

## CONSULTATION ON 2016 BENCHMARK

JUNE 2016

# Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare

## Executive Summary

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare (BBFAW) has been designed to help drive higher farm animal welfare standards across the world's leading food businesses. A key tool for the delivery of these objectives is BBFAW's annual benchmark of global food companies' policies and practices on farm animal welfare. To date, BBFAW has published four benchmarks (for 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015<sup>1</sup>) with the 2016 Benchmark scheduled for publication in early 2017.

In preparation for the 2016 Benchmark, to be conducted in August and September 2016, BBFAW is inviting comments on the following issues:

- The scope of companies covered by the Benchmark.
- The questions in the performance reporting section of the evaluation criteria.
- The weighting of the performance reporting questions.
- The introduction of new performance impact questions (the scoring of which will be deferred until 2017).
- The usefulness of the Benchmark and associated report.

### KEY CHANGES

**We are proposing four significant changes to the 2016 Benchmark:**

- 1) The addition of 12 new companies. This will increase the total number of companies covered by the Benchmark to 100.**
- 2) The addition of one new question on routine mutilations and one modified question in the performance reporting section of the evaluation criteria.**
- 3) An increase in the weighting of questions in the performance reporting section, from 20 points to 35 points, which means that this section of the Benchmark will now account of 17% of companies' overall scores, up from 10% in the 2015 Benchmark.**
- 4) The introduction of nine new questions on performance impact. These will be evaluated in 2016 but will not be included in companies' overall 2016 Benchmark scores and will not affect their 2016 tier rankings. Our expectation is these questions will be included in the scoring from 2017.**

**We also welcome any wider comments on the Benchmark and on how the Benchmark might be developed over time.**

[The consultation will run from 20 June to 15 July 2016.](#)

---

<sup>1</sup> These reports can be downloaded from [www.bbfaaw.com](http://www.bbfaaw.com)

### How should stakeholders provide feedback?

We welcome written and verbal comments. We are also happy to convene face-to-face meetings or conference calls with investment-related organisations, food companies and other stakeholders during the consultation period. All comments received will be treated in strict confidence.

Please send your comments to [secretariat@bbfaw.com](mailto:secretariat@bbfaw.com). Alternatively, if you would prefer to discuss your feedback in person, please contact Nicky Amos, Programme Director, Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare at this email address.

### Next steps

At the close of the consultation period, we will review and, as appropriate, revise the core company list, the evaluation criteria and the question weightings in the light of the feedback received.

We will prepare a short summary, to be posted on the BBFAW website, of the feedback received and of the changes we have made as a result of this feedback. The fifth Benchmark Report will be published in early 2017.

**Thank you for taking the time to participate in the consultation. We value your opinion and feedback, and are grateful for your support of the BBFAW.**

## Part I: Background

### BBFAW Overview

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare is designed to help drive higher farm animal welfare standards in the world's leading food companies. BBFAW is supported by Compassion in World Farming, World Animal Protection and Collier Capital, who provide technical expertise and guidance on farm animal welfare and related issues, funding and practical resources.

### The 2015 Benchmark

The fourth Benchmark covered 90 of the world's largest food companies, broadly distributed across (i) food retailers and wholesalers, (ii) restaurants and bars (a category that includes food service providers), and (iii) food producers and manufacturers. In August 2015, these companies were assessed on their approach to managing farm animal welfare, based on their publicly available information. The results, which were presented in the 2015 Benchmark report<sup>2</sup> published in January 2016, indicated that farm animal welfare is rising up the business agenda, with 19 (24%) of the 79 companies that were assessed in the 2014 Benchmark moving up at least one tier. Some 69% of companies (compared to 46% in 2012) had published farm animal welfare policies, and 54% of companies had published farm animal welfare-related objectives and targets (up from 26% in 2012).

Despite these improvements, the 2015 report revealed that farm animal welfare continues to be a systemic risk that many companies in the food industry are either not effectively managing or not properly reporting. With the average score across the 90 companies being just 33%, the report concluded that farm animal welfare is still not receiving anything like the same management attention as other corporate responsibility topics. Of particular note, 36 (40%) of the 90 companies assessed had yet to acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue or had yet to implement effective processes for managing farm animal welfare.

### Investor and Stakeholder Engagement

Alongside our annual evaluations of food companies, the BBFAW maintains an active programme of engagement with investors and food companies through direct dialogue, meetings and seminars, as well as through periodic briefings and published articles on issues of relevance and interest.

Over the past year, we have sought feedback, through group and one-one meetings and through structured surveys, from a variety of stakeholders (investors, companies, academics, policy makers and civil society organisations) on the usefulness of the Benchmark to them, and on how the scope and criteria might be strengthened. This feedback has been an important influence on the proposals set out in this document.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2015), The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: 2015 Report (BBFAW, London; <http://www.bbfaw.com/media/1338/bbfaw-2015-report.pdf>)

<sup>3</sup> Details of this engagement (e.g. meeting notes, survey results) are available though the BBFAW website, [www.bbfaw.com](http://www.bbfaw.com)

## Part II: Company Coverage

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

For the 2016 Benchmark, we are proposing to:

- **Add 12 new companies – six US companies, three Chinese companies, two French companies and one Thai company– to the core list of companies covered by the Benchmark.**
- **Use the same core list of companies as in the 2015 Benchmark, with the following exceptions:**
  - **Burger King will be evaluated as part of its Canadian parent company, Restaurants Brands International.**
  - **KraftHeinz will be evaluated for the first time, following the merger of Kraft and Heinz in 2015.**
  - **UK company, Dairy Crest, will be removed from the company scope following the sale of a significant proportion of its dairy business in 2015.**

**In total, the 2016 Benchmark will cover 100 companies – see Attachment II for a complete listing.**

One of our longer-term objectives is to progressively broaden the coverage of the Benchmark, both in terms of the number of companies and the geographic regions covered. Our plan is to increase the number of companies from the 90 in the 2015 Benchmark to 100 in the 2016 Benchmark. From a benchmarking perspective, we want to maintain a broadly consistent universe of companies. While the 90 constituents of the 2015 benchmark provide the starting point for the 2016 Benchmark, we are proposing the following changes:

- Burger King will be evaluated as part of its Canadian parent company, Restaurants Brands International.
- KraftHeinz will be evaluated for the first time, following the merger of Kraft and Heinz in 2015.
- UK company, Dairy Crest, will be removed from the company scope following the sale of a significant proportion of its dairy business in 2015.

These changes, if adopted, would mean that we have a starting list of 88 companies for the 2016 Benchmark. In deciding on the additional companies to be included in the 2016 Benchmark, we considered the following factors:

- (a) The company's scale (in terms of turnover or market size).
- (b) The size of the company's footprint (in terms of the volume of animals affected).
- (c) The company's significance within the industry sectors covered by the Benchmark (i.e. whether it is seen as a useful comparator for other companies within the sub-sector, or whether it has the potential to influence or drive the sector).
- (d) The company's country of origin or listing. For the 2016 Benchmark, we are particularly keen to extend our coverage of US companies and to extend our coverage of companies in Asia. From 2017, we expect to place an increasing emphasis on companies from emerging markets.

Based on these factors, we are proposing to add the following 12 companies to the 2016 Benchmark:

| Proposed Company            | Ownership   | ICB Classification            | Country of Origin/ Incorporation |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Chick-fil-A                 | Private     | 5757: Restaurants & Bars      | USA                              |
| Charoen Pokphand (CP) Group | Private     | 3570: Food Producer           | Thailand                         |
| Dunkin' Brands Inc          | Public      | 5757: Restaurants & Bars      | USA                              |
| E Leclerc                   | Cooperative | 5337: Retailers & Wholesalers | France                           |
| Zhongpin Inc                | Public      | 3570: Food Producer           | PRC                              |
| Hormel Foods Corporation    | Public      | 3570: Food Producer           | USA                              |
| Les Mousquetaires           | Private     | 5337: Retailers & Wholesalers | France                           |
| New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd       | Public      | 3570: Food Producer           | PRC                              |
| OSI Group                   | Private     | 3570: Food Producer           | USA                              |
| Panera Bread                | Public      | 5757: Restaurants & Bars      | USA                              |
| Publix Super Markets Inc    | Private     | 5337: Retailers & Wholesalers | USA                              |
| Yonghui Superstores         | Public      | 5337: Retailers & Wholesalers | PRC/USA                          |

We provide a brief description of each in Attachment III. The main reasons why we have chosen these companies, and the effect of these selections on the Benchmark, are:

- The addition of E Leclerc and Les Mousquetaires (which owns Intermarché and Netto) will ensure that the most significant food retailers and wholesalers in Europe are included in the Benchmark. It will also take the total number of companies in France from 8 to 10, making France the largest European country (excluding the UK) represented in the Benchmark.
- The inclusion of six additional companies, and the merger of Kraft and Heinz in the USA will increase the number of companies in the region from 23 to 28.
- The addition of CP Group (one of the largest producers of poultry in the world), Zhongpin Inc and New Hope Liuhe Co (two of China's largest meat producers), and Yonghui Superstores (a leading food retailer in China) will, along with WH Group (already included in the Benchmark), increase the Benchmark's coverage of Asian companies.

