

Greening the realm: sustainable food chains and the public plate

Morgan, Kevin

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Morgan, K. (2008). Greening the realm: sustainable food chains and the public plate. *Regional Studies*, 42(9), 1237-1250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400802195154>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this document must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



**GREENING THE REALM
SUSTAINABLE FOOD CHAINS AND THE PUBLIC PLATE**

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2007-0189.R1
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	Q18 - Agricultural Policy Food Policy < Q1 - Agriculture < Q - Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics, Q56 - Environment and Development Trade Sustainability Accounting < Q5 - Environmental Economics < Q - Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics, R38 - Government Policies Regulatory Policies < R3 - Production Analysis and Firm Location < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R58 - Regional Development Policy < R5 - Regional Government Analysis < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	green procurement, sustainable development, healthy school food

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

GREENING THE REALM

SUSTAINABLE FOOD CHAINS AND THE PUBLIC PLATE

Kevin Morgan

University of Wales, Cardiff - Department of City and Regional Planning

P.O. Box 906 CARDIFF CF1 3YN

United Kingdom

morgankj@cardiff.ac.uk

First received: July 2007

Accepted: February 2008

Public procurement is one of the most powerful, yet paradoxical, functions of the state in Britain:
powerful, because it deploys a purchasing budget of *150 billion per annum; paradoxical, because its

1
2
3 economic significance is inversely related to its political status. Through the prism of the school food
4
5 service, this article explores the scope for, and the barriers to green procurement - one of the most
6
7 underrated ways in which governments can help to fashion a more sustainable society. Creating a
8
9 sustainable school food service is the litmus test of a country's commitment to sustainable development
10
11 because it involves nothing less than the health and well being of young and vulnerable people.
12

13
14
15 Q18 - Agricultural Policy|Food Policy < Q1 - Agriculture < Q - Agricultural and Natural Resource
16 Economics, Q56 - Environment and Development|Trade Sustainability|Accounting < Q5 -
17 Environmental Economics < Q - Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics, R38 -
18 Government Policies|Regulatory Policies < R3 - Production Analysis and Firm Location < R -
19 Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R58 - Regional Development Policy < R5 - Regional
20 Government Analysis < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics

21 green procurement *, sustainable development *, healthy school food *

22
23
24 La prise de conscience écologique au sein de la société:
25 des chaînes alimentaires durables et l'assiette publique.
26

27 Morgan
28

29
30 L'approvisionnement public est une des fonctions à la fois les plus puissantes et paradoxales de l'Etat
31 en Grande-Bretagne; puissante, parce qu'il affecte un budget d'achat de *150 milliards par an;
32 paradoxale, parce que son importance économique se rapporte inversement à son poids politique. Par le
33 canal des services alimentaires scolaires, cet article cherche à examiner les possibilités pour et les
34 barrières à l'approvisionnement écologique - une des façons les plus sous-estimées dont les divers
35 gouvernements aident la construction d'une société plus durable. Fournir un service alimentaire
36 scolaire durable est la mise à l'épreuve de l'engagement d'un pays au développement durable, car cela
37 implique explicitement la santé et le bien-être des jeunes gens vulnérables.
38

39 Approvisionnement écologique / Développement durable / Alimentation scolaire saine
40

41
42 Classement JEL: Q18; Q56; R38; R58
43
44

45 **Begrünte Beschaffung: nachhaltige Lebensmittelketten und öffentliche Versorgung**

46 Kevin Morgan

47 In Großbritannien ist die öffentliche Beschaffung eine der mächtigsten, doch zugleich
48 paradoxesten Funktionen des Staates: mächtig, weil für sie ein Einkaufsetat in Höhe von
49 jährlich 150 Milliarden * verwaltet wird; paradox, weil ihre wirtschaftliche Bedeutung in
50 umgekehrtem Verhältnis zu ihrem politischen Status steht. Durch das Prisma der
51 Lebensmittelversorgung von Schulen wird in diesem Artikel untersucht, welche Möglichkeiten
52 und Grenzen für eine grüne Beschaffung vorhanden sind – eine der am stärksten
53 unterbewerteten Methoden, mit denen der Staat bei der Gestaltung einer nachhaltigeren
54 Gesellschaft mitwirken kann. Die Gewährleistung der nachhaltigen Lebensmittelversorgung
55 von Schulen ist die Nagelprobe für das Engagement eines Landes für nachhaltige
56 Entwicklung, denn bei ihr geht es um nichts weniger als die Gesundheit und das
57 Wohlbefinden von jungen und verletzlichen Menschen.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Q18 Q56, R38 -R58
4 Grüne Beschaffung
5 Nachhaltige Entwicklung
6 Gesundes Essen in Schulen
7
8

9 Adquisiciones ecológicas: cadenas de alimentación sostenible y aprovisionamiento público
10 Kevin Morgan

11 La adquisición pública es una de las funciones más poderosas pero también paradójicas del
12 Estado británico: poderosa porque administra un presupuesto de adquisición de 150 mil
13 millones de * al año y paradójica porque su importancia económica está inversamente
14 relacionada con su prioridad política. Desde el prisma de los servicios de alimentación para
15 comedores escolares, en este artículo analizamos las posibilidades y los obstáculos en las
16 adquisiciones ecológicas, uno de los métodos más subestimados con el que los gobiernos
17 podrían ayudar a modelar una sociedad más sostenible. Crear un servicio sostenible de
18 alimentación para comedores escolares es la prueba determinante del compromiso de un
19 país por el desarrollo sostenible porque implica nada menos que la salud y el bienestar de los
jóvenes y las personas vulnerables.

20 Adquisición de materiales ecológicos

21 Desarrollo sostenible

22 Alimentación escolar sana
23

24 Q18 Q56, R38 -R58
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **1.Introduction**

45
46
47 Recent debates on the state in urban and regional studies have paid too much attention
48 to spatial scale and too little to organisational capacity. With an increasingly complex
49 multi-level polity emerging in the European Union, embracing sub-national as well as
50 national and supra-national political scales, it is hardly surprising that the spatial
51 structure of the state has commanded so much attention of late (Brenner, 2004).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, this article argues that the state's *organisational capacity* - its capacity to
4 regulate the economy, deliver public services and procure goods and services - needs
5 to be better understood if we are to arrive at a finer appreciation of the scope for, and
6 the limits to sustainable development in advanced capitalist countries.
7
8

9
10
11 Sustainable development, it is always worth stressing, needs to be understood in a
12 multiple sense to include the social, economic and environmental dimensions of
13 development because all too often it is reduced to the third of these dimensions. As
14 we will see later, this narrow and emasculated conception of sustainable development
15 is becoming all too apparent in the UK, where it is justified by the claim that the
16 environmental dimension is easier to measure and manage compared to the social and
17 economic dimensions. It is also the case, however, that the environmental side is
18 perceived, by governments and corporations alike, as less threatening and more easily
19 contained than the social and economic dimensions, which open up questions of
20 social justice and economic democracy that constitute more of a challenge to the
21 status quo.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 In other words 'greening the realm' can be understood in one of two ways. In a
41 minimalist sense it refers to the narrow environmentalist interpretation of
42 sustainability identified above. On a broader interpretation, it also refers to the
43 political project of creating a 'green state', which has been defined in generic terms as
44 'a democratic state whose regulatory ideals and democratic procedures are informed
45 by *ecological* democracy rather than *liberal* democracy' (Eckersley, 2004: 2). In
46 substantive terms, this means a state that accords parity of esteem to all three
47 dimensions of sustainable development, a state that seeks to implement sustainable
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practices not merely in the public sector but also, through the powers at its disposal, in
4
5 the private sector as well.
6

7
8 The very possibility of a 'green state' under capitalist conditions is, of course, open to
9
10 question; indeed, it is the subject of a lively debate between ecologically-minded
11
12 Marxists (Hay, 1996; O'Connor, 1998) and ecological modernisers (Hajer, 1995;
13
14 Eckersley, 2004). While the former tend to argue that 'sustainable capitalism' is
15
16 something of an oxymoron, the latter contend that the prospects for 'green growth'
17
18 under capitalism may be better than the critics allow, even if some of them concede
19
20 that a *deeply* green democratic state would be tantamount to 'a postcapitalist state'
21
22 (Eckersley, 2004:84).
23
24

