be meaningful, the validity of all green claims made must be backed up by some sort of third-party verification.	None	None
21		C	It is absolutely critical that verification be conducted by a third-party to ensure there is no greenwashing of the event. Every valuable certification has a third party audit in order to maintain credibility.	None	None
22		E	Yes, we feel the recycled content requirements still seem reasonable.	None	None
23	Achievability of point requirements  (Question posed on forum: Do the point requirements for each category seem achievable?)	A	I do think that the minimum number of points required per category could be increased by 1 or 2. It seems very easy to meet the requirements, and while we do want people to participate in this effort, we also want them to do as much as they can, and it seems pretty easy to meet a lot of the requirements. Another option could be to have rewards for going above and beyond.  For example, have levels of points, and at the higher levels the event could designate a non-profit environmental organization that is the beneficiary of the "lost" bonds.	Several commenters provided similar feedback, i.e. that the point requirements for each category were too low. The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
24		B	I agree that the goal of having the top 20% of "green" events satisfy the certification criteria is on target. That said, I was astounded to read that only 22.7% of researched events would meet the proposed point requirements for waste reduction, materials and energy, carbon and transport.  From my experience working with running events this past year, any event worthy of green certification ought to be able to achieve the proposed points requirements easily--most events that I have worked with or studied would earn nearly double the necessary points without much additional effort.  Bottom line: I think the proposed point requirements are too achievable.  Is there a mechanism in place/development that will address this issue if too many events achieve the point requirements? Not to be elitist, but if the majority of events are certified green because the standards are too easily achieved, what have we really accomplished?  But, as I said in my comment about point requirements, I think the minimum point standards are too achievable, and would again agree with [commenter A] that 1-2 additional points/category than are currently proposed should be required for certification.	Several commenters provided similar feedback, i.e. that the point requirements for each category were too low. The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
25		C	I believe the point values may be easily reachable, however, since there are so few events reaching for the certification these need to be held at a level that is attractive for them to at least begin the process.	The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
26		B	Have you given thought to raising the "bar" more frequently, or sooner than the next proposed review in 2011/2012? Or, perhaps, should there be a couple of tiers of certification: basic, intermediate and advanced, for example?	It would be possible to have a tiered system. The EcoLogo Program will consider this approach at the next revision. Three years is currently the review cycle period. Only if we find a major problem with the standard can we shorten this review cycle period.	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
27		C	I like the idea of [commenter B] that there be levels of achievement such as basic, intermediate and advanced. This will ensure continuous improvement and more events would be inclined to participate.	It would be possible to have a tiered system. The EcoLogo Program will consider this approach at the next revision.	None
28		D	5 points for [the Waste Reduction] category seem very low. Especially considering that the EcoLogo wishes to recognize the best 20% of events.	The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
29		G	To be authorized to carry the EcoLogo, the event should at least score a total of 8 points out of the 12 points possible in [the Waste Reduction] section.  [Note that this commenter also made amendments to the point values in the Waste Reduction section; these changes are listed in the section titled "Point values for each action (Weighting)". Also, changes were suggested to the wording of some criteria; these changes are addressed in the appropriate subsections of the Waste Reduction section. Any new suggested criteria are listed in the section titled "Additional Proposed Criteria".]	The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
30		D	It seems way too easy to fit the [Material] category's requirement of 6 pts.  8 pts is a minimum to be labeled "green"  6 points seems very easy to achieve	The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
31		G	[The Materials] section should also be more stringent, since a lot of greening aspect are covered, the minimum scoring should not be 6 points but 12. There are 21 points that may be allocated in this section.  [Note that this commenter also made amendments to the point values in the Materials section; these changes are listed in the section titled "Point values for each action (Weighting)". Also, changes were suggested to the wording of some criteria; these changes are addressed in the appropriate subsections of the Materials section. Any new suggested criteria are listed in the section titled "Additional Proposed Criteria".]	None	None
32		E	The point requirements in the Waste Reduction and Materials categories seem achievable, but the Energy, Carbon and Transport category may be our biggest challenge. Due to our affiliation with local charities through our Foundation we will not ask for donations for carbon offsets as we are already requesting donations for these charitable organizations. Currently that leaves us with the options of grid-based electricity (which we don't use during our festival so is not applicable), renewable fuel in our generators (currently this type of generator is not available from [local] suppliers), and bicycle parking (which we already have in place). Bicycle parking will only give us one point out of the three we need in this category so without further options our only hope is to find the appropriate style of generator we would need. It would be appreciated if other options could be added to this category, but we are unsure which items would apply to this area and what the appropriate point values would be.	The EcoLogo Program has removed biofuels from this category due to uncertainty about their environmental advantage (see comment # 113) and has added two additional options to this category: proximity of public transit (see comment # 130) and facilitation of carpooling (see comment # 132)	Removed biofuels, added two other options in Energy, Carbon and Transport Category.
33		D	Generally speaking, the fulfillment of the Energy, Carbon and Transport Category should be much more demanding than it is.  3 points seems very easy to achieve and this category should have a higher value.	The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
34		G	For the Energy, Carbon and Transport category, the event must have completed any combination of the tasks described below to give a total of 4 points out of 9  [Note that this commenter also made amendments to the point values in the Energy, Carbon and Transport section; these changes are listed in the section titled "Point values for each action (Weighting)". Also, changes were suggested to the wording of some criteria; these changes are addressed in the appropriate subsections of the Energy, Carbon and Transport section. Any new suggested criteria are listed in the section titled "Additional Proposed Criteria".]	The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
35		H	[For the Energy, Carbon and Transport category, the event must have completed any combination of the tasks described below to give a total of 3 points]  Comment: this is too low because transportation makes up about 80% of the carbon footprint	The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
36	Point values for each action (Weighting)  (Question posed on forum: Do the point values assigned to each action seem reasonable?)	A	Yes, I do think the point values are reasonable.	None	None
37		B	I agree with [commenter A], the point values are reasonable.	None	None
38		E	Yes, the point values assigned to each action do seem reasonable. The only challenge we anticipate is that it may take some time for our suppliers to fall in line and have greener options available to us. This could cause a challenge for us when securing the numerous types of supplies that are required on site during the festival. Therefore some of the action items may not be real options for us in the short term, but hopefully local suppliers will increase their efforts in this area.	None	None
39		D	Instead of giving away points for things which are now very common in most events (ex: recycling), the CCD should define mandatory requirements and then give points for things which are less common.  In our opinion, collecting recyclables must be mandatory (minimal requirement) since almost every Canadian town is now offering this service.	This point is well taken; however because there still may be some areas that do not recycle some types of materials, EcoLogo did not wish to penalize events in these areas by making any requirements mandatory. If certain materials are not recyclable in some areas, then events in these areas should be given the opportunity to take other waste reduction actions in order to gain the required number of points.	None
40		G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  - 2 [3] points: <b>for collection of tableware for composting</b> , [Containers are provided for the collection of compostable tableware, and this material is taken to a licensed composting facility. (These points are only available if compostable tableware is used at the event.)]	This change was made. See comment # 47 for more details.	Number of points for providing compost containers was changed from 3 to 2.