We acknowledge that the Benchmark does not yet cover many companies from the emerging markets. This has been a conscious decision. In part, it is because we need to consolidate our coverage of existing regions (in North America, in particular). It is also because we intend to use the period during 2016 and 2017 to establish a dialogue with stakeholders in the geographic territories not yet covered by the Benchmark (as we have previously done in North America and Australasia), as a prelude to extending the geographic coverage of the Benchmark.

**CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

1. Do you agree with the proposed scope of companies to be included in the 2016 Benchmark?
2. Are there specific companies that you think should be included or excluded from the universe of companies to be covered by the 2016 Benchmark?
3. Given our plan to increase our coverage of emerging markets, are there specific companies or geographic regions that you think should be included in future Benchmark iterations?

## Part II: Revisions to Benchmark Evaluation Criteria on Performance Reporting

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

**For the 2016 Benchmark, we are proposing:**

- **The addition of a new question on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations in the Performance Reporting section, with this question to be included in the 2016 Benchmark scoring.**
- **Minor modifications to certain existing Performance Reporting questions.**

In line with our aim to increase the focus on company performance over time, the Benchmark will increasingly take account of both the level/quality of a company's disclosure on their performance, and the company's impact on the animals concerned. We refer to these two aspects respectively as performance reporting and performance impact (see definitions on page 7).

In developing and introducing performance-related questions into the Benchmark, we are mindful of the fact that performance reporting presents real challenges for companies (including the multiplicity of species and complexity of production systems across different geographies; variances in management standards; the absence of universal global performance standards; the relative difficulties in reporting ingredients versus fresh produce). We also accept that performance reporting will only become standard when there is a consensus on the performance data that needs to be reported and when a critical mass of companies are reporting this information.

### DEFINITIONS

**Performance in farm animal welfare** is the action or process of achieving a defined level of welfare throughout the process of breeding, rearing/finishing, transporting and slaughtering of animals in the food industry.

**Performance reporting** of a company's practices refers to the disclosure of a combination of resource/management inputs and indicators from the animals themselves (outcomes), both of which can be recorded quantitatively and objectively.

**Performance impact** refers to the combination of these achievements on animal welfare.

In the 2014 Benchmark, we began to expand the Benchmark evaluation criteria from process to performance, with the introduction of four questions relating to performance reporting. These questions are designed to provide a high level indicator of the scope and clarity of reporting on farm animal welfare performance by companies (although they did not, as we discuss below in Part III, offer a value judgement on companies' performance on farm animal welfare). Three of these questions assess whether companies are reporting on commonly accepted welfare

issues (close confinement, pre-slaughter stunning and long-distance live transportation), and one assesses whether companies are reporting on species-specific welfare outcome indicators. While we did not include the scores from these questions in companies' overall scores and tier rankings in 2014, we allocated a 10% weighting to these questions in the 2015 Benchmark.

The 2015 Benchmark revealed that reporting on farm animal welfare performance remains in its infancy, with just 30 companies (33% of the 90 companies evaluated) reporting on the proportion of animals that are free from close confinement, 10 companies (11%) reporting on the proportion of animals that are stunned prior to slaughter, and 8 companies (9%) providing quantitative information on transportation times. Furthermore, only 4 companies (4%) reported on farm animal welfare outcomes.

In October 2015, we established a Performance Measures Working Group ('Working Group')<sup>4</sup> to evolve our approach to performance reporting. This Group met twice (in October 2015 and March 2016) and it invited inputs from a range of stakeholders, including other members of the Technical Working Group, external researchers, members of Food Business and Corporate Engagement teams within Compassion in World Farming and World Animal Protection and selected companies.

The Working Group also reviewed the performance reporting-related feedback received by BBFAW on previous iterations of the Benchmark. This feedback can be summarised as follows:

- The performance reporting section should include a generic question on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations. The primary rationale for this was that companies should report on the four most prominent animal welfare issues of close confinement, routine mutilations, pre-slaughter stunning and long-distance live transportation.
- Question 13 in the 2015 Benchmark should focus only the reporting of progress against policy and against objectives and targets, and the part of the question relating to the provision of explanations for progress on performance should be included as a separate question in the Performance Reporting section.

The Working Group agreed with both of these suggestions. We are therefore proposing to introduce a new high-level question on whether companies disclose the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations. We are also proposing that this question receive the same weighting as the questions which assess whether companies are reporting on other commonly accepted welfare issues (i.e. a maximum score of 5 points). We are also proposing that the question on reporting progress and trends in performance on input or output measures be included in the Performance Reporting section.

The remaining Performance Reporting questions remain broadly unchanged, although the wording of certain question(s) or their rationale has been clarified (see

---

<sup>4</sup> The Performance Measures Working Group comprised the following members: Dr Tracey Jones and Jemima Jewell from Compassion in World Farming; Martin Cooke, Audrey Mealia, Basia Romanowicz and Penny Sawyer from World Animal Protection; and Nicky Amos from the BBFAW Secretariat.

amendments to text in blue in the 2016 Benchmark Evaluation Criteria in the Appendix).

**CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

- 4. Do you agree with the proposal to include a new question in the Performance Reporting section on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations?**
- 5. Do you agree with the proposal to split the former Q.13 on performance reporting?**
- 6. Do you have any specific comments you would like to share on performance measure and disclosure within the Benchmark?**

## Part III: Revisions to Benchmark Evaluation Criteria on Performance Impacts

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

**For the 2016 Benchmark, we are proposing:**

- **The introduction of nine new Performance Impact questions, focusing on the proportion of key species that are free from the most prominent welfare impacts.**
- **That these questions are not included in companies' scoring or rankings in 2016. Our expectation is that these questions will be included in the overall scoring and rankings from 2017.**

The integration of impact measures into the Benchmark has been a key objective for BBFAW since its inception, although we have delayed this work until we have reached a point where companies are starting to report meaningfully and consistently on their farm animal welfare-related practices and processes. From an animal welfare perspective, the welfare of farm animals is the key test of the efficacy and effectiveness of farm animal welfare management systems and processes. From an investor perspective, the measurement of impact is similarly important; investors want to know that companies have effective management systems and processes in place, and want evidence that these are effective.

The Performance Measures Working Group focused on the development of criteria relating to Performance Impacts. The Working Group recommended that the Benchmark focus on the most prominent welfare impacts – close confinement, routine mutilations, pre-slaughter stunning and long distance live transportation – and on the principal species – laying hens, pigs, broiler chickens, dairy cattle – in their supply chains. The Working Group noted that this list should be seen as a starting point and recommended that the range of impacts and the range of species be extended over time.

The Working Group also recommended that these questions not be included in companies' scoring and ranking in the 2016 Benchmark. The reason is that companies will need time to familiarise themselves with the questions and adapt their reporting accordingly. It therefore suggested that it would be appropriate to start scoring these questions in the 2017 Benchmark and progressively increasing the weighting of these questions in subsequent Benchmarks. Our current thinking – although we will consult on this point – is that the performance impact questions will represent approximately 15% of each company's score in 2017 and 20-25% in 2018. This is in line with our intention to increase the weighting of performance reporting and impact questions in the Benchmark to 35% by 2018.

**CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

- 7 Do you agree with the proposal to introduce nine new Performance Impact questions in the 2016 Benchmark?
- 8 Do you agree that the scoring for these questions should not be included in the 2016 ranking of companies?
- 9 Do you agree that these questions should be included in the overall scoring and ranking from 2017? If yes, do you have suggestions on the weighting (or number of points) that should be assigned to these questions?

## Part IV: Revisions to Benchmark Evaluation Scoring and Weighting

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- **The weighting of scores in the Governance and Management section will decrease from 41% in 2015 to 36% in 2016.**
- **The weighting of scores in the Performance Reporting section will increase from 10% in 2015 to 17% in 2016.**

The proposed changes to the performance reporting questions outlined in Part III and Part IV will increase the overall score from 205 points to 210 points. The changes will affect the weighting of scoring as follows:

- The revised question (previously Q.13) on reporting performance related to a company's animal welfare policy and/or objectives and targets will reduce the scoring in the Governance and Management section by 10 points to 75 points. This means that the Governance and Management section will represent 36% of the overall score (compared with 41% in 2015).
- The new question on routine mutilations and the revised question on performance on welfare inputs or outcomes takes the total number of Performance Reporting questions from four to six, and will take the total maximum score for the Performance Reporting section from 20 to 35, representing 17% of the overall score.
- The nine new performance impact questions described in Part IV will not be included in the 2016 Benchmark scoring.

### CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

9. **Do you agree with the proposed 17% weighting for the performance reporting questions in the 2016 Benchmark?**
10. **Do you agree with the proposed change in the weighting of the Governance and Management section from 41% in 2015 to 36% in 2015, as a result of splitting the existing question (Q13) on performance reporting?**
11. **Do you broadly agree with the proposal to gradually increase the weighting on performance disclosure year-on-year?**
12. **Do you have any specific comments you would like to share on performance measure and disclosure within the Benchmark?**

## Part V: Revisions to Benchmark Evaluation Criteria on Performance Impacts

We are keen to continually evolve our approach to evaluating and reporting on the state of farm animal welfare management and reporting across the food industry. As such, we are keen to understand how we can further develop our methodology and our reporting to maximise the Benchmark's usefulness to investors, companies and other stakeholders.

### **CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

- 13. Having reviewed the proposed amendments to existing questions and the proposed additional questions, are there any other changes or amendments you would like to propose to the 2016 Benchmark?**
- 14. Do you have any wider reflections on how the Benchmark might be developed over time?**

## Appendix I: Proposed scope of companies for 2016 BBFAW Benchmark

|    | Company   | Ownership   | ICB Classification                   | Country of Origin/<br>Incorporation |
|----|---|-------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1  | Ahold BV  | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Netherlands                         |
| 2  | Albertsons                                      | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | USA                                 |
| 3  | Aldi Nord (Aldi Markt)                          | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Germany                             |
| 4  | Aldi Sud/Aldi Einkauf GmbH&Co                   | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Germany                             |
| 5  | Carrefour SA                                    | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | France                              |
| 6  | Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA                    | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | France                              |
| 7  | (The) Co-operative Food (UK)                    | Cooperative | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | UK                                  |
| 8  | Coop Group (Switzerland)/Coop Genossenschaft    | Cooperative | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Switzerland                         |
| 9  | Costco Wholesale Corp                           | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | USA                                 |
| 10 | Delhaize Group SA                               | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Belgium                             |
| 11 | E Leclerc                                       | Cooperative | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | France                              |
| 12 | Edeka Zentrale                                  | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Germany                             |
| 13 | El Corte Ingles SA                              | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Spain                               |
| 14 | Groupe Auchan                                   | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | France                              |
| 15 | ICA Gruppen/ICA Eiendom Norge AS                | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Sweden                              |
| 16 | J Sainsbury PLC                                 | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | UK                                  |
| 17 | (The) Kroger Company                            | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | USA                                 |
| 18 | Les Mousquetaires                               | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | France                              |
| 19 | Lidl Stiftung & Co KG                           | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Germany                             |
| 20 | Loblaw  | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Canada                              |
| 21 | Marks & Spencer PLC                             | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | UK                                  |
| 22 | Mercadona SA                                    | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Spain                               |
| 23 | Metro AG  | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Germany                             |
| 24 | Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund                     | Cooperative | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Switzerland                         |
| 25 | Publix Super Markets Inc                        | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | USA                                 |
| 26 | Rewe Group                                      | Cooperative | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Germany                             |
| 27 | Schwarz Unternehmens Treuhand KG/Kaufland       | Private     | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Germany                             |
| 28 | Sysco Corporation                               | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | USA                                 |
| 29 | Target Corporation                              | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | USA                                 |
| 30 | Tesco PLC                                       | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | UK                                  |
| 31 | Waitrose  | Partnership | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | UK                                  |
| 32 | Walmart Stores/Asda                             | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | USA                                 |
| 33 | Wesfarmers                                      | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Australia                           |
| 34 | Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC                    | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | UK                                  |
| 35 | Woolworths Limited                              | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Australia                           |
| 36 | Yonghui Superstores                             | Public      | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | PRC                                 |
| 37 | Aramark Corporation                             | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | USA                                 |
| 38 | Autogrill SpA                                   | Joint Stock | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | Italy                               |
| 39 | Camst – La Ristorazione Italiana Soc. Coop. ARL | Cooperative | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | Italy                               |
| 40 | Chick-Fil-A                                     | Private     | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | USA                                 |
| 41 | Chipotle Mexican Grill                          | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | USA                                 |
| 42 | Compass Group PLC                               | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | UK                                  |
| 43 | Cremonini SpA                                   | Private     | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | Italy                               |
| 44 | Darden Restaurants PLC                          | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | USA                                 |
| 45 | Domino's Pizza Group PLC                        | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | UK                                  |
| 46 | Dunkin' Brands Inc                              | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | USA                                 |
| 47 | Elior   | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | UK                                  |
| 48 | Gategroup Holding AG                            | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | Switzerland                         |
| 49 | Greggs PLC                                      | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | UK                                  |
| 50 | JD Wetherspoon PLC                              | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars           | UK                                  |

|     |   |             |                            |             |
|-----|---|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|
| 51  | McDonald's Corporation                      | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | USA         |
| 52  | Mitchells & Butlers PLC                     | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | UK          |
| 53  | Olav Thon Gruppen AS                        | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Norway      |
| 54  | Panera Bread                                | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | USA         |
| 55  | Restaurant Brands International/Burger King | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Canada      |
| 56  | Quick Restaurants                           | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | France      |
| 57  | Sodexo                                      | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | France      |
| 58  | SSP Group Limited                           | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Sweden      |
| 59  | Starbucks Corporation                       | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | USA         |
| 60  | Subway/Doctor's Associates Inc              | Private     | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | USA         |
| 61  | Umoe Gruppen AS                             | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Norway      |
| 62  | Wendy's Company (The)                       | Private     | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | USA         |
| 63  | Whitbread PLC                               | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | UK          |
| 64  | Yum! Brands Inc                             | Public      | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | USA         |
| 65  | 2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd) | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | UK          |
| 66  | Arla Foods Ltd                              | Cooperative | 3570: Food Producer        | Denmark     |
| 67  | Associated British Foods PLC                | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | UK          |
| 68  | Barilla SpA                                 | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | Italy       |
| 69  | BRF SA                                      | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | Brazil      |
| 70  | Cargill                                     | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | USA         |
| 71  | Charoen Pokphand (CP) Group                 | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | Thailand    |
| 72  | ConAgra                                     | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | USA         |
| 73  | Cranswick PLC                               | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | UK          |
| 74  | Danish Crown AmbA/Tulip                     | Joint Stock | 3570: Food Producer        | Denmark     |
| 75  | Dean Foods                                  | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | USA         |
| 76  | Ferrero SpA                                 | Joint Stock | 3570: Food Producer        | Italy       |
| 77  | Fonterra                                    | Cooperative | 3570: Food Producer        | New Zealand |
| 78  | General Mills Inc                           | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | USA         |
| 79  | Groupe Danone SA                            | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | France      |
| 80  | Gruppo Lactalis                             | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | Italy       |
| 81  | Gruppo Veronesi                             | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | Italy       |
| 82  | Hormel Foods Corporation                    | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | USA         |
| 83  | JBS SA                                      | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | Brazil      |
| 84  | KraftHeinz                                  | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | USA         |
| 85  | Mondelez International                      | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | USA         |
| 86  | Marfrig Alimentos SA                        | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | Brazil      |
| 87  | Mars Inc                                    | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | UK          |
| 88  | Muller Group AG                             | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | Germany     |
| 89  | Nestlé SA                                   | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | Switzerland |
| 90  | New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd                       | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | PRC         |
| 91  | Noble Foods                                 | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | UK          |
| 92  | OSI Group                                   | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | USA         |
| 93  | Premier Foods PLC                           | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | UK          |
| 94  | Royal FrieslandCampina                      | Cooperative | 3570: Food Producer        | Netherlands |
| 95  | Terrena Group                               | Cooperative | 3570: Food Producer        | France      |
| 96  | Tyson Foods Inc                             | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | USA         |
| 97  | Unilever NV                                 | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | Netherlands |
| 98  | VION Food Group                             | Private     | 3570: Food Producer        | Netherlands |
| 99  | WH Group Ltd                                | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | PRC         |
| 100 | Zhongpin Inc                                | Public      | 3570: Food Producer        | PRC/USA     |