25
26 The prospects for sustainable development under capitalism will clearly also vary
27
28 from one country to another, depending on the strength of the ecological coalition in
29
30 the nation-state. Where there is a strong ecological coalition, it is more likely that the
31
32 state will be pressured to exercise its powers in favour of sustainable development.
33
34 The key powers of the state - particularly its power to levy differential taxes, its power
35
36 to regulate and its power to deploy its procurement budget - can be used to favour
37
38 some activities over others. Potentially, this amounts to a powerful set of incentives
39
40 and sanctions to change the behaviour of the public, private and third sectors, as well
41
42 as the behaviour of individuals and households.
43
44

45
46 Of all the powers at the disposal of the UK state, none has been as neglected as the
47
48 power of purchase. This is more surprising than it may seem because the public
49
50 procurement budget amounts to some £150 billion per annum, and this constitutes an
51
52 incredibly powerful mechanism for the state to promote sustainable practices
53
54 throughout the national economy. As we will see, however, this power is more
55
56 apparent than real because it is fragmented across hundreds of functionally distinct
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 bodies which have little or no incentive to collaborate for common ends. The state's
4 organisational capacity to engage in green or sustainable public procurement is further
5 compromised by a lack of skills, which means that procurement managers have
6 neither the competence nor the confidence to play a catalytic role in greening the
7 realm - certainly not in the stronger sense discussed above.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 There are exceptions to this generalisation of course, and the case of public food
15 provisioning may be one of them. The public provision of food - in schools, hospitals,
16 care homes, prisons and so forth - is arguably a litmus test of the state's commitment
17 to sustainable development in the fullest sense of the term because, depending on the
18 nature of the provisioning, it can address social justice, human health, economic
19 development and environmental goals, the main domains of sustainable development.
20
21 Food is an especially good prism through which to explore these domains because
22 agri-food has a unique status. Although it is invariably treated as one 'sector' or
23 'industry' among others, food is actually unlike any other for the simple reason that we
24 ingest its output.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Accessing the products of the agri-food 'sector' is therefore essential to human health
42 and well being in a way that access to other products is not, which is why the moral
43 economy aspects of food are so important (Morgan et al, 2006). The concept of the
44 moral economy has re-emerged in recent years, partly as a response to the excessive
45 utilitarianism of mainstream economics and partly as a vehicle for academics and
46 activists to address the normative issues that they consider to be *intrinsically*
47 significant (such as health, education and well being), rather than merely
48 instrumentally significant (such as income). According to Andrew Sayer, one of the
49 leading social theorists in this field, the moral economy:
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 'embodies norms and sentiments regarding the responsibilities and rights of
4 individuals and institutions with respect to others. These norms and sentiments
5 go beyond matters of justice and equality, to conceptions of the good, for
6 example regarding needs and the ends of economic activity. They might also
7 be extended further to include the treatment of the environment' (Sayer, 2000).
8
9

10 The moral economy of food is nowhere more apparent than in the case of food
11 provisioning through public canteens, the 'public plate' for short, because it is in these
12 prosaic settings that we find the most vulnerable consumers of all - namely pupils,
13 patients, pensioners and prisoners. The nutritional quality of public food, its
14 organoleptic properties (smell, taste, texture) and its provenance (how and where it is
15 produced) can be used as an indicator of the moral economy of food as well as of the
16 sustainability of the food chain itself.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 To explore these issues in more detail, the article is structured in the following way.
30 Section two introduces the arcane, rule-bound realm of *public procurement* to
31 highlight the problems that have bedevilled the British state in this realm and to
32 explain why the power of purchase was stymied, why best value became confused
33 with low cost and why radical reform became inevitable after 1999. Section three
34 examines the novel challenge of *green procurement* in the UK, prompted by the
35 British government's new drive to promote sustainable development throughout the
36 public realm, particularly in public sector catering. Section four uses the *school food*
37 *service* as a prism through which to explore green procurement in a sector which,
38 against all the odds, has become highly politicised as a result of the popular backlash
39 against junk food in schools. Section five distils the implications of the preceding
40 analysis and identifies some of the key barriers to sustainable procurement,
41 highlighting in particular the lack of appropriate *skill sets* within the public sector and
42 the failure to apply *whole life* costing when purchasing goods and services. Finally,
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 section six examines the prospects for a transition to a 'green state' where, among
4
5 other things, the purchasing power of cities and regions could help to fashion a more
6
7 localized, re-moralized and more sustainable food system.
8
9

10 **2. The Fallible Client: The Paradox of UK Public Procurement**

11
12 One of the puzzling paradoxes of economic policy in the UK is that successive
13
14 governments have shown an avid interest in areas (like money markets) where they
15
16 have little or no control, but have virtually ignored other areas (like public
17
18 procurement) where they enjoy almost complete control. Perhaps not surprisingly,
19
20 therefore, the history of public procurement in the UK is littered with costly and
21
22 embarrassing delays, especially in the defence, information technology and civil
23
24 engineering sectors. Far from being a recent phenomenon, the fallibility of the British
25
26 state in the public procurement arena predates iconic failures like the Millennium
27
28 Dome, raising deeper questions about the competence of the state to act as an
29
30 intelligent customer. Long forgotten examples of problematic public procurement
31
32 projects would include the System X digital exchange and the Advanced Passenger
33
34 Train, both of which were commercial disappointments despite their innovative
35
36 technical qualities. In contrast to France, where public procurement power was
37
38 successfully deployed to modernise key sectors of the economy, particularly mass
39
40 transit, energy and telecommunications, the history of public procurement in the UK
41
42 is a story of untapped potential (Cawson and Morgan et al, 1990).
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 The fallibility of the British state as a customer is nowhere more evident than in the
50
51 defence sector, where the Ministry of Defence (MoD) is ostensibly in charge of the
52
53 procurement process. The scale of the problems in this sector is without precedent in
54
55 the UK, even if smaller fiascos like the Dome continue to haunt the popular
56
57 imagination. In its latest progress report, the National Audit Office disclosed that the
58
59
60

1
2
3 largest twenty weapons projects are currently overspent by almost £3 billion and,
4
5 taken together, they have been delayed by a total of 36 years. Such are the delays and
6
7 cost overruns on the notorious Eurofighter aircraft (now called Typhoon), that the
8
9 current cost is no longer even published because it is deemed to be 'commercially
10
11 sensitive' (NAO, 2006).
12

13
14 There is no easy explanation for this lamentable public procurement performance,
15
16 though the main reasons would have to be sought in some combination of the
17
18 following: the lack of project management skills at the highest levels of the civil
19
20 service; a bureaucratic culture which extolled policy design over project delivery; the
21
22 silo-based structure in Whitehall, which stymied the dissemination of good practice;
23
24 and the fact that this lack of technical competence is both cause and consequence of a
25
26 lack of political confidence, rendering civil servants and their masters reluctant to
27
28 assert public sector priorities over private sector interests (Cawson and Morgan et al,
29
30 1990; House of Commons, 2001; Craig, 2006; Page, 2006).
31
32
33

34
35 Although it created more problems than it solved, the Thatcherite offensive against
36
37 the state was partly an attempt to import private sector business skills into the heart of
38
39 the public sector, a trend that actually intensified under New Labour. Between 1997
40
41 and 2005 for example, the Blair governments are estimated to have spent some £10
42
43 billion on management consultancy fees. New Labour's modernisation of government
44
45 agenda is such a bonanza for private consultants that it amounts, in the words of a
46
47 whistleblower, to the 'plundering' of the public sector in which civil servants have
48
49 ceded too much control to external private sector suppliers on the advice of their
50
51 internal private sector consultants (Craig, 2006). According to this analysis New
52
53 Labour convinced itself that it needed private sector skills to deliver more effective
54
55 public services, a skill set that was beyond the ken of the traditional civil service.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Here it was merely echoing the words of a senior partner at Ernst and Young, who
4
5 said 'the public sector must have access to the skills needed to perform successfully in
6
7 this more competitive regime: skills more commonly found in the private sector than
8
9 in public service' (Craig, 2006).
10