41		G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  - 2 [3] points: <b>for bulk drinking water</b> , [Drinking water is provided in bulk containers]	No rationale provided for the suggested change to point value; therefore no change will be made.	None
42		G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  - 3 [2] points: <b>for collection of food scraps</b> , [Containers are provided for the collection of food scraps, and this material is taken to a licensed composting facility]	The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
43		H	2 points: Containers are provided for the collection of food scraps, and this material is taken to a licensed composting facility.  <b>Comment: Make this 3 points, it's worth it for what it takes to make this happen.</b>	The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
44		G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  - 2 [1] points: <b>should be allocated for</b> [All] condiments, including those provided by non-affiliates, are provided in bulk containers, not single-use packets <b>(this is a big one)</b> .	No rationale provided for the suggested change to point value; therefore no change will be made.	None
45	D	In our opinion:  "All condiments, including those provided by non-affiliates, are provided in bulk containers, not single-use packets" AND "Drinking water is provided in bulk containers" should be awarded the same amount of points.	No rationale provided for the suggested change to point value; therefore no change will be made.	None	
46	G	[Original criteria stated that 3 points would be gained if 50% of cleaning products were certified.]  Comment - would it be possible to allocate points on a sliding scale with 1pt for 50% EcoLogo, 2pts for 75% and 3pts for 100%?	No rationale provided for the suggested change to point value; therefore no change will be made.	None	

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
47		D	Compostable tableware is awarded a higher score than reusable tableware and this should not be the case... o Compostable tableware : 3 points ("Containers are provided for the collection of compostable tableware, and this material is taken to a licensed composting facility/") + /material/ + 2 points ("If any single-use tableware is used, 100% of the single-use tableware is compostable/") = 5 points o Reusable tableware : 3 points ("100% of tableware used at all meals, snacks, coffee breaks and water refill stations is reusable/")	This is a valid comment which was mentioned by two commenters. The point system should definitely reward reusable tableware to a greater extent than compostable items.	The scoring system will be adjusted so that reusable tableware is worth 4 points; providing containers for compostable tableware is worth 2 points; and providing compostable tableware is worth 1 point.
48		G	There are currently 5 points available in the criteria document for using compostable tableware and composting it, whereas only 3 points are available for using reusable tableware. As the more ecological of the two options is using reusable tableware, the scoring system should reflect this.	See comment above.	See action above
49		D	Ensuring that all waste is recyclable is at least as important that ensuring that it is compostable.	Valid comment. A criterion relating to recyclability of waste should also be included in the criteria statement for compostability. 1 point will be allotted if 100% of waste is "either compostable or recyclable (where recyclable means that collection of this material will occur at the event)".	Include a point value for recyclability of waste (worth 1 point, i.e. the same point value as compostability)
50		H	[2 points: All table napkins (including napkins provided by non-affiliates) contain at least 70% recycled material.]  <b>Comment: not worth 2 points, maybe 1 point</b>	No rationale provided for the suggested change to point value; therefore no change will be made.	None
51		H	[2 points: All paper towels (provided in washroom facilities used by attendees) contain at least 70% recycled material.]  <b>Comment: not worth 2 points, maybe 1 point</b>	No rationale provided for the suggested change to point value; therefore no change will be made.	None
52		G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  - 1[2] point[s]: <b>but for more than 10%, perhaps 20%</b> (by cost) of all food and beverages provided are locally sourced, meaning that all of the ingredients in the product were grown less than 160 km from the event location. (The total cost excludes food/beverages provided by non-affiliates. Water and alcoholic beverages are excluded from calculations.)  <b>This should also include food provided by non-affiliates on site at conference centres and sports arenas.</b>	This commenter suggested that the point value for this action should be lower (1 instead of 2). However, another commenter suggested the opposite, i.e. that the point value for this action should be higher (i.e. 3 points). No rationale was provided for the suggested change to point value; therefore no change will be made. (The additional suggestions relating to the content will be addressed in the appropriate subsection of the Materials category.)	None
53		H	[At least 10% (by cost) of all food and beverages provided are locally sourced, meaning that all of the ingredients in the product were grown less than 160 km from the event location. (The total cost excludes food/beverages provided by non-affiliates. Water and alcoholic beverages are excluded from calculations.)]  <b>Comment: Make this 3 points or maybe 3 points for 160 km and 2 points for 500 km.</b>	This commenter suggested that the point value for this action should be higher (3 instead of 2). However, another commenter suggested the opposite, i.e. that the point value for this action should be lower (i.e. 1 point). No rationale was provided for the suggested change to point value; therefore no change will be made.	None
54		G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  - 2 [1] points: <b>should be granted for at least 10%, but this should make it mandatory to always serve Fair Trade coffee, including non-affiliates.</b> [At least 10% (by cost) of all food and beverages provided are certified organic. (The total cost excludes food/beverages provided by non-affiliates. Water and alcoholic beverages are excluded from calculations.)]	No rationale provided for the suggested change to point value; therefore no change will be made. (The additional suggestions relating to the content will be addressed in the appropriate subsection of the "Additional Proposed Criteria" category.)	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
55		D	<p>It is not clear how the weighting is done within a given category.</p> <p>For instance, 1 point is awarded to eliminate PVC posters and 1 point is also awarded for using vegetable-based ink.</p> <p>These two situations have very different environmental footprints and the weighting system should be proportional to the environmental gain or performance. Life cycle assessment of these alternatives could be used to weight the consequence of an action.</p>	EcoLogo acknowledges that it is difficult to determine weighting factors for different actions, such as the two described in this example. It is agreed that, ideally, life cycle assessment would be the preferred method for determining weighting factors. However, life cycle assessments are not available for all of the event-related impacts in this criteria document; therefore it is not possible to use this method in all cases. The commenter did not provide studies or evidence to suggest how the point values should be changed for these impacts, and EcoLogo is not aware of any LCAs comparing these two. Therefore, there is not sufficient information to make changes to the values.	None
56		G	<p>[3 points: Attendees are provided with the opportunity to make donations which will be used to offset the carbon related to the event. (Carbon offsets must be purchased from a provider that has valid certification with an independent carbon offset certification organization.)]</p> <p><b>Comment – disagree with attendees being responsible for offsetting, as numbers would typically be quite low under this scenario and therefore not have much of an impact. Perhaps 1pt could be given for making this option available and 3pts for organizations that choose to offset all of the emissions.</b></p>	It is agreed that offsetting all emissions would be preferable to offering voluntary offsets by attendees. However, in order for EcoLogo to require that an event must offset all of its emissions, the auditing procedure would have to involve a calculation of the actual total emissions from the event. This is an extremely complex task, and although there are simplified methods of calculating offsets based on the square footage of an event or other attributes, some of these methods may be far less accurate than others. Since EcoLogo is not aware of a certified/recognized method for calculating the actual carbon footprint of an event, we do not feel that this is something we can audit and verify without significant extra effort and cost. Therefore, voluntary offsets are specified instead of carbon neutrality. Our research showed that even voluntary offsets can have a significant impact: one event offset 228% of their emissions using voluntary donations.	None
57		F	<p>[Edited:] Most environmentalists agree that, in terms of the specific steps to take to address our environmental footprint, when it comes to electricity the option to purchase green power should be the step before purchasing offsets. Purchasing green power is a verifiable way to lower emissions and, in the case of Bullfrog, supports the addition of new green power into the system. [...]</p> <p>However, as proposed, an opportunity for optional carbon offset donations cannot be said to have a comparable impact to a specific purchase of green electricity or RECs. Given the stated uncertainties around the calculation of an event's total emissions from travel, food preparation, etc., this option is, at best, a contribution towards a portion of the events environmental footprint and will likely not directly offset the entire event's impact.</p> <p>For the above reasons, Bullfrog proposes that offsets should not be treated the same as purchasing green power or other conservation or reduction actions.</p> <p>We suggest a realignment of potential points in this area to recognize the importance of conservation/reduction, buying green and only as a last resort the purchase of high integrity, quality carbon offsets with an independent certification such as the Gold Standard Foundation. Specifically, the realignment of points would mean a fewer number of points awarded for optional offsets than for conservation or buying green power.</p>	Valid comment; it is agreed that the number of points for optional offsets should be lower than for purchasing green electricity. The point values will be revised accordingly.	Change the number of points for optional offsets to 2 (instead of 3). The number of points for green electricity will remain at 3.