## Appendix II: Background Information on Additional Companies

| Proposed Company            | Rationale for inclusion   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Charoen Pokphand (CP) Group | CP Group is the 14th largest red meat producer in world, producing chicken, shrimp, duck, pork and processed foods. Livestock operations include chicken broilers, chicken layers, ducks, and swine. Within its aquaculture operations, the two main marine animals are shrimp and fish.  |
| Chick-fil-A                 | Chick-Fil-A is ranked the 8 <sup>th</sup> largest company in the 2015 QSR Top 50 index of quick service restaurants. The company operates more than 1,850 restaurants mainly in the south-eastern United States.  |
| Dunkin' Brands Inc          | Dunkin' Brands is ranked the 7 <sup>th</sup> largest company in the 2015 QSR Top 50 index of quick service restaurants.   |
| E Leclerc                   | E Leclerc operates in seven countries, with 500 outlets across France and 114 elsewhere. The company was ranked 22 <sup>nd</sup> in the Deloitte 2015 Top 250 Global Retailers Index.   |
| Hormel Foods Corporation    | Hormel Foods is ranked the 14 <sup>th</sup> largest company in Food Processing's Top 100 producers (USA & Canada), and the 13 <sup>th</sup> largest red meat producer in world. The company recently acquired Applegate Farms, and operates out of 40 manufacturing and distribution facilities.  |
| Les Mousquetaires           | Les Mousquetaires is ranked 27 <sup>th</sup> in the Deloitte Top 250 Global Retailers Index. The company owns leading French retailers, Intermarché and Netto.  |
| New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd       | New Hope is the largest company in China for feed sales volume and meat processing volume. Principally engaged in animal feed manufacturing, meat processing (broiler breeders, duck breeders, pig breeders, and commercial broilers and cooking, livestock and poultry breeding). Its slaughtering and meat products include fresh and frozen poultry and meat, and cooked meat. The company has more than 265 subsidiary companies nationwide employing over 57,000 people. |
| OSI Group                   | OSI Group is ranked by Forbes as the 60 <sup>th</sup> largest private company in the USA. A meat supplier to multiple Western fast food chains in China, including Subway, Starbuck's, Papa John's, and Pizza Hut.  |
| Panera Bread                | Panera Bread is ranked 10 <sup>th</sup> largest company in the 2015 QSR Top 50 index of quick service restaurants. Operates more than 1,800 restaurants across the United States.   |
| Publix Super Markets Inc    | Publix is the 9 <sup>th</sup> largest privately owned company in the USA (Forbes, 2015). It was also ranked 32 <sup>nd</sup> largest company in the Deloitte 250 Global Retailers 2016 index, and it is the largest employee-owned supermarket chain in the U.S.A, operating more than 1,100 retail food supermarkets.  |
| Yonghui Superstores         | Yonghui is one of China's largest supermarket and hypermarket operators, with approximately 5% market share.  |
| Zhongpin Inc                | Zhongpin is the 6 <sup>th</sup> largest meat producer in China by revenue. The company is involved in the production and distribution of fresh and frozen pork, processed fruit & vegetable products, and low temperature meat products.  |

## Appendix III: Proposed 2016 Benchmark Evaluation Criteria

| Management Commitment and Policy  |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Q1. Does the company acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue?</b>  |    |
| <i>Acknowledging farm animal welfare as a business issue is an important first step towards implementing a comprehensive approach to farm animal welfare management. It is good practice for food companies to identify whether and why farm animal welfare is a relevant issue for the business.</i>   |    |
| No evidence that farm animal welfare is regarded as a relevant business issue.  | 0  |
| Farm animal welfare is identified as a relevant business issue.   | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>   |    |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for an acknowledgement by the parent company that farm animal welfare is a business issue.</li> <li>• Companies that acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue and/or set out the reasons why farm animal might be a business issue (e.g. because of public or customer concerns, security and sustainability of supply, cost) are awarded the maximum points.</li> <li>• The score does not take account of the specific reasons advanced.</li> <li>• The score does not take account of the importance assigned by companies to farm animal welfare (e.g. relative to other corporate responsibility issues). The importance assigned by individual companies to farm animal welfare depends on factors such as the nature of their business, their existing management practices, the other business risks and priorities they need to manage, and their perceptions of customer and stakeholder pressure for action.</li> </ul> |    |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Q2. Does the company publish an overarching corporate farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent)?</b>  |    |
| <i>It is good practice for companies to formalise their approach to animal welfare in a policy (or equivalent document such as a statement of guiding principles, a code of practice or a sourcing charter). While the existence of a policy may not provide a guarantee of implementation, the absence of a policy is a clear sign that farm animal welfare is not on the business agenda.</i> |    |
| No evidence of a formal policy statement (or equivalent) on farm animal welfare.  | 0  |
| Broad commitment to farm animal welfare in a policy statement (or equivalent) but no description of how the policy is to be implemented.  | 5  |
| Broad commitment to farm animal welfare within a policy statement (or equivalent) and a description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy is effectively implemented.   | 10 |

|   |
|---|
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>   |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment does not differentiate between companies that publish stand-alone farm animal welfare policies and companies that incorporate farm animal welfare into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice.</li> <li>• Companies that publish a clear statement of commitment to farm animal welfare and/or farm animal welfare-related principles that provide a starting point for the company's accountability to its stakeholders are awarded a score of 5 points.</li> <li>• Companies that supplement these commitments or principles with details of how these are to be implemented are awarded a score of 10 points. To score maximum points, company farm animal welfare policies need to include most/all of the following:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— A clear statement of the reasons why farm animal welfare is important to the business (including both the business case and the ethical case for action)</li> <li>— A commitment to compliance with relevant legislation</li> <li>— A clear position with regard to expected standards of farm animal welfare</li> <li>— A description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy is effectively implemented (e.g. senior management oversight, commitments to continuous improvement, performance monitoring, corrective action in the event that the policy is not being effectively implemented)</li> <li>— A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Q3. Does the policy statement provide a clear explanation of scope?</b>  |   |
| Understanding the scope of a policy is important to understand the breadth of a company's commitment to action on farm animal welfare.  |   |
| Scope not specified   | 0 |
| Not specified   | 0 |
| Scope is limited to certain specified geographies   | 2 |
| Scope is universal across all geographies   | 5 |
| Not specified   | 0 |
| Scope is limited to certain specified species   | 2 |
| Scope is universal across all relevant species  | 5 |
| Not specified   | 0 |
| Scope is limited to own-brand products or ingredients (i.e. the policy does not apply to imported or other brand products)  | 2 |
| Scope is universal across own brand, imported and other brand products  | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 15)</b>   |   |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only scored if marks have been awarded for Question 2, i.e. when the company has a published farm animal welfare policy.</li> <li>• The sub-questions on geography, species and products are scored separately (i.e. companies can score up to 5 points in each of the three sub-questions, and the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores awarded for the</li> </ul> |   |

- other sub-questions).
- The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market, across species and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their farm animal welfare policies.
  - In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points for these sub-questions.
  - For companies involved in or using the products from finfish aquaculture, we assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise. Where there is ambiguity, we highlight this in our feedback to companies and we encourage these companies to clarify whether their farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish and/or to product a specific policy for finfish.
  - We define finfish aquaculture as the breeding, rearing and harvesting of aquatic vertebrates (i.e. cold blooded animals with a bony or cartilaginous skeleton and a segmented spinal column) in all types of water environments, including ponds, rivers, lakes and the ocean.
  - We do not consider policies for finfish that focus on conservation or sustainable fishing, unless there is an explicit reference to animal welfare within these.

**Q4. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement and intensive systems for livestock (e.g. sow stalls, concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), feedlots, farrowing crates, single penning, battery cages, tethering, veal crates, force feeding and, for finfish, high stocking densities and close confinement of solitary finfish species)?**

*Many of the most significant farm animal welfare concerns result from close confinement practices (such as those listed above) or from high stocking densities in the case of finfish. It is good practice for companies to commit to no close confinement of farm animals and to avoid excessively high stocking densities.*

|  |   |
|--|---|
| No states position.  | 0 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of confinement but the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) is not clearly defined.                  | 1 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of confinement and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined. | 3 |
| Universal commitment to avoid confinement across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.   | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 5)</b>   |   |

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement.
- Simply stating compliance with legislation (e.g. with EU Directives on egg laying hens and sow stalls) is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all close confinement practices, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy on close confinement are, therefore, awarded zero points.

- Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits close confinement is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of close confinement).
- Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of close confinement but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point.
- Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of close confinement for a specific product or product range (e.g. using only free-range eggs) are awarded a score of 1 point.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Q5. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants throughout its products?</b>   |   |
| <i>Both cloning and genetic engineering raise serious animal welfare concerns<sup>5</sup>. In farmed fish species this includes heat treatment of eggs to induce triploidy, which renders fish sterile.</i>   |   |
| No states position.   | 0 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.   | 1 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.  | 3 |
| Universal commitment to avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.   | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 5)</b>  |   |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits genetic modification is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance</li> </ul> |   |

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed discussion of the animal welfare implications of cloning and genetic engineering, see Peter Stevenson (2012), *Cloning and Genetic Engineering of Farm Animals. BBFAW Investor Briefing No. 6 (September 2012)* (BBFAW, London), [http://www.bbfa.com/media/1083/briefing-no6\\_cloning-and-genetic-engineering-of-farm-animals.pdf](http://www.bbfa.com/media/1083/briefing-no6_cloning-and-genetic-engineering-of-farm-animals.pdf)

- of genetically modified or cloned animals).
- Companies that makes a commitment to the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point.
  - Companies that publish general statements on the avoidance of products or ingredients subject to genetic engineering or cloning are not awarded points unless these statements explicitly refer to animals as a part of these products or ingredients. For example, we do not consider statements relating to genetically modified crops used in animal feed.
  - We do not award points to companies that state that they would not use products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants so long as these are prohibited by legislation or opposed by consumers. That is, we are looking for unqualified rather than qualified commitments.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Q6. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances?</b>   |   |
| <i>Antibiotics given at low doses improve food conversion rates, most likely by changing the composition of gut microbiota in a way that enables animals to grow faster using less feed. Hormonal growth promoters are used to specifically promote abnormal muscle growth or milk production in animals farmed for food. The use of growth promoting substances can undermine animal welfare, as they may enable animals to grow or produce milk in a way that puts excessive strain on their physiological capabilities. While the use of hormonal growth promoters and the use of antibiotics for growth promotion are banned in the EU, their use is widely practised outside of Europe.</i>   |   |
| No states position.  | 0 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances, but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.   | 1 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances, but the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.  | 3 |
| Universal commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances.  | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 5)</b>   |   |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances that are typically used to increase the muscle (meat) or milk production of animals farmed for food. Examples include the hormone BST used to increase milk production, hormone feed additives in pig production (e.g. ractopamine) and low dose antibiotics.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues<sup>6</sup>, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state</li> </ul> |   |

<sup>6</sup> For example, the use of hormone and antibiotic growth promoters is not permitted by EU legislation. While products treated with hormone growth promoters cannot be imported into the EU, the same is not true of products produced with antibiotic growth promoters.

that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.

- Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits the use of growth hormones is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances).
- Companies that state that they avoid the use of antibiotics as preventative measures but do not explicitly prohibit their use as growth promoters are not awarded points for this question.
- Companies with a states target to reduce the level of growth promoting substances (rather than avoidance) are not awarded points for this question (although they may score points for Question 11 if the target/objective has a clear link to farm animal welfare).

**Q7. Does the company have a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use?**

*The over-use of antibiotics in humans and in animals is directly linked to the increase in antibiotic resistance. The use of antibiotics on-farm (typically through feed or water) is frequently prophylactic; effectively 'propping up' intensive farming systems where animals are kept in confined and stressful conditions and where their immune systems are compromised and disease outbreaks can spread rapidly<sup>7</sup>. Companies are expected to commit to reducing the levels of antibiotics they administer routinely and to develop animal production systems that are not reliant on the routine use of antibiotics for disease prevention.*

|  |   |
|--|---|
| No states position.  | 0 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics, but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined. | 1 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics, and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.    | 3 |
| Universal commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics across all geographies, species and products.   | 5 |

**(Max Score 5)**

**Explanatory Notes:**

- We define antibiotics as medicines used to control infectious diseases in humans and animals. There are four broad categories of on-farm use of antibiotics, namely: therapeutic (i.e. giving a treatment when clinical disease is identified), metaphylactic (i.e. giving treatment to a group of animals when some are showing signs of illness), prophylactic (i.e. giving a treatment to an animal or group of animals in anticipation of a disease or when there is a risk of infection), and growth promotion (i.e. giving antibiotics to improve the growth rates of animals).
- This question is looking for a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use.
- Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a

<sup>7</sup> See, further, Vicky Bond and Jemima Jewell (2014), The Impacts of Antibiotic Use in Animals on Human Health and Animal Welfare. BBFAW Investor Briefing No. 17 (BBFAW, London). <http://www.bbfa.com/media/1070/briefing-17-impacts-of-antibiotic-use-in-animals-on-human-health-and-animal-welfare.pdf>

clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use.

- Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits or restricts antibiotic use is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to reduction or avoidance of antibiotic use is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the reduction or avoidance of antibiotic use).

**Q8. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations (castration, teeth clipping, tail docking, toe clipping, dehorning, desnooding, de-winging, disbudding, mulesing, beak trimming, fin clipping)?**

*Many farm animals are subjected to procedures that alter their bodies, often with no anaesthesia, causing pain and distress. Examples include beak trimming, castration of beef cattle with knives, branding with hot irons, dehorning of dairy cattle with hot irons, castration and tail docking of pigs, and fin clipping in finfish aquaculture.*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| No states position.   | 0 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined. | 1 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.    | 3 |
| Universal commitment to avoidance of routine mutilations across all relevant species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.                       | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 5)</b>  |   |

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations.
- Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations. The reasons are (a) legislation does not cover all routine mutilations, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.
- Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits routine mutilations is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations).
- Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point.

**Q9. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning, or (in the case of finfish) meat from animals that have not been rendered insensible?**

*It is essential to render an animal unconscious before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs.*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| No states position.   | 0 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning or from finfish | 1 |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| that have not been rendered insensible but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.   |   |
| The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning or from finfish that have not been rendered insensible and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.  | 3 |
| Universal commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning or from finfish that have not been rendered insensible across all species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.  | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 5)</b>  |   |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear commitment to the use of stunning (typically using carbon dioxide or electrical stunning methods) to render animals unconscious immediately prior to slaughter (or rendered insensible in the case of finfish)</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear commitment to pre-slaughter stunning. The reasons are (a) legislation may not be comprehensive, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that requires pre-slaughter stunning is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning).</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to pre-slaughter stunning but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that describe the actions taken (e.g. the installation of CCTV in abattoirs) but do not makes a formal policy commitment to pre-slaughter stunning are awarded a score of zero points for this question.</li> <li>• Some companies make exceptions to requirements for pre-slaughter stunning to account for religious concerns (e.g. for Halal meat for Muslim communities, Kosher or Shechita meat for Jewish communities). In these situations, so long as the scope of the exception is clear, companies are awarded 3 points for this question.</li> </ul> |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Q10. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of long distance live transportation?</b>   |   |
| <i>When being transported, animals can experience hunger, thirst, discomfort, pain, frustration, fear and distress, as well as physical welfare problems including injury, disease, and, in the worst cases, death. For these reasons, transport of live animals should be minimised wherever possible and journeys should be kept as short as possible. Specifically, any transport of a live animal that exceeds 8 hours, from loading to unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. In the case of farmed fish, handling practices and water quality conditions, particularly oxygenation, can have a significant impact on welfare.</i> |   |
| No states position.   | 0 |
| The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of long distance transport but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not  | 1 |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| clearly defined.  |   |
| The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of long distance transport and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.  | 3 |
| Universal commitment to avoidance of long distance live transportation across all species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.  | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 5)</b>  |   |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear commitment to the avoidance of long distance live transportation, where long distance is defined as eight hours or more from loading to unloading.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear commitment to the avoidance of long distance live transportation. The reasons are (a) legislation may not be comprehensive, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that imposes limits on transportation times is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of long-distance transport) and the maximum journey time is specified.</li> <li>• Companies that state that transport distances are low (e.g. because of local sourcing, or the geographic boundaries of the areas where they operate) are not considered to have made a policy commitment to the avoidance of long distance live transport.</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of long distance live transportation but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> </ul> |   |