11
12 A new era in the history of public procurement began in 2000, when the Office of
13
14 Government Commerce (OGC) was formed to modernise public purchasing and to
15
16 secure better value for money from government contracts. The creation of the OGC as
17
18 an office of the Treasury was the main outcome of a major review of civil procurement
19
20 in central government conducted by Peter Gershon, the first chief executive of the
21
22 OGC. The Gershon Review of civil procurement exposed a woefully inadequate if not
23
24 shocking picture:
25
26

- 27
28 • No one really knew how much was being spent by the
29
30 government on a whole range of products and services
31
32
- 33
34 • The government was not utilising effectively its position in the
35
36 market place, for example through leveraging its relationship
37
38 with suppliers
39
- 40
41 • The fragmented approach to procurement meant that there was
42
43 enormous variations in performance
44
- 45
46 • Public procurement was not regarded as a core competence and
47
48 its professional status within government suffered as a result
49
- 50
51 • There was plenty of scope for government to become a more
52
53 intelligent and professional customer, but this potential was not
54
55 being tapped
56
57
58
59
60

- There were major value for money improvements to be gained simply by doing things better (Gershon, 1999)

The modernisation programme that followed this catalytic review begged an important question that has never been resolved – should procurement be modernised within an old, cost-cutting business model (*doing things better*) or does modernisation embrace a new, more sustainable value-adding business model (*doing better things*)? According to Gershon, the modernisation and greening of public procurement went hand in hand, as he told a *Greening Government Procurement* conference:

'Our attention is firmly focused on value for money - not simply the lowest price. This means looking at quality and whole life costs, including disposal and packaging, which are areas where environmentally friendly products tend to score well...Your task is to work out how to procure environmentally friendly goods while retaining value for money. We should not accept a 'green premium' as an inevitable consequence of greening Government procurement' (Gershon, 2001).

As we will see later, the notion that the 'green line' is synonymous with the 'bottom line' in public purchasing decisions has proved to be a profoundly difficult claim to substantiate, despite repeated assurances from Whitehall that there is no conflict between them. What threw this issue into sharper relief was the second Gershon review, which claimed to have identified £21.5 billion in 'efficiency savings' that could be made over a three year period, all of which could be re-invested in front line services (HM Treasury, 2004). This was doubly attractive to New Labour ministers because it promised to increase investment in public services by cutting civil service bureaucracy and public sector inefficiencies. More than a third of the £21.5 billion 'efficiency savings' was scheduled to come from public procurement as a result of

1
2
3 buying goods and services more cheaply. One of the main mechanisms for realising
4
5 cost savings, according to the review, was through the economies of scale that would
6
7 be achieved by aggregating demand by cutting local government purchasing centres
8
9 from some 400 separate local centres to perhaps 10 regional centres or even four
10
11 national centres. Regional purchasing consortia, along with new 'toolkits' to help
12
13 public sector managers to design value for money procurement policies, heralded
14
15 'nothing less than a revolution in the way government does business' (N. Timmins,
16
17 2004).
18
19

20
21 Taken together the Gershon reviews constitute a tipping point, signalling the
22
23 formative moment when the state ceased to be the naïve and fallible client it had been
24
25 for much of the post-war period. Belatedly, the strategic potential of procurement was
26
27 beginning to be recognised at the highest levels of government, an epiphany that
28
29 occurred in the private sector at least a decade earlier, when firms in the auto and
30
31 electronics sectors woke up to the fact that strategic sourcing was one of the 'secrets'
32
33 behind the success of Toyota and Nissan (Cooke and Morgan, 1996).
34
35

36
37 Although the Gershon reviews acknowledged that value for money should not be
38
39 confused with low cost, the pressure to realise 'efficiency savings' often means that, in
40
41 practice, these can easily become one and the same thing. What constitutes 'value for
42
43 money' has emerged as the central question in the new politics of public procurement
44
45 because the challenge of *sustainable development* is first and foremost a challenge to
46
47 the conventional ways in which we view and value things.
48
49

50 51 **3. The Ecological Client: The Challenge of Green Procurement**

52

53
54 The political commitment to sustainable development in the UK began with the 1992
55
56 Earth Summit, when the UK government signed up to the UN-sponsored Rio
57
58 Declaration. The first formal sustainable development strategy appeared in 1994,
59
60

1
2
3 followed by another in 1997 and a third in 2005, underlining the growing significance
4 of sustainability issues in mainstream British politics. Although there were some ad
5 hoc initiatives in the late 1990s, green public procurement emerged in a systemic way
6 in the UK in 2001 with the formation of the Sustainable Procurement Group in
7 Whitehall, an inter-departmental group created to consider how central government
8 procurement could support sustainable development. DEFRA and the OGC took the
9 lead in this process and, in 2003, they jointly announced the first minimum
10 environmental standards for all new central government contracts, covering such
11 aspects as energy efficiency, recycled content and biodegradability. This was said to
12 be 'a vital first step' in putting in place the structures and strategies to support and
13 encourage sustainable procurement (DEFRA, 2003b).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Like charity, ecological behaviour begins at home and therefore one of the key tests
29 of the political commitment to sustainable development is the sustainability of the
30 Government Estate, the collective term for all government departments and their
31 executive agencies. The Framework for Sustainable Development on the Government
32 Estate began to set targets for central government departments in 2002, though it was
33 not until 2004 that public procurement targets were included. Progress in meeting
34 these targets used to be reported annually in the Sustainable Development in
35 Government (SDiG) report, which was originally compiled by government itself. This
36 may help to explain the fact that the 2004 SDiG report was charged with exaggerating
37 the progress that the Government Estate was making with its sustainable development
38 targets (NAO, 2005). To overcome this conflict of interest, where government was
39 effectively assessing itself, the SDiG report is now compiled and analysed
40 independently by the Sustainable Development Commission (SDC), which has been
41 given a watchdog role in this area. In its first report the SDC used a 'traffic lights'
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 analysis to rate progress and it concluded by giving government red marks against
4 performance on waste, water and commitment to sustainable development, and amber
5 warnings against performance on energy, travel, estate management, biodiversity and
6 public procurement (SDC, 2005).
7
8
9

10
11 Central government's green procurement efforts began by focusing on a small number
12 of products, in particular paper, timber, electrical products and food, where it was
13 believed that some 'early wins' could be secured. Of these products, public sector food
14 purchasing has received the most attention, largely because of the unexpected political
15 salience of school food, an issue addressed in section four. In reality central
16 government had begun to focus on public sector food catering long before school food
17 became a *cause celebre* in 2005. An official inquiry into the future of farming and
18 food, held in the wake of the foot and mouth crisis, concluded by saying that 'local
19 food' offered untapped opportunities for hard pressed primary producers to re-connect
20 with their consumers, and it identified public procurement as one of the means to this
21 end (Policy Commission, 2002). It was against this political background that the
22 Public Sector Food Procurement Initiative (PSFPI) was launched by DEFRA in 2003.
23
24 The main aim of the PSFPI is to encourage public sector purchasers to work in
25 concert with farmers, growers and suppliers to ensure that *sustainable food* is
26 consumed in public canteens. It has five broad objectives:
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

- 45 • To raise production and process standards
- 46
- 47 • To increase tenders from small and local producers
- 48
- 49 • To increase consumption of healthy and nutritious food
- 50
- 51 • To reduce adverse environmental impacts of production and supply
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- To increase the capacity of small and local suppliers to meet more exacting demand standards (DEFRA, 2003a)

In addition to these broad objectives, the PSFPI aims to promote the demand for organic food; to improve choice for minority ethnic communities; to enhance working conditions for public sector catering staff; to reduce food waste; and to improve the standard of data collection and monitoring. Despite its modest resources, the PSFPI is an innovative and inclusive programme embracing a wide array of very different actors, including central government and local government, public sector purchasing bodies, farmers, food service companies, NGOs and universities. As we will see, there are major barriers to the design and delivery of sustainable food throughout the food chain, from farm to fork. To help overcome these barriers, the PSFPI offers purchasers and suppliers a one-stop shop of guidance, advice and inspiration through a dedicated web site, which includes practical projects, model specifications, training, professional contacts and case studies of sustainable food chains.