58		D	In our opinion, the weighting concerning transport should be increase since, according to most LCAs, transport of participant typically represents between 50 and 75% of environmental impacts.	Valid comment. We need the LCA report. We will consider this research document at the next review in three years	None
59		H	How did you come up with the point system? Is it based on the amount of work/logistics it will take to make these modifications, the amount of money it takes or the most positive environmental impact?	As explained in the Background Note, the points were awarded based on the environmental benefit of each action.	None
60	Rewarding reduction	D	<p>Following the 3R-V principles, the weighting system should reward the organizer who chooses not to give away t-shirts or not to print posters instead of promoting "ecofriendlier" solutions.</p> <p>At the moment, if you need one more point in the "Material" category, the system encourages you to offer organic t-shirts, while an organizer who decides not to give any t-shirts is not rewarded...</p>	Valid comment. This option should be removed for this reason.	Remove the requirement relating to organic cotton t-shirts.
61	Event locations and sub-events: number of certifications required	A	If an event has several sub-events or locations, can the event apply for certification for only one sub-event or location?	In the definitions section of the criteria document, it is stated that: " "event" means an activity (or a series of related activities) with a fixed duration which occur(s) at a particular geographic location..." Therefore, if similar events occur in different geographic locations, each location would have to be certified separately. It is not entirely clear what is meant in this case by a "sub-event", but in order for an event as a whole to be EcoLogo certified, all components of the event (e.g. "sub-events") together must meet the criteria.	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
62		C	(Responding to commenter A's question above): In the business category I believe a product can be EcoLogo certified when the entire company is not. Therefore with that logic one would be led to believe that a large event with several locations or sub-events could be EcoLogo certified at that one location.	See EcoLogo response above.	None
63	Value of EcoLogo certification	A	What is the value of the EcoLogo Certification? Why would my event choose this certification over any other? How will the certification be promoted?	This question does not relate specifically to the process of criteria development; thus it will not be addressed here.	None
64		C	(Responding to commenter A's question above): The EcoLogo certification value puts the stamp of approval of an accredited outside verification organization. This could lead to funding application approvals from environmental sponsors, more attractive to popular entertainers who wish to be associated with an environmentally recognized organization, better cooperation with suppliers who are EcoLogo certified. It also has the potential to lead to positive media attention and greater respect with the event going public.	This question does not relate specifically to the process of criteria development; thus it will not be addressed here.	None
65		H	The other thing I think is fundamentally important is to explain the difference between guidelines and standards and certifications. What sets your certification apart from the competition and why should I follow it? While you do list other eco-labels in 2.3 which ones are truly certifications and which ones are just guidelines? Also, APEX is not mentioned and I think it should be (even though it's still in the development stages). I, for one, am getting totally confused by all these so-called standards etc. so I'm certain other planners would feel the same. I think it would be beneficial for you to include an explanation.	This question does not relate specifically to the process of criteria development; thus it will not be addressed here.	None
66		H	Lastly, at this stage, one fundamental question has to be answered. If I was to follow your criteria, would my event be greener than if I hadn't? Because, to follow it will mean more work for me so there's got to be a benefit to it other than just having the logo on the event. If this certification is to be real, I think it must work towards achieving that goal. I'm certain that's the intent of what you are doing, but I'd love to hear from you about this because I know many planners who will not bother with a standard or a certification because it's too much extra work. There's got to be a compelling reason to do it and it can't just be the optics, it's got to be more real than that.	The answer to this question depends on how green the event was before applying for EcoLogo certification. If the event was taking no green actions previously, and then changed its practices in order to become certified, then it would be greener. However, due to the wide variety of events and impacts, it is not possible to quantify the actual green effect of EcoLogo certification in a general sense.	None
67		Discount with other certified environmental product suppliers?	A	Will events that are EcoLogo certified receive a discount with environmental product suppliers that you also certify?	This question does not relate specifically to the process of criteria development; thus it will not be addressed here.
68		C	(Responding to commenter A's question above): Special discounts from company to event organizations should not be at the discretion of the EcoLogo certification body. This is free enterprise and should be between the event organizer and the supplier.	See EcoLogo response above.	None

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
<b>Waste Reduction Category</b>					
69	Recycling	G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  3 points: <b>should be allocated only when containers, accompanied by appropriate signage, are provided for all of</b> [Containers are provided for the collection of at least] the following materials: glass, plastic, metal, paper, and these materials are taken to a licensed recycling facility,	The need for signage on recycling containers is recognized. A statement to this effect will be added to the criteria statements for all three related statements (i.e. containers for recycling, compostable tableware, and food scraps).	A reference to signage will be added to the criteria statement.
70		H	Suggestion: cardboard should be added to the list of materials to be recycled.	The original intention was that cardboard would be considered a paper product; however it is agreed that it would be best to list it separately for clarity.	Include cardboard in the list of materials.
71	Bulk drinking water	C	Water should be provided from a municipal source with drinking fountains or a water bar where individuals can refill their own reusable water bottles.	The criteria statement says "Drinking water is provided in bulk containers". The intent of the criteria statement was to include municipal water sources as "bulk" sources, but the use of the word "containers" in the current criteria statement is confusing. The criteria statement will be re-worded as follows: "Drinking water is provided in bulk containers or directly from a municipal water source".	Wording will be changed.