| <b>Governance and Management</b>  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Q11. Has the company assigned management responsibility for farm animal welfare to an individual or specified committee?</b>   |   |
| <i>When looking at the management of farm animal welfare, both oversight and implementation responsibilities are important. Oversight is necessary to ensure that senior management is aware of the business implications of farm animal welfare and is prepared to intervene when needed (e.g. if there are tensions between the organisation's farm animal welfare policy and other business objectives). However, it is often the case that those charged with oversight know relatively little about the specific details of how to effectively manage farm animal welfare. It is, therefore, important that there are individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the farm animal welfare policy is implemented and that farm animal welfare is effectively managed.</i> |   |
| No clearly defined management responsibility.   | 0 |
| Published details of the management position with responsibility for farm animal welfare on a day-to-day basis.   | 5 |
| Published details of how the board or senior management oversees the implementation of the company's farm animal welfare policy.  | 5 |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>(Max score 10)</b>   |  |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two sub-questions are scored separately (i.e. companies can score 5 points for publishing details of who is responsible for farm animal welfare on a day-to-day basis and 5 points for publishing details of senior management responsibility for overseeing the farm animal welfare policy).</li> <li>For the purposes of scoring the question on day-to-day responsibility, the question is not looking for named individuals, but evidence of roles with responsibility for farm animal welfare (e.g. a statement that this is the responsibility of a dedicated technical or sourcing manager, or a statement that responsibility is divided among a number of functions, with information on the various roles and responsibilities).</li> <li>For the oversight question, we recognise that companies may assign responsibility to a named senior person or that farm animal welfare may form part of the remit of a wider sustainability, CSR or sourcing committee.</li> <li>For the purposes of scoring, the emphasis is on the management of farm animal welfare. General information on the management or oversight of CSR or sustainability is only credited if it is clear that this includes farm animal welfare.</li> </ul> |  |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Q12. Has the company set objectives and targets for the management of farm animal welfare?</b>   |    |
| <i>Objectives and targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of these objectives and targets.</i>   |    |
| No published objectives and targets.  | 0  |
| Published objectives and targets but with no information on how these are to be achieved.   | 5  |
| Published objectives and targets together with information on the actions to be taken to achieve these, the resources allocated and the schedule for the delivery of these objectives and targets.  | 10 |
| <b>(Max score 10)</b>   |    |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is looking for evidence of explicit farm animal welfare-related targets, and for evidence that the company has a clear plan for achieving these targets.</li> <li>We do not award points for objectives and targets adopted for other purposes (e.g. quality), unless improving farm animal welfare is an explicit aim of these objectives and targets.</li> <li>For the purposes of scoring, we do not differentiate between process (e.g. to formalise their farm animal welfare management systems, to introduce audits) and performance (e.g. to phase out specific non-humane practices, to ensure that specific standards are met for all species) targets.</li> <li>Companies are awarded maximum points if they provide information on how the targets are to be achieved, e.g. by specifying the main actions to be taken, by indicating the financial and other resources required.</li> </ul> |    |

**NB. We have moved the sub-questions on performance measures to the Performance Reporting section. The question wording, rationale and scoring for the sub-questions on reporting against policy and against objectives and targets remains unchanged.**

**Q13. Does the company report on its performance against its animal welfare policy**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>and objectives?</b>  |   |
| <i>Companies should explain how they have performed against their policy commitments, and against their objectives and targets.</i>   |   |
| The company does not report on how it has performed against the commitments set out in its overarching policy.  | 0 |
| The company reports on how it has performed against the commitments set out in its overarching policy.  | 5 |
| The company does not report on how it has performed against its objectives and targets.   | 0 |
| The company reports on how it has performed against its objectives and targets.   | 5 |
| <b>(Max score 10)</b>   |   |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sub-questions (on policy, and on objectives and targets) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores on the other sub-questions).</li> <li>• The policy question is only assessed if marks have been awarded for Question 2, i.e. the company has published a farm animal welfare policy. Otherwise, zero points are awarded for this part of the question.</li> <li>• The objectives and targets question is only assessed if the company has been awarded 5 or 10 points for Question 11, i.e. the company has published objectives and targets. Otherwise, a score of zero is awarded for this part of the question.</li> </ul> |   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Q14. Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its farm animal welfare policy is effectively implemented?</b>  |   |
| <i>The effective implementation of a farm animal welfare policy relies on employees who are competent to oversee the implementation of the policy, and on controls that allow the company to respond quickly and effectively in the event of non-compliance with the policy.</i>   |   |
| No information provide on employee training in farm animal welfare.  | 0 |
| Specific training provide to employees in farm animal welfare.   | 5 |
| No information provide on the actions to be taken in the event of non-compliance with the farm animal welfare policy.  | 0 |
| The company describes the actions it takes in the event of non-compliance with its farm animal welfare policy.   | 5 |
| <b>(Max score 10)</b>  |   |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sub-questions (on training and on internal controls) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores for the other sub-questions).</li> <li>• On training, companies are only awarded 5 points if the training provided is aimed at employees and if it explicitly addressed farm animal welfare-related issues.</li> <li>• The training question does not address the quality of the training provide, the manner in which skills or competencies are assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provide.</li> <li>• On internal controls, companies are only awarded 5 points if they explicitly discussed the actions that they take in relation to non-compliance with their farm animal welfare policy. A number of the companies reviewed described their</li> </ul> |   |

internal controls in relation to CSR or product quality-related policies. However, unless it is clear that these policies and processes also covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Q15. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain?</b>   |   |
| <i>Many of the business risks and opportunities associated with farm animal welfare relate to companies' supply chains. Companies have the ability to influence their suppliers' performance both formally (e.g. through contracts, auditing processes) and informally (e.g. through capacity building and education).</i>   |   |
| No description of processes for implementing farm animal welfare policy through supply chain.  | 0 |
| No information on how farm animal welfare is included in supplier contracts.   | 0 |
| Farm animal welfare incorporated into contractual obligations for suppliers but limited by geography and/or certain products or species  | 3 |
| Farm animal welfare incorporated into contractual obligations for suppliers across all species, products and geographies.  | 5 |
| No information provide on how supplier compliance with contract conditions is monitored.   | 0 |
| Farm animal welfare specified as part of supplier auditing programme.  | 5 |
| Specific support and/or education provide to suppliers on farm animal welfare policy/issues.   | 5 |
| <b>(Max score 15)</b>  |   |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sub-questions (on contracts, auditing and supplier education) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores for the other sub-questions).</li> <li>• On contracts, companies are awarded 3 points if they indicate that they include farm animal welfare in contracts but do not indicate whether this applies to all relevant contracts or if they indicate that farm animal welfare is not included in all contracts.</li> <li>• On auditing, companies are only awarded 5 points if it is clear that their auditing processes explicitly cover farm animal welfare. Many of the companies report that they audit their suppliers against safety and/or quality standards, but unless it is clear that these audit processes cover farm animal welfare, companies score zero for this sub-question.</li> <li>• On supplier support and/or education, 5 points are awarded to companies that publish case studies or examples and/or provide a more comprehensive description of their approach. The award of 5 points is not dependent on the number or proportion of suppliers receiving this support and/or education. A number of companies describe their support to suppliers on a range of supply chain issues. However, unless it is clear that this support also covers farm animal welfare, companies score zero for this sub-question.</li> </ul> |   |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Q16. Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?</b>  |
| <i>Farm assurance schemes provide frameworks for managing farm animals, including their health and welfare, provenance and the legal compliance of the systems used. They can also play an important role in promoting higher welfare standards. Where species-specific legislation exists, schemes should ensure that minimum legislative standards are met and preferably schemes should lift the standards above the</i> |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <i>minimum. Where there is no species-specific legislation, assurance standards are increasingly important for protecting welfare.</i>   |    |
| No assurance standard specified.   | 0  |
| A proportion of products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard, but no information on the balance.  | 3  |
| A proportion of products audited to a combination of basic and higher farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard, but no information on the balance.  | 6  |
| 100% of products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard.   | 10 |
| 100% of products audited to a combination of a basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard and a higher welfare assurance (or company equivalent standard).  | 15 |
| 100% of products audited to higher level (or company equivalent) assurance standard.   | 20 |
| <b>(Max Score 20)</b>  |    |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic farm assurance standards typically do not go beyond legislative requirements for welfare and so contribute relatively little to enhanced welfare. In general, these involve yearly inspections by an independent body. Examples of standards which provide basic farm assurance (typically within a wider quality context) include the Red Tractor Farm Assurance Schemes, BEIC Lion Quality, Viande de Porc Française, Certification de Conformité de Produits, and Best Aquaculture Practice (BAP) Standards.</li> <li>• Farming systems that provide for behavioural freedom without compromising health can be described as having higher welfare potential. Whilst it is essential to set high standards to ensure livestock production systems have high welfare potential, it is also important to monitor welfare outcomes (such as mortality, disease, lameness, injuries and the occurrence of normal and abnormal behaviours) to assess the overall performance of the system. In general, schemes with an animal welfare focus require system inputs that offer a higher welfare potential. However, they may also include more detailed welfare outcome measures and more frequent/ detailed inspections than basic farm assurance standards. Examples of higher welfare schemes, which offer many welfare advantages relative to standard industry practice for all species include the Soil Association organic standards, RSPCA Assured, Beter Leven, KRAV, Label Rouge, Neuland, GLOBALGAP 5-Step for certain species. .</li> <li>• Where companies report on performance by reference to their own internal standards, we need a clear description of how the company standard compares to the relevant basic or higher assurance standards outlined above in order for points to be awarded.</li> <li>• Companies that report on performance by reference to the proportion of products audited but without specifying whether these are to basic or higher farm assurance standards are awarded 3 points.</li> <li>• There are a number of voluntary schemes that claim to incorporate animal welfare components but are, in fact, designed to assure quality or safety standards. In these instances, it is not always clear what standards, if any, of farm animal welfare are expected. Companies that describe their performance against these sorts of standards generally do not receive points unless there is a clear description of the farm animal welfare elements of such standards.</li> </ul> |    |