What constitutes a 'sustainable food chain' is of course open to debate, but the key feature would surely be the internalisation of the costs that are externalised in conventional food chains by, for example, factoring into the equation the effects on human health and the environment of the entire agri-food cycle from farm to fork.¹ This is clearly what DEFRA had in mind when it launched the initiative by highlighting the multi-dimensional nature of public sector food procurement:

'If we are what we eat, then public sector food purchasers help shape the lives of millions of people. In hospitals, schools, prisons, and canteens around the country, good food helps maintain good health, promote healing rates and improve concentration and behaviour. But sustainable food procurement isn't

1
2
3 just about better nutrition. It's about where the food comes from, how it's
4 produced and transported, and where it ends up. It's about food quality, safety
5 and choice. Most of all, it's about defining best value in its broadest sense'
6 (DEFRA, 2003a).
7
8
9

10 For the worlds of policy and practice, this statement succinctly captures the multiple
11 benefits of sustainable food chains. However, at the same time it also identifies two of
12 the biggest challenges to their development, when it says that sustainable food chains
13 are about 'where the food comes from' and most of all about 'defining best value in its
14 broadest sense'. The following section examines these two issues - value and
15 provenance - in the highly charged political context of school food.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **4. Sustainable School Food Chains: The Potential of the Public Plate**

25
26 Having been marginalised in Westminster and Whitehall for more than twenty years,
27 school food was unexpectedly propelled to the top of the political agenda in the UK in
28 2005, where it became a litmus test of New Labour's avowed commitment to public
29 health, social justice and sustainable development. In this section I use the school
30 meal service as a prism through which to explore two key issues in the burgeoning
31 debate about sustainable food chains - namely value for money and the geographical
32 provenance of the food. To understand these issues in the context of the school meal
33 service, one needs to appreciate the regulatory worlds in which the service evolved
34 (Morgan, 2006).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 *The Regulatory Worlds of School Food*

48
49 *The Welfare World of Collective Provision.* Given the low political prominence of the
50 school food issue in the 1980s and 1990s one would never know that the school food
51 service was once considered to be one of the foundation stones of the British welfare
52 state. But the origins of school food as a national system owe as much to warfare as
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 welfare because it was the Boer War, when the poor physical condition of recruits
4 impaired the campaign, that effectively triggered the Education (Provision of Meals)
5 Act of 1906, which gave all local education authorities the power to provide meals
6 free for children who needed them (Passmore and Harris, 2004). Although the origins
7 of the welfare era can be traced back to local initiatives in the 1880s, it was the
8 Education Act of 1944 that inaugurated the welfare era of collective provision in the
9 UK as a whole. Among other things the 1944 Act laid a duty on all LEAs to provide
10 school meals and milk in primary and secondary schools; it specified that the price of
11 meals could not exceed the cost of the food; and it established that the school lunch
12 had to be suitable as the main meal of the day and meet mandatory nutritional
13 standards (Sharp, 1992). Whatever the limitations of the welfare era, the fact that it
14 would later appear as a 'golden era' spoke volumes for what followed it.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 *The Neo-Liberal World of Choice.* The neo-liberal era was introduced in stages by
31 successive Conservative governments after 1979 and it was predicated on two totemic
32 Tory values - less public spending and more private choice. The neo-liberal era was
33 enshrined in two radical pieces of legislation. The first was the 1980 Education Act,
34 which transformed the school meals service from a compulsory national, subsidised
35 service for all children, to a discretionary local service. The 1980 Act introduced four
36 fundamental changes: it removed the obligation on LEAs to provide school lunches,
37 except for children entitled to free school meals; it removed the obligation for meals
38 to be sold at a fixed price; it eliminated the requirements for the lunches to meet
39 nutritional standards; and it abolished the entitlement to free school milk. These
40 changes, it was claimed, would help to reduce public expenditure. The second piece
41 of neo-liberal legislation was the 1988 Local Government Act, which introduced
42 compulsory competitive tendering (CCT) into public sector catering and other local
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 services. Under the CCT regime, local authorities were obliged to subject their school
4 meals services to outside competition – a requirement that led to a dramatic reduction
5 in costs (Davies, 2005).
6
7

8
9
10 Lower costs carried a cost of their own because CCT triggered a series of profoundly
11 negative changes in the school meals service, notably a lower skilled workforce, a
12 loss of kitchens in schools, and a service ethos deemed to be inimical to healthy
13 eating. Of all the changes wrought by CCT, however, by far the most important was
14 the debasement of the food itself, which was colourfully described by one leading
15 dinner lady as 'cheap processed muck' (Orrey, 2003). The net effect of this neo-liberal
16 revolution was a consumer-led school meals service where the menu was based on a
17 simple calculation, namely 'if a food sold well and was profitable, it was provided. If
18 it did not sell, or was not profitable, it was not provided' (Passmore and Harris, 2004).
19
20

21
22
23 From today's vantage point, when there is a moral panic about childhood obesity, the
24 neo-liberal era of food policy appears to be a monstrously myopic mistake. In its
25 desire to make short-term public expenditure savings, it actually contributed to the
26 problem of unhealthy eating, which now costs the public purse many times what was
27 saved by trimming the school meals budget (Morgan, 2006).
28
29

30
31
32 *The Ecological World of Sustainable Provision.* The fact that a radically new school
33 food policy did not appear (in England) until 2006, nine years after New Labour came
34 to power, illustrates the fallacy of thinking that regulatory eras change when
35 governments change. Although the revolution in British school food policy is
36 generally attributed to a celebrity chef's popular television series in 2005, the real
37 breakthrough came three years earlier in Scotland, where the Scottish Parliament
38 commissioned an expert panel to design a radically new school meals strategy called
39 *Hungry for Success* (Scottish Executive, 2002). Three of the panel's recommendations
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 would eventually resonate throughout the UK, namely: (i) the need for a whole school
4 approach to school meal reform to ensure that the message of the classroom was
5 echoed in the dining room; (ii) the need for better quality food to be served in schools,
6 and for this to be underwritten by new nutrient-based standards; and (iii) a plea for the
7 school meals service to be seen more as a health service than a commercial service
8 (Scottish Executive, 2002). The ripple effect of this Scottish social policy innovation
9 stimulated the campaign for similar reforms in England and Wales, which took place
10 in 2005 and 2006 respectively (SMRP, 2005; WAG, 2006).
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Far from being concerned simply with the environment, the ecological world seeks to
22 address one of the core principles of sustainable development - the need to render
23 visible the costs neglected by conventional cost-benefit analysis, where many of the
24 negative costs of the industrial agri-food system have been externalised (Morgan et al,
25 2006). Because it appeared so much later than its Scottish counterpart, the English
26 report, *Turning the Tables*, went further in embracing the ecological approach in the
27 sense that it also included the food procurement process, which it said should be
28 'consistent with sustainable development principles and schools and caterers should
29 look to local farmers and suppliers for their produce where possible' (SMRP, 2005).
30 The government accepted the main thrust of these recommendations when it made its
31 seminal announcement that a new regulatory regime would come into effect in
32 September 2006 to ensure that:
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

- 48 • School lunches are free from low quality meat products, fizzy drinks,
49 crisps and chocolate or other confectionary
50
51
- 52 • High quality meat, poultry or oily fish is available on a regular basis
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- Pupils are served a minimum of two portions of fruit and vegetables with every meal
- Deep-fried items are restricted to no more than two portions in a week
- Schools and vending providers are required to promote sales of healthy snacks and drinks such as water, milk and fruit juices
- Schools will be required to raise the bar even higher when more stringent nutrient-based standards - stipulating essential nutrients, vitamins and minerals - are introduced in primary schools by September 2008 and in secondary schools by September 2009 (DfES, 2006).