72		H	What about using jugs and water coolers?	Jugs and water coolers would be considered bulk containers. To clarify this, a definition of bulk containers (for drinking water) will be added to the Interpretation section.	Add definition of bulk containers to Interpretation section
73		G	This may be difficult, as some events ban people from bringing their own containers due to safety reasons or problems with people smuggling in alcohol.	It is recognized that some events do not allow attendees to bring their own beverage containers. However, the points system allows these events to gain points in other areas if this is the case.	None
74		G	There are also potential hygienic concerns around the use of bulk water containers that need to be addressed.	It is assumed that an event will take all necessary measures to ensure that water is provided in a hygienic manner. If this is not possible for an event for some reason, the points system allows the event to gain points in other areas.	None
75	Bulk condiments	D	All sorts of small volume, glass or aluminum drinking containers should be avoided. eg : 25cl and 33cl aluminum cans (sodas and beer), 25 or 33 cl glass bottles (juices, beer, water), 37.5 or 50cl glass bottles (wine, champagne).  In our opinion, this must be also the case for other type of container such as: salt & pepper satchels, milk cups, sugar satchels, etc.	The use of bulk containers for items other than condiments (e.g. drinks) is problematic because if drinks are provided in bulk, a container (mug, glass) still needs to be provided. At a meeting or conference, it is possible to provide reusable containers, but at most outdoor events, bulk-dispensed beverages generally provided in non-recyclable waxed cups. Therefore, there may not necessarily be an environmental advantage of avoiding single-use containers. In terms of condiments, a criteria statement already exists for the avoidance of single-use condiment containers.	None
<b>Materials Category</b>					
76	Cleaning products	G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  3 points: <b>A minimum of 50 % cleaning products purchased and used on site should be certified by a Type 1 Ecolabel program. The percentage should be by used volume and not purchased. Then event could total 3 points.</b> [If cleaning products are purchased by the event organizers or their affiliates for use at the event, at least 50% of cleaning products are certified by a Type I ecolabel. (The percentage of products is based on the number of different products purchased, not by weight or volume of product used.)]	EcoLogo certification for events must be awarded prior to the actual occurrence of the event (in order to be able to advertise the certification in advance of the event). As a result, it is not possible to determine the actual volume of cleaning products used in advance of the event. Therefore, the criteria statement is based on the amount purchased rather than the amount used.	None
77		G	...cleaning products purchased and used on site" should read "... purchased and/or used on site."	See comment above.	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
78		G	It needs to be clear what exactly "cleaning products" encompasses.	Valid comment. A definition of cleaning products will be provided in the definitions section. Definition of cleaning products will include: window and glass cleaners, vehicle cleaners, degreasers, industrial cleaners, cooking appliance cleaners, bathroom cleaners, dish cleaners, disinfectants, hand cleaners, multi-purpose cleaners, laundry detergent, fabric softener, and laundry bleach.	Add definition for cleaning products.
79		H	[The purchase of cleaning products] is not controlled by the event organizer.	EcoLogo is aware of several events for which organizers did have control over the types of cleaning products used. The certification process is based on a points system, so if an event does not have control over certain aspects (e.g. cleaning products), then it can choose to gain points in other areas.	None
80	Reusable tableware	C	Bring Your Own dishware and napkins and cutlery should be paramount and an expectation that nothing is to end up in landfill. Reusable containers can be loaned out on a rental/deposit program to avoid the waste of not just disposable but also compostable dishes. Less waste generation when using and washing reusables.	A criteria statement exists relating to reusable dishware.	None
81	Compostable tableware  (Question posed on forum: Is it reasonable to specify that 100% of tableware must be compostable, including all plates, bowls, cups, cutlery, and other boxes/containers?)	A	Absolutely! But, it does depend on how other events handle their non-affiliate contracts (per the other topic about contracts). Our event is a Marathon, and we manage all of our contracts in advance, and only work with vendors via a contract. The one area where it could be difficult for us is at our Expo (where we have 150 vendors).	None	None
82		C	Items such as french fry forks and straws need to be compostable.	French fry forks would already be included as cutlery; however straws were inadvertently omitted from the list of items that must be compostable. Straws will be added to this list.	Add straws to list of items that need to be compostable.
83		E	100% does seem high to us, especially when boxes/containers are also included in this action. We believe that 70% would be a more reasonable expectation.	Only one commenter noted that the percentage seemed high.	None
84	Compostable tableware – Environmental impacts	D	Warning: biodegradable is not always good for the environment!!! For instance, life cycle analyses of corn-based biodegradable products have shown that their life cycle impacts are sometimes as important as traditional non-biodegradable plastics. In addition, using crops to produce tableware instead of food is controversial.  In addition, compostable tableware only makes sense if there is a composting system in place. Sending composting tableware to landfill does not present any environmental gain.  The criteria should give a more precise definition of acceptable biodegradable material...  Again, there is no scientific evidence about the environmental value of biodegradable material.	We have not seen this report. We will try to find this LCA and modify our standard accordingly at the next review.	None
85	Tableware: Reusable or disposable?	G	Is it my understanding that all events should either have reusable or compostable tableware? Meaning that if an event has disposable plastic tableware they cannot obtain the certification? Is that the case?	No, that is not the case. As long as an event obtains the minimum number of points in each category, they can still obtain certification. There are no absolute requirements. Therefore an event could choose to obtain its points from other actions besides non-disposable tableware.	None
86	Definition of recycled material	H	["recycled material" means post-consumer material and pre-consumer material. It does not include by-products of an industrial process that can be, and regularly are, used in either the same process, or in a different process, except that proportion which originated as post-consumer material and pre-consumer material. It may include sawdust or planer shavings from sawmill operations]  <b>Comment: is there a percentage required (i.e. 30% post-consumer etc.)</b>	For the purpose of this criteria document, EcoLogo is not making a distinction between pre- and post-consumer recycled content. As long as the required total amount of recycled content is used, points will be awarded. There is no minimum percentage of post-consumer recycled content.	None
87	Recycled content for paper products  (Question posed on forum: Is 70% a reasonable requirement for recycled content for toilet tissue, table napkins, and paper towel; and is 30% a reasonable requirement for recycled content for paper/ cardboard (used for event signs, posters, handouts, reports, etc.)?)	A	This is a good question. My question back to you is what is the cost difference for using 70% recycled paper products? If you could include a cost-benefit analysis, that could be helpful - if only in advanced planning (and a cost analysis for all of the criteria).	This question does not relate specifically to the process of criteria development; thus it will not be addressed here.	None
88		E	Yes, we feel these percentages are reasonable requirements.	None	None
89		H	[2 points: All toilet tissue contains at least 70% recycled material.]  <b>Question: in the hotel guestrooms and/or in the venue washrooms?</b>	It is agreed that it was not clear whether guest rooms in hotels are included as part of the event. As mentioned in an earlier section ("Scope"), a change was made to the definition of events which clarified the fact that guest rooms were not included.	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
90		G	[2 points: All toilet tissue contains at least 70% recycled material.] <b>Comment – this may be difficult to implement due to existing contracts in a given venue. Also, this is something that organizers typically would not have much control over.</b>	EcoLogo is aware of several events for which organizers did have control over the types of paper products used. The certification process is based on a points system, so if an event does not have control over certain aspects (e.g. toilet tissue), then it can choose to gain points in other areas.	None
91		G	[2 points: All paper towels (provided in washroom facilities used by attendees) contain at least 70% recycled material.] <b>Comment: this may be difficult to implement due to existing contracts in a given venue. Also, this is something that organizers typically would not have much control over.</b>	See comment above.	None