| <b>Innovation and Leadership</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Q17. Is the company currently investing in projects dedicated to advancing farm animal welfare practices within the industry?</b>   |   |
| <i>Farm animal welfare is a collective issue for the food industry as well as being an individual issue for each company in the industry. Making progress and raising standards across the industry requires individual companies to support research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare, to share their knowledge and expertise with their suppliers and with their industry peers, to play a supportive role in public policy debates around farm animal welfare, and to support industry and stakeholder initiatives directed at improving farm animal welfare.</i>  |   |
| No evidence of involvement in advancing farm animal welfare beyond company practices.  | 0 |
| Evidence of current involvement in research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare.   | 5 |
| Evidence of active involvement in industry or other initiatives (e.g. working groups, supporting NGO lobbying, responding to government consultations) directed at improving farm animal welfare.  | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>  |   |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sub-questions (on research and development and industry initiatives) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores on the other sub-questions).</li> <li>• Companies that report on their involvement in initiatives or programmes to improve farming techniques on environmental, safety or quality grounds, for example, are not awarded a score unless there is a clearly defined farm animal welfare element to these initiatives.</li> <li>• Similarly, only those industry initiatives that are explicitly directed at improving farm animal welfare are eligible to be scored.</li> <li>• In order to receive a score of 5 points for either sub-question, it is necessary for companies to demonstrate not only that the initiative has a meaningful farm animal welfare dimension but that the company has played a significant role in the initiative. That is, companies have to demonstrate that they are dedicating significant time, resources or expertise to the initiatives in question. For example, it is not sufficient simply to say that the company has attended roundtables or working groups with industry peers. However, if a company has initiated or become a founding member of an initiative aimed at advancing farm animal welfare, a score of 5 points will be awarded.</li> </ul> |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Q18. Has the company received any notable awards or accreditations for its farm animal welfare performance in the last two years?</b>  |   |
| <i>Awards from credible animal welfare organisations, consumer associations and industry and farming bodies provide tangible evidence that companies are achieving good/best practices in those areas of their operations covered by the awards. Awards can also play an important role within companies through motivating employees and signalling to senior management that farm animal welfare is an area where the organisation is achieving good/best practice.</i> |   |
| No evidence of notable awards or accreditations in the last two years.  | 0 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| The company has received a notable award or accreditation for a single category or species.   | 5  |
| The company has received a significant award relating to its efforts across a number of species, or the company has received awards for its efforts on different species.   | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>   |    |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only awards that (a) explicitly focus on farm animal welfare, (b) are offered by credible animal welfare organisations, consumer associations or industry and farming bodies, and (c) involve a focus on farm animal welfare achievements are considered.</li> <li>• Awards/commendations from business partners (or other organisations where a commercial relationship exists) are not counted for scoring purposes because of concerns that these commercial links may play a role in the assessment process.</li> <li>• Companies are able to score 10 points if they receive multiple awards from a single awarding organisation (e.g. from Compassion in World Farming) provided that these awards relate to different species or production systems.</li> <li>• Awards made prior to 2014 are not counted for scoring purposes (i.e. only awards received in the 2 years prior to the assessment are considered).</li> <li>• To be considered for scoring, awards need to be publicly acknowledged by the company. In a number of cases, companies receive farm animal welfare-related awards but do not have any information on these awards on their websites.</li> </ul> |    |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Q19. Does the company promote higher farm animal welfare to consumers through education and/or awareness-raising activities?</b>   |    |
| <i>Companies have an important role to play in raising awareness of farm animal welfare among their customers and clients. This, in turn, should contribute to increases in demand for higher welfare products.</i>   |    |
| No evidence of promoting higher farm animal welfare.  | 0  |
| At least one example of promoting higher farm animal welfare to consumers.  | 5  |
| Multiple examples of promoting higher farm animal welfare to consumers.   | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>   |    |
| <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The activities that could be considered in this question are defined broadly. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— The provision of farm animal welfare information on the company's website. Note: This is not just about providing information in the corporate responsibility section of the website but making farm animal welfare an integral part of customer communications and engagement.</li> <li>— On-pack or on-shelf labelling – provide this is evidenced on the company's website, in its published reports or on social media platforms.</li> <li>— Information leaflets or information packs.</li> <li>— Media promotions.</li> <li>— Supporting third party campaigns or programmes e.g. the RSPCA Farm Animal Week.</li> <li>— Customer farm visits, seminars or roundtables.</li> <li>— Social media campaigns.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In order to receive a score of 5 or 10, the focus has to be on farm animal welfare.</li> <li>• Initiatives aimed at showing how products are sourced or produced but without an explicit focus on the welfare of farm animals, are not scored in the assessment.</li> </ul> |    |

### Performance Reporting

**NB. Wording in the criteria has been modified**

**Q20. Does the company report on the proportion of animals (or volume of fresh or frozen animal products and ingredients) for own-brand products in its global supply chain that are free from confinement (i.e. those in barn, free range, indoor group housed, indoor free-farrowing, outdoor bred/reared, low stocking densities, non-tethered)?**

*In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict reporting criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the housing systems and environmental enrichment of animals in their supply chains. This is because many of the most significant farm animal welfare concerns result from close confinement practices and barren living conditions (such as barren battery cages, sow stalls, farrowing crates, veal crates, concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), feedlots, tethered systems, close confinement of solitary finfish species).*

|  |   |
|--|---|
| No reporting on the proportion of animals free from confinement  | 0 |
| The company reports on the proportion of animals free from confinement, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products. | 3 |
| The company reports fully on the proportion of animals free from confinement, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.             | 5 |

**(Max Score 5)**

**NEW QUESTION**

**Q21. Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that are free from routine mutilations (i.e. castration, teeth clipping, tail docking, toe clipping, dehorning, desnooding, de-winging, disbudding, mulesing, beak trimming, fin clipping)?**

*In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the routine mutilation of animals in their supply chains.*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| No reporting on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations  | 0 |
| The company reports on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products. | 3 |
| The company reports fully on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.             | 5 |

**(Max Score 5)**

**NB. This question was previously Q21.**

**Q22. Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that are subject to pre-slaughter stunning?**

*In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the slaughter of animals (or the rendering of fish insensible) in their supply chains. It is essential to render an animal unconscious before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs.*

|  |   |
|--|---|
| No reporting on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning.   | 0 |
| The company reports on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products. | 3 |
| The company reports fully on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.             | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 5)</b>   |   |

**NB. This question was previously Q22.**

**Q23. Does the company report on the average, typical or maximum permitted live transport times for the animals in its global supply chain?**

*In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the live transportation of animals in their supply chains. When being transported, animals can experience hunger, thirst, discomfort, pain, frustration, fear and distress, as well as physical welfare problems including injury, disease, and, in the worst cases, death. For these reasons, transport of live terrestrial animals should be minimised wherever possible and journeys should be kept as short as possible. Specifically, any transport of a live terrestrial animal that exceeds 8 hours, from loading to unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. In the case of farmed fish, handling practices and water quality conditions (particularly oxygenation) can have a significant impact on welfare. Conditions for transportation of fish must therefore be suitable and a maximum time limit may be required as determined from species-specific welfare risk assessments.*

|  |   |
|--|---|
| No reporting on live transport times.  | 0 |
| The company partially reports on the live transport times for animals, but reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products. | 3 |
| The company reports fully on the live transport times for animals, covering all relevant species and geographies.                            | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 5)</b>   |   |

**NB. This question was previously Q23. There are no changes to the wording or the scoring of this question. However, the rationale now includes more explicit examples of welfare outcome measures by species.**

**Q24. Does the company report on welfare outcome measures (i.e. measures linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?**