In political terms, *Turning the Tables* is arguably the most radical school food policy statement since the founding of the welfare state, not least because it makes the case for a high quality food system in terms of health, educational and behavioural benefits, in contrast to the narrow commercial values of the neo-liberal world. In setting new and more exacting regulatory standards the state was in effect fashioning new markets in the public sector for more sustainable products by creating opportunities for local farmers and growers to supply locally-produced fresh produce. Under pressure from health and environmental NGOs, public bodies throughout the world are coming to similar conclusions about the need for more sustainable food chains. However, such chains face a number of significant barriers, not least the higher costs of better quality food and EU regulations which forbid the explicit purchasing of local food.

Accounting for Sustainability: From Low Cost to Best Value

1
2
3 A 'cheap' food' culture was, as we have seen, systematically introduced into the school
4 meal service in the 1980s, when local authorities were exposed to CCT regulations
5 that spawned a radically new cost-cutting mindset. Although New Labour jettisoned
6 some of the cruder, more debilitating features of the CCT regime when it introduced
7 its own Best Value regime, the 'cheap food' culture lingered on, leaving local
8 authorities unsure about how to make the transition from low cost to best value. To
9 illustrate this conundrum it is worth considering the case of Carmarthenshire County
10 Council (CCC), where a Best Value inspection was conducted in 2001 with the aim of
11 improving the quality of the school catering service.
12
13

14
15
16 On a four point scale embracing poor, fair, good and excellent, the CCC catering
17 service was said to be 'a good level of service' because primary school pupils receive
18 healthy and nutritionally balanced food; secondary schools provide a range of food
19 that most pupils considered to be good quality; paid meal uptake was the highest in
20 the country and free school meal uptake was in the upper quartile for all schools; and
21 front line staff had a common sense of purpose and a commitment to quality
22 provision. On the negative side the inspectors were concerned that pupils paid more
23 for a meal (£1.35 in 2000/01) than in other local authorities and, concluded that if
24 'productivity' and 'competitiveness' could not be achieved, CCC should engage the
25 private sector to deliver the service. Overall the inspectors found that the catering
26 service was 'a high quality, high cost service', the implication being that it should be a
27 high quality and lower cost service (Audit Commission, 2001).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 This Best Value review is not above criticism itself because it takes as resolved what
51 actually needs to be explained. Such terms as 'high cost' and 'low productivity', for
52 example, may be appropriate to an industrial context, but what validity do they have
53 here? The metric used by the inspectors - meals produced per staff hour - would seem
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to be more attuned to a widget-making factory than a health-promoting school. Had
4
5 the council meekly accepted the Best Value recommendations it might have found
6
7 itself in the absurd position of seeking higher productivity at the expense of the
8
9 children's well being (Morgan, 2004).
10

11
12 Fortunately, CCC decided to defend its 'high quality, high cost service' by accounting
13
14 for it in terms of a community health metric, which was radically removed from the
15
16 industrial-like metric used in the Best Value review. However, without the resolve of
17
18 senior officers who were committed to maintaining a health-promoting school meal
19
20 service, and local politicians who were able to defend the service in terms of the
21
22 council's 'joined-up' community strategy, the CCC catering service might have been
23
24 forced to emulate the lower cost services of other local authorities, where lower costs
25
26 had been achieved at the expense of lower quality school food provision. Even in
27
28 Carmarthenshire, however, there is a perennial struggle to justify the costs associated
29
30 with high quality provision because, like local authorities throughout the UK, it is
31
32 difficult to quantify the benefits of good food and healthy eating, many of which are
33
34 long term in nature. This raises the question of *whole life costing*, one of the most
35
36 important ingredients in the recipe for sustainable food chains.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Re-localising the School Food Chain*

49
50 Sustainable food chains are generally thought to be synonymous with local food
51
52 chains, though a more robust definition would include fairly-traded global food chains
53
54 as well. Recent efforts to re-localise the food chain have encountered a whole series
55
56 of barriers, one of which is the fact that under EU procurement rules it is illegal to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 specify 'local' food in public catering contracts. Although this is less of a barrier than
4
5 was originally thought, many public procurement managers in the UK believe they
6
7 are unable to purchase locally-produced food by EU directives that forbade it on the
8
9 grounds that this would violate the free trade principles of transparency and non-
10
11 discrimination.

12
13
14 While EU procurement rules do indeed outlaw explicit 'buy local' policies on the part
15
16 of public bodies, our research shows that some member states have been far more
17
18 creative than the UK in how they chose to interpret these EU rules. Public bodies in
19
20 Italy and France, for example, design contracts that specify certain product qualities -
21
22 like freshness, seasonality, organic and so forth - which enabled their municipalities to
23
24 privilege local food because such specifications favoured local producers. Through
25
26 such creative procurement policies, public bodies in Italy and France are able to
27
28 purchase local food without specifying it as such (Morgan and Morley, 2002; Morgan
29
30 and Sonnino, 2007).

31
32
33
34
35 What constitutes 'local food' is a debate that will never be fully resolved because there
36
37 is no consensus as to what is meant by 'local'. At one extreme there is the National
38
39 Farmers Union, which equates local food with British food, at the other there is the
40
41 Council for the Protection of Rural England, which defines local food as food that is
42
43 grown and processed within 30 miles of its point of sale (Morgan and Morley, 2002).
44
45 Rural areas would have less of a problem meeting the 30 mile radius than urban areas,
46
47 so one needs to avoid hard and fast rules as to what constitutes the 'local' when
48
49 designing re-localisation strategies. Specifying the radius of local food is perhaps
50
51 more art than science and the least of the difficulties involved in creating sustainable
52
53 food chains. Far more difficult is the problem of calibrating demand and supply.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Stimulating *demand* for local food is a long term endeavour and, to be effective, it
4
5 needs to be part of a wider process of consumer education, and the latter has to be
6
7 more imaginative than the conventional injunctions from the health promotion
8
9 industry. Here the UK has much to learn from Italy, where local food products are
10
11 used as learning materials for teachers and pupils in a programme called *Cultura che*
12
13 *Nutre* - culture that feeds. Aside from learning about the links between products and
14
15 places, the key aim of this educational programme is to create knowledgeable
16
17 consumers who have an awareness of, and a commitment to, locally-produced
18
19 nutritious food. Discerning and demanding consumers are ultimately the most
20
21 important factor in the process of creating sustainable food chains (Morgan and
22
23 Sonnino, 2007).
24
25
26

27
28 However, if more locally-produced food was demanded in school meals tomorrow it
29
30 could not be delivered because farmers have neither the skills nor the distributional
31
32 infrastructure to get it from farm to fork. The dangers of creating a new market, by
33
34 stimulating demand, and doing nothing to create a local source of *supply* would
35
36 provoke a flood of imports, which is precisely what happened with the rapid growth
37
38 of the organic food market in the UK. Farmers and growers have found it difficult if
39
40 not impossible to break into the public sector catering market, where the barriers to
41
42 entry include an exacting and time-consuming tendering process and the caterers'
43
44 preference for dealing with large food service companies that offer lower transaction
45
46 costs and sponsorship deals which feature the 'brands' to which children are drawn.
47
48

49
50 Equally debilitating is the lack of a localised infrastructure to get local produce from
51
52 farm to fork. The lack of local processing capacity for fresh meat is an especially
53
54 acute problem, which has been exacerbated by the inadvertent effects of EU hygiene
55
56 regulations that are rendering small abattoirs uneconomic. This implies that locally-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reared livestock have to travel long journeys to be processed, creating animal welfare
4 problems as well as unnecessary food miles. Farmers and growers will need to
5 collaborate to a much greater extent if they are ever to overcome the supply-side
6 barriers that continue to keep locally-produced food out of local public sector
7 markets.
8

9
10
11
12
13
14 If sustainable school food chains are to become the norm rather than the exception a
15 more concerted effort will have to be made to calibrate demand and supply because,
16 according to one public procurement director:
17
18

19
20
21 'The food supply chain from farmer, through distributors to schools (and other
22 public sector customers) is complex, fragmented, inefficient, distorts markets,
23 under-utilises UK producers, has no planning or coordination, and is far from
24 supporting the need for local fresh food cooked on site' (Taylor, 2006)
25
26
27