92	Local food	D	Also: concerning the criteria below: « 2 points: At least 10% (by cost) of all food and beverages provided are locally sourced, meaning that all of the ingredients in the product were grown less than 160 km from the event location. » 10% really doesn't seem enough. A much higher effort should be made in order to increase the percentage of locally produced food and drink products. More points should be available for local purchases.	The EcoLogo Program believes that the current point system is such that only approximately 20% of the events that will apply to the program will pass the standard and be certified. During the next three years we will continue to evaluate the leadership market and make appropriate changes to the standard at the next revision period in three years.	None
93		G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.] <b>1[2] point[s]: but for more than 10%, perhaps 20%</b> (by cost) of all food and beverages provided are locally sourced, meaning that all of the ingredients in the product were grown less than 160 km from the event location. (The total cost excludes food/beverages provided by non-affiliates. Water and alcoholic beverages are excluded from calculations.) <b>This should also include food provided by non-affiliates on site at conference centres and sports arenas.</b>	See comment above. It was decided that it would not be possible to require non-affiliates to provide local food because these vendors often have their own contracts and suppliers which would limit their ability to obtain food from alternative sources.	None
94	Organic food	G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.] <b>- 2 [1] points: should be granted for at least 10%, but this should make it mandatory to always serve Fair Trade coffee, including non-affiliates.</b> [At least 10% (by cost) of all food and beverages provided are certified organic. (The total cost excludes food/beverages provided by non-affiliates. Water and alcoholic beverages are excluded from calculations.)]	This comment was somewhat confusing because the original intent of the criteria statement was related to organic food, but the issue of Fair Trade coffee was added to this criteria statement by the commenter. The issue of Fair Trade is discussed in a separate section below (titled "Additional Proposed Criteria"). However, the commenter also mentioned that non-affiliates should be included. It was decided that it would not be possible to require non-affiliates to provide organic food because these vendors often have their own contracts and suppliers which would limit their ability to obtain food from alternative sources.	None
95	Printing inks and varnishes	G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria.] 1 point: All printed materials used at the event (e.g. signs, posters, handouts, reports, etc.) are printed using vegetable-based inks, <b>and soya based varnishes.</b> (Materials provided by non-affiliates are excluded.)	It is recognized that varnishes also have an environmental impact; however the proposed requirement for "soya-based varnishes" is overly specific. The best option is not to use varnishes at all. If varnishes must be used, then either water-based or vegetable-based varnishes are preferred. Therefore, the criteria statement will be changed as follows: "...printed using vegetable-based inks AND must be printed using either: no varnish, water-based varnish, or vegetable-based varnish."	Add criteria relating to varnishes.
96	Organic fibres for t-shirts	D	Some criteria are too specific. For instance, instead of using the word "T-shirt", the criteria should refer to "cloth" or "accessories".	Valid comment. However, this problem is no longer applicable because this criteria statement will be removed (due to the possibility of an event providing organic items just to gain points, thereby increasing the use of materials).	None
97	PVC in signs/banners	G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria.] 1 point: Signs/banners are not manufactured with vinyl compounds, e.g. PVC (polyvinyl chloride). (Signs/banners provided by non-affiliates are <b>included.</b> ) [Previously, criteria said "excluded".]	It was decided that it would not be possible to require non-affiliates to comply with specifications that signs/banners not include PVC. Most non-affiliates would already have their own signs/banners, and it would be wasteful to require them to dispose of these functional items and purchase new ones just for the purpose of being able to attend this particular event.	None
98		H	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show comment.] 1 point: Signs/banners - <b>for my events specifically as I don't have control over what hotels/venues use</b> are not manufactured with vinyl compounds, e.g. PVC (polyvinyl chloride). (Signs/banners provided by non-affiliates are excluded.)	The criteria statement specifies that signs/banners provided by non-affiliates are excluded.	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
99			What about biodegradable PVC as these are being sold as environmental (I just bought one and it was expensive).	The main issues with PVC are not related to biodegradability. For example, the manufacture of PVC involves the production of hazardous chemicals such as dioxins. Therefore, EcoLogo is skeptical of the environmental benefits of purchasing "biodegradable PVC" items.	None
<b>Energy, Carbon, and Transport Category</b>					
100	Minimum donation toward carbon offsetting  (Question posed on forum: For carbon offsetting, should there be a minimum per-person donation? If so, what should this amount be?)	A	I agree with this in some respects, but also don't agree with it. Last year we collected a \$2 optional donation from each registrant that we then sent to Native Energy. About 15% of our runners donated. This year we are collecting \$5 per person as an optional donation, but instead of donating it to Native Energy, we are putting it toward our own "Green Initiative" to help us invest in being able to make these environmental changes to our event. So, I think you could have events either donate the money, or invest it into greening their event.	The intent of this criteria statement is to offset the carbon emissions from the event. Therefore, EcoLogo requires that any donations collected for this purpose must go toward offsetting carbon, and cannot be used for other purposes.	None
101		B	I'm troubled by the "one size fits all" approach to carbon offsetting for event participants, whether it's \$2 or \$5 or ... One of the greatest challenges/opportunities we have is educating folks about the true impact of their transportation choices.  Ideally, you would ask each participant to pay an amount that would offset their carbon footprint 100%, whether that was 25 cents or \$25 dollars--there's a big difference between someone taking public transportation to an event and someone else flying in on their private jet.  Of course, the level of sophistication of the typical carbon calculator would have to improve greatly to be able to provide an accurate estimate of the individual's transportation footprint, but it is doable. There is at least one race management company in the US that already has this tool built into their race registration toolkit ( <a href="http://www.onemillionrevolutions.org/registration.html">http://www.onemillionrevolutions.org/registration.html</a> )	It is agreed that it would be preferable to make the attendee's donation reflect the actual impact of their travel choices. EcoLogo certainly encourages events to use a variable donation system with values based on a travel calculator or other similar method. However, EcoLogo is not specifying this type of system as a requirement in its criteria statement. This is because EcoLogo would then have to endorse the use of a specific method/calculator to ensure consistency among events, which would require extensive research into the accuracy of the models and methods used to create these calculators. EcoLogo does not possess the resources to engage in such an exercise at this time.	None
102		C	Many of the events/festivals I have been involved in have been free to the public in an open park where people can come and go at will. Donations are accepted throughout the event. However it would be difficult to charge for the carbon offsets since much of the time we are not sure how many people are in attendance and the carbon offsets become a mandatory charge making these events no longer free.  It would certainly be appropriate to include the carbon offsets for all of the entertainers and out of town vendors that set up at these free events. Just not as easy to charge the attending public.	In order to gain points in this category, the criteria statement says that "Attendees are provided with the opportunity to make donations which will be used to offset the carbon related to the event...". This donation is voluntary, no mandatory charges are involved.	None