*In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at welfare outcome measures (WOMs) relating to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals. WOMs may be quantitative, or qualitative. They should focus on the most important species-specific measures, of physical wellbeing, mental wellbeing and behaviour. WOMs might include for example:*

- For all species: mortality rates*
- For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter*
- For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate*
- For pigs: lameness, tail bite and other lesions*
- For broiler chickens: gait score, footpad dermatitis, hockburn, breast blisters*
- For beef: body condition, lameness*
- For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <i>For fish: fin and body damage</i>  |   |
| <i>For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort</i>   |   |
| <i>For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, socialising</i> |   |
| <i>For transportation: injuries, fatigue, road traffic incidents, mortality (dead-on-arrival/DOA)</i>                     |   |
| <i>For slaughter: effectiveness of stunning</i>   |   |
| No reporting on welfare outcome measures.   | 0 |
| Partial reporting on welfare outcome measure but reporting is limited to certain species or geographies.                  | 3 |
| Company fully reports on at least one welfare outcome measure per relevant species and/or per relevant geography.         | 5 |
| <b>(Max Score 5)</b>  |   |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>NB. This question was formerly part of Q13 but has been moved to this section. The wording, rationale and scoring for this part of the question are unchanged.</b>  |    |
| <b>Q25. Does the company provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance (either in terms of input measures or welfare outcome measures)?</b>   |    |
| <i>Companies should provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance and clearly define the scope of reporting (i.e. by geography, by species, by production system, by welfare outcome).</i>  |    |
| The company does not report on progress on animal welfare performance (either in terms of input measures or welfare outcome measures).   | 0  |
| The company reports on progress on at least one animal welfare performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure), but this is limited to certain species, products or geographies and there is no explanation of trends in performance.   | 4  |
| The company reports on progress on at least one animal welfare performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure) in its supply chain, but this is limited to certain species, products or geographies, although it does provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance. | 6  |
| The company reports on at least one performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure) per relevant species across all geographies but there is no explanation of progress or trend in performance.  | 8  |
| The company reports on at least one performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure) per relevant species across all geographies, and it provides an explanation of progress or trend in performance.  | 10 |
| <b>(Max score 10)</b>  |    |

### Performance Impact

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>NEW QUESTION</b>   |  |
| <b>Q26. What proportion of laying hens (for shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is cage-free?</b>  |  |
| <i>Companies making public commitments to source cage-free eggs should report on the proportion of own brand shell eggs and eggs used as ingredients that are from cage-free hens. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of eggs that are cage-free but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.</i> |  |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 0% of laying hens are cage-free, or no reported information | 0  |
| 1 – 25% of laying hens are cage-free                        | 1  |
| 26 – 50% of laying hens are cage-free                       | 3  |
| 51 – 75% of laying hens are cage-free                       | 5  |
| 76 – 99% of laying hens are cage-free                       | 7  |
| 100% of laying hens are cage-free                           | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>                                       |    |

**NEW QUESTION**

**Q27. What proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is sourced from pigs that are free from sow stalls?**

*Companies making public commitments to source sow-stall-free pork should report on the proportion sows that are free from sow stalls. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of pork that is sow stall-free but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.*

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 0% of sows are free from sow stalls, or no reported information | 0  |
| 1 – 25% of sows are free from sow stalls                        | 1  |
| 26 – 50% of sows are free from sow stalls                       | 3  |
| 51 – 75% of sows are free from sow stalls                       | 5  |
| 76 – 99% of sows are free from sow stalls                       | 7  |
| 100% of sows are free from sow stalls                           | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>   |    |

**NEW QUESTION**

**Q28. What proportion of fresh/frozen milk or milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is sourced from cows that are free from tethering?**

*Companies making public commitments to source milk from dairy cows that are not tethered should report on the proportion of own brand milk and milk products (including ingredients) that are from dairy cows that are not tethered. NB. Companies that report of the proportion of milk or milk products and ingredients that are sourced from cows that are free from tethering but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.*

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 0% of dairy cows are free from tethering, or no reported information | 0  |
| 1 – 25% of dairy cows are free from tethering                        | 1  |
| 26 – 50% of dairy cows are free from tethering                       | 3  |
| 51 – 75% of dairy cows are free from tethering                       | 5  |
| 76 – 99% of dairy cows are free from tethering                       | 7  |
| 100% of dairy cows are free from tethering                           | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>  |    |

**NEW QUESTION**

**Q29. What proportion of broiler chickens for own-brand fresh/frozen products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 33 kg/m<sup>2</sup> or less)?**

*Companies making public commitments to source broiler chickens to higher welfare standards should report on the stocking densities of own brand fresh and frozen chicken meat and ingredients. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens reared at lower stocking densities but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. Companies will not be scored for reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that are cage-free. (That is, the actual stocking density or higher welfare/free range systems must be specified). For retailers and wholesalers, this*

*question applies to all own-brand products.*

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 0% of broiler chickens reared at lower stocking densities, or no reported information | 0  |
| 1 – 25% of broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities                    | 1  |
| 26 – 50% of broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities                   | 3  |
| 51 – 75% of broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities                   | 5  |
| 76 – 99% of broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities                   | 7  |
| 100% of broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities                       | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>   |    |

**NEW QUESTION**

**Q30. What proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain is free from beak trimming or tipping?**

*Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that are free from beak trimming or tipping. NB. Companies that report of the proportion of shell eggs or eggs as ingredients that are sourced from laying hens that are free from beak trimming or tipping but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.*

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 0% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping       | 0  |
| 1 – 25% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping  | 1  |
| 26 – 50% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping | 3  |
| 51 – 75% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping | 5  |
| 76 – 99% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping | 7  |
| 100% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping     | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>  |    |

**NEW QUESTION**

**Q31. What proportion of pigs in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?**

*Companies should report on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report of the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients that are sourced from pigs that are free from tail docking but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.*

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 0% of pigs are free from tail docking, or no reported information | 0  |
| 1 – 25% of pigs are free from tail docking                        | 1  |
| 26 – 50% of pigs are free from tail docking                       | 3  |
| 51 – 75% of pigs are free from tail docking                       | 5  |
| 76 – 99% of pigs are free from tail docking                       | 7  |
| 100% of pigs are free from tail docking                           | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>   |    |

**NEW QUESTION**

**Q32. What proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?**

*Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that are free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report of the proportion of fresh/frozen milk products and ingredients that are sourced from cows that are free from tail docking but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 0% of dairy cows are free from tail docking, or no reported information | 0 |
| 1 – 25% of dairy cows are free from tail docking                        | 1 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 26 – 50% of dairy cows are free from tail docking | 3  |
| 51 – 75% of dairy cows are free from tail docking | 5  |
| 76 – 99% of dairy cows are free from tail docking | 7  |
| 100% of dairy cows are free from tail docking     | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>                             |    |

**NEW QUESTION**

**Q33. What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company’s global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?**

*This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the slaughter of animals in their supply chains. It is essential to render an animal unconscious (through for example captive bolt and stun to kill methods including electrical stunning, gas stunning, gas stun to kill) before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. NB. Companies that report of the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. This question currently excludes finfish because finfish are slaughtered in commercial aquaculture systems using a variety of methods, which, depending on the species and husbandry system, may or may not involve pre-slaughter stunning.)*

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 0% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned, or no reported information | 0  |
| 1 – 25% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned                        | 1  |
| 26 – 50% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned                       | 3  |
| 51 – 75% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned                       | 5  |
| 76 – 99% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned                       | 7  |
| 100% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned                           | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>  |    |

**NEW QUESTION**

**Q34. What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company’s global supply chain is transported within specified maximum journey times?**

*This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the live transportation of animals in their supply chains. When being transported, animals can experience hunger, thirst, discomfort, pain, frustration, fear and distress, as well as physical welfare problems including injury, disease, and, in the worst cases, death. For these reasons, transport of live terrestrial animals should be minimised wherever possible and journeys should be kept as short as possible. Specifically, any transport of a live terrestrial animal that exceeds 8 hours, from loading to unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. NB. Companies that report of the proportion of animals that have been transported in 8 hours or less but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point.*

*This question currently excludes finfish because the key welfare issues concern the pumping, crowding and poor handling of finfish, as well the deterioration of water quality, especially the depletion of oxygen or accumulation of carbon dioxide and ammonia.*

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 0% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less, or no reported information | 0  |
| 1 – 25% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less                        | 1  |
| 26 – 50% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less                       | 3  |
| 51 – 75% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less                       | 5  |
| 76 – 99% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less                       | 7  |
| 100% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less                           | 10 |
| <b>(Max Score 10)</b>  |    |