28
29 While it is probably true overall, this bleak assessment understates two aspects of the
30 school food chain. Firstly, while there is no *public* planning of demand and supply,
31 there is certainly a good deal of *private* planning on the part of food service
32 companies like Brakes and 3663 for example, and there is mounting evidence to
33 suggest that these companies are no longer impervious to local food offers where the
34 latter are available. Secondly, it fails to acknowledge the innovative role of NGOs in
35 calibrating demand and supply at a local level. East Anglia Food Link, Sustain and the
36 Soil Association have taken the lead in nurturing locally-integrated school food
37 chains. Especially significant is the Soil Association's *Food for Life* programme,
38 which is widely perceived to be the gold standard in sustainable school food chains in
39 the UK (Melchett, 2005).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 The main problem with the *Food for Life* programme, however, is that it remains a
55 localised phenomenon, confined as it is to the islands of good practice. Although the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 PSFPI aims to provide a supportive national framework for sustainable food chains,
4
5 good practice is a notoriously bad traveller because, for whatever reason, it is slow to
6
7 disseminate from one local authority area to another (Morgan and Morley, 2006).
8
9 Belatedly, mainstreaming good practice has been recognised as one of the key
10
11 challenges facing the government in its avowed aim of making the UK a leader in
12
13 sustainable procurement.
14

15 16 17 **5. The Barriers to Sustainable Procurement: Skills and Whole Life Costing**

18
19 It is not too much of an exaggeration to say that the British public sector - central
20
21 government, local government and a wide array of other public bodies - is only now
22
23 beginning to appreciate the potential of public procurement. As we have seen, the
24
25 modernisation of the public procurement process did not begin until 2000, when the
26
27 OGC was created to act on the shocking findings of the Gershon review of civil
28
29 procurement in central government. Although the UK public procurement budget
30
31 amounts to £150 billion per annum, equivalent to 13% of GDP, the power of this
32
33 budget is more apparent than real because it is chronically fragmented over hundreds
34
35 of different public sector bodies, few of whom cooperate to achieve economies of
36
37 scale or share good practice, though this is beginning to change. The UK government
38
39 may have announced its intention of being one of the European leaders in sustainable
40
41 procurement by 2009, but it has a long way to go before it catches up with leading
42
43 countries like Denmark and Sweden, where green procurement strategies were
44
45 launched in the 1990s (Erdmenger, 2003). Furthermore, central government's actions
46
47 to date have been almost entirely focused on the environmental dimension of
48
49 sustainability, to the exclusion of the social and economic dimensions, which means
50
51 sustainable procurement in the narrowest sense of the term (NAO, 2005).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Food is one of the sectors where all three dimensions of *sustainable* procurement are
4 being pioneered in the UK, thanks to the popular outcry that transformed school food
5 into a serious political issue. The public catering sector in the UK spends some £2
6 billion per annum and this budget has enormous potential to raise the nutritional
7 quality of food provisioning, especially in deprived areas, where poor nutrition is one
8 of the most insidious and least visible signs of multiple deprivation (Dowler and
9 Turner, 2001; Lang and Heasman, 2004). Over the past decade there has been a
10 revolution in the quality of British food, with the re-discovery of local and regional
11 products and a new cachet attached to fresh ingredients (Ilbery and Kneafsey, 2002).
12 However, the customers of public canteens - in schools, hospitals, care homes and the
13 like - have yet to enjoy the benefits of this quality food revolution, unlike their
14 counterparts in other European countries (Peckham and Petts, 2003).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 The barriers to the sustainable procurement of school food are similar in nature to the
31 barriers in other sectors, which are shown in Figure 1.

32
33
34
35 *Figure 1: Commonly Cited Barriers to Sustainable Procurement*

- 36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- **Cost:** Perception of increased costs associated with sustainable procurement. Value for money is perceived to be inconsistent with paying a premium to achieve sustainability objectives.
 - **Knowledge:** Lack of awareness of the need for and processes required to conduct procurement more sustainably.
 - **Awareness and information:** Lack of information about the most sustainable option; lack of awareness of products; lack of monitoring of supplies; perceptions of inferior quality.
 - **Risk:** Risk-averse buyers prefer to purchase from suppliers with a good track record. Organisations fear criticism from the media and are therefore less keen to take innovative approaches.
 - **Legal issues:** Uncertainty as to what can, and cannot be done, under existing rules (both UK and EC) on public procurement.
 - **Leadership:** A lack of leadership - both organisational and political - leading to a lack of ownership and accountability at all levels.

- **Inertia:** Lack of appetite for change. Lack of personal or organisational incentives to drive change.

Source: National Audit Office (2005)

Many of these barriers surfaced again in the most comprehensive study of sustainable procurement ever conducted in the UK, the product of a task force chaired by Sir Neville Simms (SPTF, 2006). Of all the barriers identified in the Simms report, two deserve special attention - namely the failure to apply *whole life costing* and the lack of *sustainable procurement skills*.

As regards the first barrier - whole life costing - the report put it very succinctly when it said that 'the efficiency message was being interpreted throughout the public sector in ways which drowned out sustainability considerations' (SPTF, 2006: 52). The 'efficiency message' is shorthand for the Gershon Efficiency Review that we encountered earlier, which aimed to squeeze savings of £21.5 billion from the public sector, over a third of it from procurement savings. To address this problem the Simms report said there needed to be 'a clear message from the top that value for money must be assessed on a whole life basis' (SPTF, 2006:53).

The second barrier - the lack of sustainable procurement skills - helps to explain why the public sector systematically fails to apply whole life costing to its purchasing decisions. The Simms inquiry argued that 'many parts of the public sector currently lack professional procurement expertise and that people are routinely allowed to spend money without being appropriately trained' (SPTF, 2006:47). This knowledge deficit chimes with an earlier inquiry which found that less than a quarter of all procurement staff was fully qualified (NAO, 2005). A poorly qualified public sector workforce also helps to explain why 'examples of good practice are presently not

1
2
3 being shared fast enough or widely enough to encourage the dissemination of smarter
4 procurement throughout the public sector' (SPTF, 2006:60).

5
6
7 Although the Simms report did not explicitly mention it, *regulatory ambiguity* has
8 been another important barrier to sustainable procurement, especially in the UK
9 context. As we can see from Figure 1, the uncertainty as to what is allowed under the
10 rules tends to make procurement managers very risk averse because, if they feel they
11 are entering a grey area with respect to the regulations, they will invariably recoil
12 from experimenting and remain within their comfort zone. The case of school food
13 localisation clearly showed that UK procurement managers, though they faced the
14 same EU regulations as their European counterparts, interpreted them in a much more
15 conservative and risk-averse way. The belief that EU regulations are a barrier to green
16 procurement appears to be have been most pronounced in the UK, where a narrow
17 cost-based contracting culture was dominant for so long (Morgan and Sonnino, 2007).
18
19 In actual fact, EU regulations are much more flexible than British managers ever
20 realised, especially after the European Court of Justice delivered its landmark decision
21 in favour of green procurement in 2002, in the case of *Concordia Bus versus City of*
22 *Helsinki*, and after the European Commission published its handbook on green
23 procurement in 2004 (European Commission, 2004; Day, 2005).²

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

What all the barriers to sustainable procurement seem to have in common in the UK is a conspicuous lack of political leadership. The Simms report freely acknowledged this problem when it said that the 'lack of leadership from the top is then reflected down the organisation in lack of accountability for sustainable procurement' (SPTF, 2006: 29). These barriers - the failure to apply whole life costing, the knowledge deficit and the lack of political leadership - help to explain why sustainable procurement

1
2
3 continues to be more an aspiration than a reality in large swathes of the public sector
4
5 today.
6

