

Methods note · Everyday practice

The service inside the package: defining a fair comparison

Omar Haddad · 6 October 2026

Fictional author and institute · Editorial demonstration, not peer reviewed

ABSTRACT

Packaging comparisons become misleading when they count empty objects rather than equivalent deliveries. This methods note develops a functional-unit procedure for a small food service, drawing on the GHG Protocol Product Standard, the European Commission's Environmental Footprint recommendation, and the Environment Agency's original carrier-bag assessment. A hypothetical returnable-container case distinguishes completed meals, realised reuse, delayed returns, washing, replacement lids, collection journeys, and food loss. The analysis explains why consistent boundaries and evidence of displacement matter before environmental rankings are attempted. It also keeps accessibility and food safety outside any simplistic carbon score. No packaging footprints or savings are estimated. The proposed decision record identifies which operational observations and supplier information would be needed to support a defensible local comparison.

Keywords: functional units · packaging · reuse · life-cycle boundaries

A source-based editorial text, not a report of original Still North research. Examples and imagery are illustrative.

Define the delivery, not the object

A buyer asked to choose between a paper sleeve, a plastic pouch, and a returnable box has not yet been given a complete comparison. The packages may hold different amounts, protect their contents differently, or require different collection systems. A lower impact per empty package can coexist with a higher impact per useful delivery. The first task is therefore to describe the service that each option must provide.

This methods note examines packaging decisions for a small food service, rather than ranking materials in general. It uses the GHG Protocol Product Standard, the European Commission's Environmental Footprint recommendation, and the Environment Agency's original carrier-bag assessment to construct a comparison procedure. These are selected methodological sources, not an exhaustive evidence review. The worked quantities below are fictional, and no package footprint or environmental saving has been measured.

A functional unit expresses the service being compared. For a lunch business, it might be one hundred specified meals delivered safely, in acceptable condition, within a defined delivery window. The meal size, temperature requirements, leakage tolerance, and accessibility of opening all belong in that description. Merely specifying one hundred containers leaves important differences in function outside the calculation.

From service to reference flows

Once the function is fixed, calculate the material and activity required to fulfil it. These quantities are the reference flows: containers, lids, seals, replacement meals, washing cycles, delivery movements, and waste handling. A reusable container's advertised maximum life is not the number of uses that a particular business will achieve.

Missing returns and damaged lids can make the realised flow quite different from the product specification.

The GHG Protocol Product Standard provides life-cycle accounting requirements, but explicitly warns that product comparisons need additional, consistent specifications. Two independently produced footprint labels are not automatically comparable. The assessment must align its treatment of electricity, transport, allocation, use, and end of life. A shared unit is necessary, but it does not repair mismatched boundaries or inconsistent data.

The Commission's 2021 Environmental Footprint recommendation similarly identifies product-category rules as a way of adding specificity to a general method. Its wider environmental scope also reminds buyers that a greenhouse-gas comparison does not settle litter, local water stress, chemical safety, or every other concern. Keep those questions visible instead of silently treating carbon as a universal environmental score.

A hypothetical meal-delivery comparison

Imagine a fictional kitchen supplying one hundred identical lunches each working day. Option A uses a disposable tray and lid. Option B uses a returnable box with a separately replaceable lid. Both meet the same verified food-contact and temperature requirements. Their purchase prices are known, but their life-cycle inventories are not. This is enough to organise a decision, not enough to declare a climate winner.

For illustration only, suppose the kitchen initially issues one hundred returnable boxes. After each service, ninety are returned in time for the next scheduled wash; the others are still with customers, lost, or awaiting collection. That observation would not establish that ten boxes are permanently lost. A one-day turnaround measure, an eventual-return measure, and a physical re-

tirement rate answer different operational questions and must not be substituted for one another.

The team should follow identifiable cohorts of boxes over successive services, without collecting unnecessary customer information. Record completed uses, washing loads, lid replacements, permanent losses, and stock held outside the kitchen. Count the initial stock and later additions separately. Dividing all deliveries by the initial stock alone would overstate reuse if replacement boxes kept the service running.