103		D	* 3 pts to "/provide the opportunity for carbon offset donations/"  In our opinion, it must be the organizer of the event which should make sure that all carbon emissions are effectively offset (e.g. through internalizing the carbon cost in the event's budget)	(As mentioned in a previous section:) It is agreed that offsetting all emissions would be preferable to offering voluntary offsets by attendees. However, in order for EcoLogo to require that an event must offset all of its emissions, the auditing procedure would have to involve a calculation of the actual total emissions from the event. This is an extremely complex task, and although there are simplified methods of calculating offsets based on the square footage of an event or other attributes, some of these methods may be far less accurate than others. Since EcoLogo is not aware of a certified/recognized method for calculating the actual carbon footprint of an event, we do not feel that this is something we can audit and verify without significant extra effort and cost. Therefore, voluntary offsets are specified instead of carbon neutrality. Our research showed that even voluntary offsets can have a significant impact: one event offset 228% of their emissions using voluntary donations.	None
104		E	We do not feel as though there should be a minimum per-person donation requirement. This should be left up to each event to consider, taking into account how many participants/spectators they have and whether other charitable organizations are also being supported through the event. This action may work for festivals that do not already have a charitable component within their festival, but it is not currently an action we would choose.	None	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
105	Other issues relating to carbon offsetting	G	Also, I disagree with the paragraph that states that having a carbon neutral requirement would be overly onerous, as carbon offsetting is becoming more and more common and many tools exist which make measurement of emissions fairly simple. If an organization is not able to do the calculations on their own, most offset providers offer this service as part of their offset credit package.	(As mentioned in a previous section:) It is agreed that offsetting all emissions would be preferable to offering voluntary offsets by attendees. However, in order for EcoLogo to require that an event must offset all of its emissions, the auditing procedure would have to involve a calculation of the actual total emissions from the event. This is an extremely complex task, and although there are simplified methods of calculating offsets based on the square footage of an event or other attributes, some of these methods may be far less accurate than others. Since EcoLogo is not aware of a certified/recognized method for calculating the actual carbon footprint of an event, we do not feel that this is something we can audit and verify without significant extra effort and cost. Therefore, voluntary offsets are specified instead of carbon neutrality. Our research showed that even voluntary offsets can have a significant impact: one event offset 228% of their emissions using voluntary donations.	None
106		H	Carbon offsetting is complex. Here's a challenge right away. As the conference organizer I have the three options/approaches to this (also bear in mind that not even Environment Canada has a policy on whether it endorses carbon offsetting).  Choice 1: Delegates to offset their air travel when they book their flight (I have no control over this nor can I track it)  Choice 2: Delegates register to my event and pay a fee to a carbon offset program that I create (most organizations are still making this voluntary, even GMIC)  Choice 3: I just pay the carbon offset for everyone (whether they've purchased an offset or not). This is the most costly to an organization/company, but I have the most control.  Your points on this category should clarify which of the above scenarios is what you seek. Because even if I don't arrange a carbon offset program, technically a person booking a flight has access to a carbon offset program. Is this as far as you want to see it go in order to get the 3 points?  This is a can of worms, meeting organizers don't necessarily have control over this, if you book with Air Canada it's optional to offset, the meeting organizer won't know if they've offset unless the meeting organizer is doing the offset for them. I think points allocated for this need more consideration as there are varying degrees to how far you go with offsetting.	The criteria statement simply requires that the event provide the opportunity for attendees to provide a donation which will be used for carbon offsetting. No specific scenario is intended to be represented by this donation.	None
107	Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) and carbon offsets  (Question posed on forum: What requirements must be met to ensure that renewable energy certificates (RECs) and carbon offsets are genuine and of high quality? What are the most credible REC providers and the most credible REC providers? (Please provide a rationale for your choices.) What are the best certification schemes for	B	It's too bad that "gold standard" offsets aren't available/acknowledged in the US. Such a rating system would go a long way to ensure that the offsets being offered meet the broadly accepted criteria for valid carbon offset schemes.  Of course, the Voluntary Carbon Standard and Green-e are two good alternatives rating schemes, and there may be a few more that should be included in this discussion.  Bottom line: there must be a fair and consistently applied standard for validating REC and carbon offset options for event organizers to refer to.	Thanks	None
108		E	We don't feel as though we have enough knowledge or experience in this area to answer this question. We trust that EcoLogo are experts in this area and will provide the best certification schemes that are reasonable to festivals.	None	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
109	RECs and carbon offsets (Please provide a rationale for your choices.)	F	<p>...high integrity, quality carbon offsets with an independent certification such as the Gold Standard Foundation.</p> <p>[CCD-095] proposes that renewable energy certificates (RECs) must have been purchased from a provider that has valid certification with an independent REC certification organization. At the same time, the larger issue of the certification of RECs is also being raised in the recently released review of CCD-003, Electricity - Renewable - low impact.</p> <p>Bullfrog respectfully suggests that the larger discussion regarding certification of RECs under CCD-003 should occur before discussing certification under the specific Events certification criteria. Bullfrog would propose that the CCD-003 process is the appropriate forum for this discussion, with one exception.</p> <p>Consistent with the emphasis on local sourcing in other areas of the CCD-095 criteria document (e.g. food), Bullfrog is of the view that locally-generated green electricity and RECs should be supported wherever possible to encourage the development of renewable energy in regions across the country. The criteria document should require RECs to be sourced in the following order:</p> <p>From generation facilities within the same electricity grid from which the event is pulling its conventional electricity; or</p> <p>Where renewable energy from generation facilities within the same grid is not available, then from generation facilities connected to the local grid through an interconnection via a neighboring or regional grid; or</p> <p>As a final option, RECs generated within the same country.</p>	The EcoLogo Program will look into these details and consider modifications to the standard at the next revision in three years.	None
110	Other issues relating to renewable electricity	D	The criteria should give a more precise definition of ... renewable type of energy. Again, if one is to cut a 100-year old forest to burn in a cogenerator in order to produce electricity, this might not make any sense from an environmental point of view.	In the criteria document, it is stated that: "renewable electricity" means electricity generated using resources which are replenished through natural processes or through sustainable management practices...". If sustainable management practices were being implemented, this would avoid the type of scenario described here.	None
111		H	<p>I would be dealing with limiting factors in every province that would inhibit my ability to score better (i.e. green power is not available in every province).</p> <p>You can't buy green power in every province so this puts organizers at a disadvantage immediately if they go somewhere like Quebec.</p>	The certification process is based on a points system, so if an event does not have the ability to implement certain actions (e.g. green electricity), then it can choose to gain points in other areas.	None
112	Renewable Fuel	A	Again, it would be helpful to see a cost analysis. We have used a 15% blend, and that is extremely costly, so I am not sure how much it would cost us to use a 20% blend?	This question does not relate specifically to the process of criteria development; thus it will not be addressed here.	None
113	(Question posed on forum: Is 20% a reasonable percentage of renewable fuel for all generators (excluding non-affiliates) and for tour vehicles (90% of vehicles)?)	D	Criteria concerning renewable energy should be more specific about their origin. Especially concerning biofuels. At the moment, it is only the biofuels made from used oils which could pretend to offer an environmental advantage. There is no scientific evidence about the environmental positive value of other biofuel.	This is a valid concern. EcoLogo is currently determining its scientific position on this complex and controversial issue. Until there is a certification system available to clearly define which types of biofuels offer genuine environmental advantages, the EcoLogo program has decided to omit biofuels from the criteria document for Events.	Remove biofuels from criteria document, adjust points accordingly.