7 **6. Conclusions and Implications: Towards the Green State?**

8
9
10 The British public sector currently finds itself torn between two very different
11 political pressures. At the rhetorical level there is a growing official commitment to
12 sustainable procurement, so much so that the government has formally committed
13 itself to becoming one of the leading European practitioners by 2009, a policy that is
14 rationalised in value for money terms. However, the public sector is also being
15 subjected to the 'efficiency message' and this is a much more powerful pressure
16 because it is easier to understand, easier to implement and its results are easier to
17 measure. Although Whitehall insists that 'efficiency gains' are not to be confused with
18 budget cuts, the latter are invariably interpreted to be synonymous with the former,
19 and this false equation constitutes the biggest single impediment to the development
20 of sustainable public procurement. While public procurement is belatedly being
21 modernised, then, this is occurring within a cost-cutting, rather than a value-adding,
22 business model.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Notwithstanding these barriers, some genuine progress has been made in certain
40 areas, most notably with school food. Although government ministers are wont to
41 give the impression that much has been achieved here, the truth is that the UK is
42 merely on the cusp of an ecological school food service in the sense that new services
43 have been designed but not yet delivered on a systemic basis throughout the country.
44 In other words, the creation of sustainable school food chains is a *process* not an event
45 and the UK is merely at the beginning of this process because the implementation of
46 the new service - which crucially depends on financially-strapped local authorities
47 having the wherewithal to deliver - is by no means assured.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Yet it is here, in the prosaic realm of the school food service, that the UK
4
5 government's avowed commitment to sustainable public procurement will be tested
6
7 more profoundly than anywhere else because, if 'greening the realm' means anything,
8
9 it must surely mean the provision of fresh, locally-produced nutritious food in
10
11 schools, where children ought to be able to eat healthy food and learn about the links
12
13 between food, diet and well being. If the UK cannot ensure an ecological school food
14
15 service, then it cannot hope to meet the grander visions of its sustainable development
16
17 strategy. The public provisioning of nutritious food for vulnerable people – and
18
19 school children and senior citizens are among the most vulnerable, albeit for different
20
21 reasons – returns us to the notion of the moral economy. At the heart of the moral
22
23 economy is our duty of care to others, the 'nearest and dearest' as well as 'distant
24
25 others', and the fate of the ecological school food service is perhaps the quintessential
26
27 measure of the *re-moralization* of the public realm (Morgan, 2006).
28
29
30

31
32 Through the prism of public procurement, this article has argued that the
33
34 *organisational capacity* of the state needs to be given far more prominence if we want
35
36 to explore the scope for more radical forms of sustainable development. In the case of
37
38 public procurement, for example, the state's capacity for action has been stymied by a
39
40 chronic lack of internal skills to design and deliver sustainable procurement contracts.
41
42 Significant as it is, however, this knowledge deficit reflects a larger, and much more
43
44 important drag on the state's capacity for action, and the source of this problem is the
45
46 subjugation of the public realm to the marketised norms of the private sector, one of
47
48 the many consequences of a fashionable but flawed neo-liberal ideology (Marquand,
49
50 2004; Harvey, 2007). Under the guise of 'modernisation' the public procurement
51
52 process in the UK is being reformed through an infusion of marketised knowledge
53
54 and business models from private management consultants, a sector that is highly
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 adept at persuading state bodies that the latter can overcome their internal knowledge
4 deficit by 'outsourcing' their requirements to the private sector (Craig, 2006).
5
6

7
8 The public sector urgently needs to redress its internal knowledge deficit, principally
9
10 by investing in new skill sets and by developing business models that are informed by
11
12 whole life costing methodologies, thereby ensuring that low cost can no longer
13
14 masquerade as best value. Reforming public procurement is a challenge that central
15
16 government must share with the nations, regions and localities of the UK because the
17
18 public sector straddles all these spatial scales. In terms of the food economy, for
19
20 example, local government in cities, towns and rural municipalities could play an
21
22 enormously important role in *re-localising* the supply-side if they acquired the
23
24 competence and the confidence to mobilise the power of the public plate.
25
26

27
28 Under the auspices of the CARPE (Cities as Responsible Purchasers in Europe)
29
30 project, 12 cities have already begun to explore the potential of green and ethical
31
32 procurement (Eurocities, 2005). With more than 50% of public procurement
33
34 expenditure deployed at the sub-national level in EU member states, cities could
35
36 secure multiple dividends by including the food economy as one of their early
37
38 priorities for promoting sustainable development. As well as helping to tackle the
39
40 epidemic of diet-related diseases, and making a major contribution to human health
41
42 and well being, a sustainable food economy can be a prism through which to address
43
44 the burgeoning planning problems associated with food-related *waste*, food-related
45
46 *transport* and food-related *retail* disputes, especially the growing asymmetry between
47
48 supermarkets and farmers' markets. A more sustainable, low carbon food economy
49
50 also creates new incentives for cities to re-engage with their regional hinterlands,
51
52 allowing city-regionalism to assume a collaborative rather than a competitive form. If
53
54 it is sufficiently aggregated, the power of purchase within the public sector in the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 nations and regions of the UK could help to effect a genuine localization of the food
4
5 system. Although the co-location of production and consumption would be
6
7 exceedingly difficult to deliver at the local level, if the 'local' is defined as a thirty
8
9 mile radius, this arrangement is much more feasible at the broader spatial scale of
10
11 Scotland, Wales and the English regions. The political pressures towards
12
13 regionalization – across the whole public sector, but within health, education and local
14
15 government in particular – are already well advanced in the UK (Bradbury, 2008). If
16
17 public procurement policies were to be more fully integrated with these trends, and
18
19 synchronised at the regional level, a new era of regionalized food production and
20
21 consumption might be fashioned in the public foodscape, complementing and
22
23 reinforcing the growth of regional cuisine in fine restaurants – but with this crucial
24
25 difference: the regionalization of food would be rendered less culturally exclusive and
26
27 more socially inclusive (Morgan et al, 2006).
28
29
30

31
32 Surprisingly perhaps, American planners appear to be ahead of their European
33
34 counterparts in recognising the need for what they call *food system planning*. As they
35
36 put it recently:
37
38

39
40 'As a discipline, planning marks its distinctiveness by a strong claim to be
41
42 comprehensive in scope and attentive to the spatial interconnections among
43
44 important facets of community life. Yet among the basic necessities of life –
45
46 air, food, shelter, water – only food has been given short shrift by the planning
47
48 community. Given the increasing support among planners for creating more
49
50 sustainable communities, it's time for the food vacuum in planning to be filled
51
52 in' (Born et al, 2006)
53
54

55
56 Greening the realm through sustainable public procurement policies carries threats as
57
58 well as opportunities, with the biggest threat being a pious and self-referential
59
60 localism in which the local is always extolled over the global. A sustainable food
strategy, by contrast, would involve a judicious combination of 'local and green' and
'global and fair', the former to reduce the ecological damage of the food system, the

1
2
3 latter to improve the prospects of desperately poor commodity producers in
4
5 developing countries (Morgan, 2007).
6

7
8 Public sector canteens – in schools, universities, hospitals, care homes, prisons and
9
10 the like – represent a significant part of the food economy in every country. What
11
12 happens in these prosaic institutions ought to be at the centre of food system planning
13
14 because, day in and day out, they constitute a source of demand that is stable and
15
16 predictable over time, in contrast to the hyper-mobile branch factories that come and
17
18 go in peripheral regions. To design and deliver more sustainable public procurement
19
20 strategies, local municipalities need regulatory environments that positively foster
21
22 food system planning, and national and supra-national regulatory reform ought to
23
24 facilitate this process at the sub-national level.
25
26

27
28 Even with a more benign regulatory environment, however, the evidence suggests that
29
30 good practice is a bad traveller, in the sense that it does not diffuse as freely as neo-
31
32 classical economic theory would have us believe. If good practice is to become the
33
34 norm rather than the exception as regards green procurement, the public realm will
35
36 need to devise more creative and more effective diffusion mechanisms. These will
37
38 take different forms in different countries. In the UK, for example, the diffusion
39
40 mechanisms would include professional associations of public sector managers, the
41
42 local authority catering association for school cooks, regional centres of excellence in
43
44 procurement and networks of cities like the Eurocities network. Although the
45
46 mechanisms will vary from place to place, the goal ought to be the same everywhere –
47
48 to tap the power of the public plate to deliver the intrinsically significant benefits of
49
50 human health and sustainable communities.
51
52
53