If a lunch arrives damaged and must be replaced, include the additional food and delivery in the system. Do not assign a made-up spoilage rate to either package because one seems sturdier. First determine whether the package actually changes loss under the specified conditions. The functional unit counts satisfactory meals received, not meals dispatched, so failed deliveries cannot disappear from the denominator.

Put washing and returns in the right place

Washing should describe the actual safe process: machine, loading, temperature programme, detergent, water, drying, and any pre-rinsing. A full commercial load cannot be assumed if the service regularly needs a small emergency wash. Conversely, assigning an entire shared wash to a handful of boxes can overstate their burden. Explain the allocation rule and test plausible alternatives rather than choosing the rule that favours a preferred material.

Return transport needs the same care. Boxes carried back on an existing delivery round may add weight and handling without requiring a separate journey. A dedicated collection trip adds a different activity. A customer's special car journey is not equivalent to bringing a box on a trip already being made. Neither zero transport nor a whole journey per return is a defensible universal default.

Accessibility also changes which system can function. A deposit may exclude a customer with little spare cash; an awkward closure may be unusable for someone with limited hand strength. An assessment can report these constraints beside environmental estimates without pretending to convert them into emissions. Where an option cannot deliver the defined service for a group, it is not an equivalent substitute for that group.

Learn from a study without importing its answer

The Environment Agency's 2011 carrier-bag assessment compares the bags needed to carry a month's shopping, rather than one bag against another. It also examines secondary reuse, including displaced bin liners. This is a useful demonstration of why capacity and subsequent function matter. It is not a contemporary footprint table for takeaway containers, and this note does not transfer its numerical conclusions.

The report's exclusions are equally instructive. It does not resolve litter impacts or consumers' willingness to change behaviour. Its bag types and reference period are specific. Borrowing its comparison structure is reasonable; treating its material rankings as timeless truths is not. A study's functional unit, geography, and omissions travel with its conclusions, even when a chart has been separated from the report.

Secondary use requires evidence of displacement. If an old container becomes a storage box, ask whether it substitutes for a box that would otherwise have been bought. Merely finding another possible use does not justify a full avoided-production credit. The same avoided item must not be credited to two different systems. State whether the assessment models a likely consequence or allocates existing burdens.

A decision record that can survive a supplier change

The useful purchasing record is short enough to update. Write down the service, study period, options, reference flows, evidence sources, exclusions, and decision-sensitive unknowns. Ask suppliers for underlying assumptions, not just a badge. For returnables, request information about replaceable components, cleaning compatibility, and actual support. A lower purchase price means little if a missing lid forces retirement of an otherwise sound box.

Use sensitivity cases for the variables the business can influence: effective return cycles, washing loads, collection routes, and food loss. Do not conceal unresolved values inside a single central estimate. If the preferred option changes across credible cases, say what information would resolve that change. A limited operational trial can establish return and washing requirements without being presented as proof of life-cycle superiority.

There is also a valid no-purchase option. Existing containers may already fulfil the task; a menu or ordering change may remove a packaging component altogether. Such alternatives must meet the same food-safety and access requirements. Reducing packaging by transferring cleaning labour, spill risk, or inconvenience to customers is a change in service, not automatically an improvement in the same service.

Limits and practical implication

This procedure does not supply missing inventory data, certify compliance, or resolve trade-offs among environmental impacts. Local waste infrastructure, electricity supply, food characteristics, and customer access can change the comparison. Uncertain return behaviour is a substantive limit, not a reason to insert an optimistic lifetime. General guidance should never override food-safety requirements or the judgement of qualified staff.

The strongest conclusion available before measurement may concern the question rather than the package: compare satisfactory deliveries under a specified system, not attractive objects on a table. That shift directs attention towards the flows a kitchen can document and improve. It also makes disagreement useful. Buyers can identify which assumption they contest, instead of arguing about whether paper, plastic, or reuse is inherently virtuous.

References

1. World Resources Institute and World Business Council for Sustainable Development (2011). *Product Life Cycle Accounting and Reporting Standard*, especially the scope, comparison, and limitation guidance.

2. European Commission (2021). Recommendation (EU) 2021/2279 on Environmental Footprint methods.
3. Edwards, C., and Fry, J. M. (2011). Life cycle assessment of supermarket carrier bags: a review of the bags available in 2006. Environment Agency, report SC030148.