114		H	Also, I believe there is controversy over ethanol because it's using food grown crops as a fuel. Do you have any documentation to support the use of ethanol? This would help the meeting organizer. I have already had pushback from colleagues about ethanol which makes me hesitate to push for it.	See comment above	See action above
115		E	Yes, we feel 20% is a reasonable percentage of renewable fuel for all generators.	See comment above	See action above
116		H	Under page 3 of 7 "renewable fuel" definition - isn't gasoline from a biological source?	The definition also states that in order to be considered renewable, the fuel must "be replenished by natural processes at a rate comparable to or faster than its rate of consumption by humans or other users...". Since this is not the case for gasoline, it is not considered a renewable fuel.	See action above
117	Generators	H	<p>[2 points: All generators (excluding those used by non-affiliates) are powered using fuel with a renewable fuel content of at least 20%.</p> <p><b>Question: what's this for, do you mean exhibits?</b></p>	Generators at events could be used for many purposes.	See action above
118	Bicycle parking	G	- 1 point: Bicycle parking facilities are provided within 0.5 km of the entrance to the event. [Original criteria said 1 km.]	It is agreed that 1 km may be an excessive distance from the event. The distance will be reduced to 0.5 km.	Change distance.

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
<b>Additional Proposed Criteria</b>					
119	Wastewater	C	Since food preparation and the creation of wastewater is a large part of many outdoor events/festivals I suggest we include in the certification criteria document a category that provides some guidelines around how to handle this water. Not all locations where outdoor events are held have access to sanitary sewers and some vendors will just dump the grey water on the ground. If it is included as part of the criteria to be able to use the EcoLogo certification then this environmental hazard will be more readily addressed.	Valid comment. The EcoLogo Program will conduct research and add the appropriate criteria statement in the standard at the next review.	None
120	Water conservation	C	Conservation of water is another aspect that should be part of the point system. Wasting water should not be acceptable.	EcoLogo agrees that water conservation is important. However, this impact would be very difficult to audit/verify, i.e. determining what constitutes "conservation" is difficult. Since all events differ in terms of size and attributes, it is not realistic to specify a limit on water use (e.g. number of litres). It is difficult to create a meaningful, auditable criteria statement for water conservation.	None
121		H	In the first few pages the one thing that struck me that was missing was water reduction. This is becoming a huge issue and meetings and hotels gobble up tons of the stuff. I would recommend you include this.	See comment above	None
122	Plastic bags	C	For vendors selling wares...no one-time use plastic bags allowed.	EcoLogo recognizes the importance of reducing the use of plastic bags. However, it is inevitable that not every patron who attends an event will bring their own reusable bag. If a patron wishes to buy several items and is not permitted to obtain a bag, this could cause problems for vendors, and leave patrons unhappy. EcoLogo agrees that events should take all necessary steps to discourage the use of plastic bags; however it was not felt that a total bag ban would be a reasonable criteria statement for EcoLogo to include in this document.	None
123	Lighting	C	If there are nighttime activities, all lighting needs to be energy efficient, preferably recharged with solar power.	It is very difficult to create a meaningful criteria statement for energy-efficient lighting. There are numerous types of lighting available depending on the type of event, e.g. stage lighting for concerts, coloured lights, strobes, etc. In order to define "energy-efficient" lighting, extensive research would need to be done into all the various types of lighting systems and bulbs available, and determine which of these would be acceptable as "energy-efficient". EcoLogo does not possess the resources to carry out such an analysis; and it would not be meaningful to specify "energy-efficient lighting" without providing a definition of this phrase. In terms of lighting being recharged with solar power, EcoLogo feels that this topic is covered by the criteria statement relating to renewable electricity, which is not limited to solar power but includes many other green energy sources.	None
124	Waste management	D	It should be suggested that waste management should be done locally (within a 150 km radius).	It is assumed that waste management would already be done as locally as possible; therefore it seems unlikely that events would change their practices in order to meet this criteria statement. They likely would have already attempted to select local facilities simply to reduce costs.	None
125	Shuttle service	D	What about : o Providing co-shared transportation from local train stations / airport / hotel (shuttle service) ?	Creating a meaningful criteria statement relating to shuttles is challenging because it is difficult to define what constitutes a sufficient shuttle service, i.e. what exactly the event needs to do in order to obtain points for having a shuttle service. For example, how many shuttles must be available, and at how many locations? How often must they run? How many people must they hold? All of these things depend on where the event is being held, where participants are likely to be staying, how they are likely to be arriving (e.g. train, bus, airport). Therefore, what constitutes an appropriate shuttle service for one event may be highly inadequate for another.	None
126		G	Also, shuttles ... are made available for the event.	See comment above.	See action above.

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
127	Providing public transport information	D	What about : o Providing relevant information about local public transportation (schedules and costs)?	A requirement to provide transit information would be somewhat difficult to implement because transit schedules can be very detailed, and it is not possible to know where attendees are likely to be coming from; thus extensive information may be required, and it is not clear how this information would be provided in advance to attendees. Although EcoLogo recognizes the importance of using public transportation, it would be difficult to require events to provide this information to attendees in an efficient manner.	None
128		G	A requirement that is missing from this category is the location of the venue, as this will have a huge impact on the associated transportation emissions. For example, is ... transit information provided to attendees, etc.?	See comment above	None
129	Rewarding use of public transport	D	What about : o Paying back (or rewarding) all those who prove they came with public transportation ?	EcoLogo strongly encourages events to implement such policies; however it would be difficult to create a meaningful criteria statement relating to rewarding public transport use. This is because, in order to ensure fairness among events, EcoLogo would have to specify exactly what constitutes a "reward". For paid events, this could be a discount on admission; however for free events, this would mean that event organizers would have to actually create a source of funding to provide this reward. If the reward were non-monetary, it would be difficult for EcoLogo to specify what this should be, since all events are different and would be able to offer different types of rewards. EcoLogo does not feel it could leave the concept of "reward" open-ended, since this could mean a sticker at one event or \$5 off admission at another, which would not be consistent.	None
130	Proximity of public transport	D	Proximity of public transport should be rewarded (3 points maybe???)	Valid comment. An additional criteria option was added to the Energy, Carbon and Transport category to allow events to gain 1 point if their event is located within 0.5 km of a transit stop (e.g. bus, streetcar, or subway).	Add criteria option relating to public transit.
131		G	Also ... public transit [is] made available for the event.  A requirement that is missing from this category is the location of the venue, as this will have a huge impact on the associated transportation emissions. For example, is the venue located on a subway line or major bus route...?	See comment above.	See action above
132	Car-sharing facilities	D	What about : o Setting up car-sharing facilities and promote it through all possible media (invitation, website, ...) ?	Valid comment. An additional criteria option was added to the Energy, Carbon and Transport category to allow events to gain 1 point if their event facilitates carpooling by providing a link to a car-sharing service on its website.	Add criteria option relating to car-sharing service.