54 55 **REFERENCES** 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 Born, B et al (2006) *Food System Planning White Paper*, American Planning
4 Association
5

6
7 Bradbury, J (ed) (2008) *Devolution, Regionalism and Regional Development*,
8 Routledge, London
9

10
11 Brenner, N (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of*
12 *Statehood*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
13

14
15 Cawson, A and Morgan, K et al (1990) *Hostile Brothers: Competition and Closure in*
16 *the European Electronics Industry*, Clarendon Press, Oxford
17

18
19 Cooke, P and Morgan, K (1998) *The Associational Economy: Firms, Regions and*
20 *Innovation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
21

22
23 Craig, D (2006) *Plundering the Public Sector*, Constable, London
24

25
26 Day, C (2005) *Buying Green: The Crucial Role of Public Authorities, Local*
27 *Environment*, Volume 10 (2), pp.201-209
28

29
30 Davies, S (2005) *School Meals, Markets and Quality*, Unison, London
31

32
33 DEFRA (2003a) *Unlocking Opportunities: Lifting the Lid on Public Sector Food*
34 *Procurement*, Defra, London
35

36
37 DEFRA (2003b) *Government Buys into Sustainable Procurement*, News Release, 30
38 October
39

40
41 DfES (2006) *Setting the Standard for School Food*, Press Notice, 19 May, DfES,
42 London
43

44
45 Dowler, L and Turner, S (2001) *Poverty Bites: Food, Health and Poor Families*,
46 Child Poverty Action Group, London
47

48
49 Eckersley, R (2004) *The Green State: Rethinking Democracy and Sovereignty*, MIT
50 Press, Cambridge, Mass.
51

52
53 Erdmenger, C (1997) (ed) *Buying into the Environment*, Greenleaf Publishing,
54 Sheffield
55

1
2
3 Eurocities (2005) *The CARPE Guide to Responsible Procurement*, Eurocities,
4 Brussels

5
6
7 European Commission (2004) *Buying Green: A handbook on environmental public*
8 *procurement*, European Commission, Brussels

9
10
11 Gershon, P (1999) *Review of Civil Procurement in Central Government*, HM
12 Treasury, London

13
14
15 Gershon, P (2001) *Speech to Greening Government Procurement Conference*, 22
16 May, London

17
18
19 Gershon, P (2004) *Releasing Resources to the Front Line: Independent Review of*
20 *Public Sector Efficiency*, HM Treasury, London

21
22
23 Hajer, M (1995) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernisation*
24 *and the Policy Process*, Clarendon Press, Oxford

25
26
27 Harvey, D (2007) *A Brief History of Neo-liberalism*, OUP, Oxford

28
29
30 Hay, C (1996) From crisis to catastrophe? The ecological pathologies of the liberal-
31 democratic state, *Innovations* 9(4), pp.421-434

32
33
34 Ilbery, B and Kneafsey, M (2000) Producer constructions of quality in regional
35 speciality food production: a case study from South West England, *Journal of Rural*
36 *Studies*, 16, pp.217-230

37
38
39 Lang, T and Heasman, M (2004) *Food Wars: The Battle for Minds, Mouths and*
40 *Markets*, Earthscan, London

41
42
43 Marquand, D (2004) *Decline of the Public*, Polity Press, Oxford

44
45
46 Melchett, P (ed) (2005) *Double Dividend? Promoting Good Nutrition and Sustainable*
47 *Consumption Through Healthy School Meals*, Sustainable Consumption Roundtable,
48 London

49
50
51 Morgan, K (2004) *School Meals and Sustainable Food Chains: The Role of Creative*
52 *Public Procurement*, The Caroline Walker Lecture 2004, Royal Society, London

53
54
55 Morgan, K (2004) Sustainable Regions: Governance, Innovation and Scale, *European*
56 *Planning Studies*, Volume 12 (6), pp. 871-889

1
2
3
4 Morgan, K (2006) School Food and the Public Domain: The Politics of the Public
5 Plate, *The Political Quarterly*, Volume 77 (3), pp.379-387
6

7
8
9 Morgan, K (2007) *The Ethical Foodscape: Local and Green versus Global and Fair*,
10 Paper presented to the ESRC Science Week Conference on Local Food, St Asaph, 13
11 March
12

13
14 Morgan, K and Morley, A (2002) *Relocalising the Food Chain: The Role of Creative*
15 *Public Procurement*, The Regeneration Institute, Cardiff University
16

17
18 Morgan, K and Morley, A (2006) *Sustainable Public Procurement: From Good*
19 *Intentions to Good Practice*, Welsh Local Government Association, Cardiff
20

21
22 Morgan, K and Sonnino, R (2007) Empowering Consumers: The Creative
23 Procurement of School Meals in Italy and the UK, *International Journal of Consumer*
24 *Studies*, Volume 31 (1), pp.19-25
25

26
27 Morgan, K, Marsden, T and Murdoch, J (2006) *Worlds of Food: Place, Power and*
28 *Provenance in the Food Chain*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
29

30
31 National Audit Office (2005) *Sustainable Procurement in Central Government*, NAO,
32 London
33

34
35 National Audit Office (2006a) *Ministry of Defence: Major Projects Report 2006*,
36 NAO, London
37

38
39 National Audit Office (2006b) *Smarter Food Procurement in the Public Sector: A*
40 *Good Practice Guide*, NAO, London
41

42
43 O'Connor, J (1998) *Natural Causes: Essays in Ecological Marxism*, Guilford Press,
44 New York
45

46
47
48 Orrey, J (2005) *The Dinner Lady*, Bantam Press, London
49

50
51 Page, L (2006) *Lions, Donkeys and Dinosaurs*, Heinemann, London
52

53
54 Passmore, S and Harris, G (2004) Education, Health and School Meals, *Nutrition*
55 *Bulletin* 29, pp.221-227
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Peckham, C and Petts, J (2003) *Good Food on the Public Plate*, Sustain, London
4
5
6 Policy Commission (2002) *Farming and Food: A Sustainable Future*, Cabinet Office,
7 London
8
9
10 Sayer, A (2000) Moral Economy and Political Economy, *Studies in Political*
11 *Economy*, 62, pp.79-104
12
13
14 Scottish Executive (2002) *Hungry for Success: A Whole School Approach to School*
15 *Meals in Scotland*, Scottish Executive, Edinburgh
16
17
18 School Meals Review Panel (2005) *Turning the Tables: Transforming School Food*,
19 Dept of Health, London
20
21
22
23 Sharp, I (1992) *Nutritional Guidelines for School Meals*, Caroline Walker Trust,
24 London
25
26
27 Sustainable Development Commission (2005) *Leading By Example? Not Exactly*,
28 SDC, London
29
30
31 Sustainable Procurement Task Force (2006) *Procuring the Future: Sustainable*
32 *Procurement National Action Plan*, Defra, London
33
34
35 Taylor, I (2006) *A Modern Integrated and Collaborative Supply Chain for the Supply*
36 *of Fresh Local Food to Education - Why Not?*, DfES, London
37
38
39 Timmins, N (2004) Powerful Message That Has Found its Moment, *Financial Times*,
40 17 February
41
42
43 Welsh Assembly Government (2006) *Appetite for Life*, WAG, Cardiff
44
45
46
47

48 ¹ The 'farm to fork' focus does not include the 'upstream' pre-farm inputs and these need to be taken
49 into account when assessing the sustainability of the food chain as a whole. I am grateful to one of my
50 anonymous referees for drawing my attention to this point.

51 ² On 17 September 2002, the European Court of Justice ruled that the City of Helsinki was correct to
52 award a contract to a company that offered low pollution vehicles rather than to a company which
53 offered the lowest (upfront) price. The landmark decision established a legal precedent for the
54 'greening' of public procurement in the EU.

55 Acknowledgements: This article draws on an ESRC-funded project called Delivering Sustainability:
56 the creative procurement of school food in Italy and the UK. I would like to thank my colleagues at
57 Cardiff University and the ESRC for their support.
58
59
60