133	Heating and air conditioning	D	What about : o Avoiding all unnecessary heating and air conditioning ?	EcoLogo agrees that heating and air conditioning can have large environmental impacts. However, it is difficult to create a meaningful, auditable criteria statement for unnecessary heating and cooling, because the term "unnecessary" would have to be defined. This is difficult because people have different temperature tolerances, and if attendees at an event are uncomfortable, this could cause a problem for event organizers.	None
134	Energy efficiency	D	What about : o Encouraging energy efficiency ?  Use of energy efficient equipment should be rewarded (3 points maybe???)	EcoLogo agrees that energy efficiency is important; however it is difficult to create a meaningful, auditable criteria statement for energy efficient equipment. This is because events use different types of equipment, and it is not possible to define "energy-efficient" in an abstract way (i.e. that would apply to all possible types of equipment). Also, in order to create an auditable statement, it would be necessary to define the minimum requirement for energy efficient equipment, e.g. a percentage of equipment that would have to be energy-efficient. This would require defining the word "equipment", which would also be extremely difficult.	None
135	Air travel	D	Airplane travel should be discussed. A minimum carbon offset should be required.	It would be difficult for event organizers to track all airplane travel and ensure that offsets were purchased. Even if fliers were instructed to purchase offsets, it would be difficult for the event organizers to ensure that offsets from a credible organization had been purchased. How would this requirement be enforced? If fliers did not purchase their own offsets, would the event organizers be forced to cover the cost for them? This introduces many issues.	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
136	Environmental policy	G	The certification should require that the event adopt an Environmental policy, and it should be communicated to all service and products providers.	EcoLogo supports the idea of events adopting an environmental policy. However, if EcoLogo were to create a criteria statement requiring events to have an environmental policy, this would only be a meaningful action if the actual content of the policy was strong and environmentally beneficial. Judging the quality of an environmental policy is not part of the role of the auditor; therefore it would not be possible to verify the quality of the policy.	None
137	Exhibits and venues	G	The certification background document should add a section for exhibits and venues. This section would cover energy consumption, air quality, by both the venue and exhibitors.  Also this review process should allow the EcoLogo program to have a stronger influence on big event venues or centers, such as sporting arenas, stadiums, etc. These facilities still use massive amounts of Styrofoam and other non-recyclable materials.	Because CCD-095 covers all types of events, including both indoor and outdoor events, the criteria statements should be relevant to all types of events. It would be possible to create a separate criteria document with requirements for "Green Venues" but this would be a different project than the current one, which is focused on greening the events themselves.	None
138	Land management	G	The certification program should also consider including land management requirements for outdoor events.	EcoLogo has considered this possibility; however due to the wide variety of events and locations, it would be very difficult to create meaningful criteria statements that would apply to all possible land management impacts in all possible geographic locations (e.g. water, soil, plants, wildlife, etc.). Creating land management requirements would be an extensive task, requiring experts with specialized knowledge, and would go far beyond the scope of the current criteria document.	None
139	Washing stations	G	3 points [in the Waste Reduction category]: for providing washing stations where event attendees could wash mugs.	Valid comment. The EcoLogo Program will consider this item at the next review.	None
140	Paper/packaging reduction	G	A requirement that is missing from [the Waste Reduction] category is initiatives that would reduce or eliminate paper and packaging. One way this can be done, especially for conferences, is via hand-outs being provided on CDs, memory sticks or online.	In some cases, this actions could result in environmental benefits; however in other cases (depending on the volume of paper that would be handed out), the environmental impact of manufacturing memory sticks or CDs could actually be greater than handouts. As well, in some cases, it is not practical to give handouts electronically, i.e. if participants need to use the handouts during the event. Therefore, it would be difficult for EcoLogo to create a meaningful, auditable criteria statement which clearly outlined the volume and type of material that would need to be provided electronically in order to obtain points.	None
141	Hand dryers	G	How about hand-dryers? Would points also be given for energy efficient hand-dryers?	It would be difficult for EcoLogo to create a meaningful, auditable criteria statement relating to energy-efficient hand dryers. First, a definition of "energy-efficient" would need to be determined for hand dryers. Then, a minimum percentage of energy-efficient hand dryers would need to be specified. Would this percentage be based on the total number of hand dryers? The total number of [hand dryers + paper towel dispensers]? Trying to create a meaningful criteria statement for this impact would be overly complex.	None
142	Fair trade coffee	G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  [1 point: At least 10% (by cost) of all food and beverages provided are certified organic. (The total cost excludes food/beverages provided by non-affiliates. Water and alcoholic beverages are excluded from calculations.)]  <b>2 points: should be granted for at least 10%, but this should make it mandatory to always serve Fair Trade coffee, including non-affiliates.</b>	Although EcoLogo supports the purchase of Fair Trade items, advocating for social issues (e.g. wages, working conditions) falls outside the scope of EcoLogo's current mandate, which is to focus on environmental leadership.	None
143	Seafood	G	3 points: should be granted for all seafood that as been certified either Marine Stewardship Council or Blue Ocean Institute.	Valid comment. Already in the standard in the Intent section (i.e. to be considered during future revisions).	None
144	Bottled water	G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  [3 points: Drinking water is provided in bulk containers.]  <b>2 points: for bulk drinking water</b>  <b>3 points if no bottles are distributed or sold on site.</b>	Providing 2 points for bulk drinking water as well as 3 points for no bottles distributed or sold on site would create a situation where double-counting is occurring, i.e. if events do not provide or sell bottled water on site, then by default, they must be providing water in bulk. Therefore, the event would have obtained 5 points for doing this action, which seems excessive.	None

REPORT ON 1ST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FOR CCD-095: EVENTS NOV/DEC 2008

#	Section	Source	Comment	EcoLogo Response	Action for EcoLogo
145	Cloth napkins	G	[Emphasis (bold font) was added by EcoLogo to show commenter's changes to original criteria. Original wording of criteria has also been added in square parentheses below for ease of comparison.]  [2 points: All table napkins (including napkins provided by non-affiliates) contain at least 70% recycled material.]  <b>3 points for fabric napkins used.</b>	It is agreed that an option for cloth napkins should also be included; however cloth napkins should not necessarily be given a higher point value than recycled paper napkins (due to water, energy, detergent and bleach required to clean them). Therefore the criteria will be worded as follows:  [2 points: All table napkins (including napkins provided by non-affiliates) contain at least 70% recycled material OR are made from cloth.]	Change wording to include cloth napkins as an option.
146		H	What about use of linens?	See comment above.	See action above.
147	Leftover food	H	What about donation of leftover food?	This is a complex issue because there is a need to balance the desire for food donation with the goal of reducing the preparation of excess food. For example, if an event agreed in advance to donate leftovers (and received points for this), but then planned its food preparation so carefully that it did not actually have any leftovers to donate, then it would be difficult to justify awarding points for a donation that did not occur. However, it would not make sense to encourage events to generate excess food waste just to be sure that a donation would occur after the event.	None
148	Giveaways	H	What about all the other knick-knacks/giveaways at events?	EcoLogo agrees that there are often many unnecessary items given away at events which are often wasted. However, due to the wide variety of possible items that may be given out, it is unfortunately not possible to create a meaningful, auditable criteria statement to limit the amount/type of items provided.	None