

# Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare Consultation 2021



# 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 nine benchmarks (for 2012-2020<sup>1</sup>) with the 2021 Benchmark scheduled for publication in early 2022.

In preparation for the 2021 Benchmark company assessments, to be conducted in August and September 2021, BBFAW is inviting comments on the following issues:

- The scope of companies covered by the Benchmark.
- The weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact Section and changes to the assessment of the Impact questions.
- Revisions to the assessment criteria.
- The usefulness of the Benchmark and associated report.

We have additionally highlighted some proposals for the 2022 Benchmark in this consultation paper. Whilst these are not planned for introduction this year, they indicate potential changes that we are seeking feedback on at an early stage of consideration.

We are proposing the following changes to the 2021 Benchmark:

- 1.** Assessing one company under its new parent company, which is already included in the Benchmark scope, and assessing one other company under its new parent company, which has not previously been included in the Benchmark scope. These changes reflect the completion of recent company acquisitions. The total number of companies covered by the Benchmark will remain at 150.
- 2.** Increasing the overall weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact section, from 35% to 45% of the total score available, and modifying the scoring approach for the 10 Impact questions (Q28-37).
- 3.** Changing the focus of two questions (Q14 & Q27) to remove the potential for double scoring within the assessment.

As a result of these proposed changes to the weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact Section and assessment of the Impact questions, and based on the 2020 company data, we anticipate that 33 companies are at risk of falling a Tier in the 2021 Benchmark. All these companies potentially adversely affected by these methodological changes will be contacted by the Secretariat in writing in May 2021.

---

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

# BBFAW 2021 Consultation

## Dates for feedback

The consultation will run from **28th April** to **28th May 2021**.

## How should stakeholders provide feedback?

We welcome written and verbal comments. A response template has been provided alongside this document for written responses. We are happy to convene calls with investment-related organisations, food companies and other stakeholders during the consultation period. All comments received will be treated in strict confidence.

This year, we will again hold interactive webinars at 9am and 4pm BST on 19th May 2021 as an opportunity for companies to hear more about the proposed changes. The webinars will give companies the option to provide immediate feedback through polling and an opportunity to ask questions about the proposed changes to the 2021 Benchmark.

Please send your comments to, or request a call via the BBFAW Senior Programme Manager, Basia Romanowicz, [secretariat@bbfaw.com](mailto:secretariat@bbfaw.com).

## Next steps

At the close of the consultation period, we will review and, as appropriate, revise the core company list, the question weightings and the evaluation criteria in 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 tenth Benchmark Report will be published in early 2022.

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

# Structure

This consultation document is structured in five parts as follows:

- Part I: Background
- Part II: Changes to Company Scope
- Part III: Changes to the Weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact Section and Assessment of the Impact Questions
- Part IV: Revisions to BBFAW Assessment Criteria
- Part V: Wider Benchmark Revisions
- Part VI: Proposals for the 2022 Benchmark

Appendices:

- Appendix I: Proposed company scope
- Appendix II: Proposed changes to question scoring and weighting
- Appendix III: Proposed 2021 Benchmark assessment criteria

# 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 and FOUR PAWS International, who provide technical expertise and guidance on farm animal welfare and related issues, funding and practical resources. FOUR PAWS have joined the BBFAW as a supporting partner in 2021, taking over from World Animal Protection who, alongside Compassion in World Farming International, has steered the BBFAW since its inception in 2012.

## The 2020 Benchmark

The ninth Benchmark covered 150 of the world's largest food companies, including food retailers and wholesalers, restaurants and bars, and food producers and manufacturers. In October and November 2020, these companies were assessed on their approach to managing farm animal welfare, based on their publicly available information. The results, presented in the 2020 Benchmark report<sup>2</sup> published in March 2021, indicate that progress continues to be made by companies on implementing farm animal welfare into their business processes and strategy. In the 2020 Benchmark, 23 companies moved up at least one tier and the overall average score continued to increase, marginally, to 35% in 2020, from 34% in 2019, indicating that animal welfare has continued to receive sustained management attention, despite tightening of the benchmark criteria. Nearly two-thirds of companies globally, 91 of the 150 companies in the BBFAW, are now actively managing the business risks and opportunities associated with farm animal welfare, corresponding to being ranked in Tiers 1-4 of the Benchmark.

In the 2020 Benchmark, we introduced an 'Impact Rating' to assess whether company efforts in managing farm animal welfare are translating into improved welfare impacts for animals. The overall poor performance in the baseline 2020 Impact Ratings indicates that welfare impact remains under-reported. For example, whilst 61% of companies report on the proportion of laying hens free from cages, significantly fewer companies report on the proportion of laying hens free from routine beak trimming, or the proportion of pigs free from sow stalls or tail docking, or the proportion of dairy cattle free from tethering or routine tail docking. Companies are also failing to disclose what proportion of broiler chickens in their global supply chains is from slower growing breeds or is reared at lower stocking densities, or what proportion of animals in their global supply chains is pre-slaughter stunned or is transported in eight hours or less. Whilst 79% of companies have published formal improvement objectives for farm animal welfare (75% in 2019),

---

<sup>2</sup> Nicky Amos, Rory Sullivan and Nathan Rhys Williams (2021), *The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: 2020 Report* (BBFAW, London). <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

there is a gap in companies' disclosure on how these commitments are leading to improved welfare performance on the ground.

Fifty-nine of the 150 companies appear in Tiers 5 and 6, indicating that these companies provide little or no information on their approach to farm animal welfare. Across these tiers, 28 companies (19%) still do not publish a farm animal welfare policy, highlighting that there is significant work to be done before the business risks associated with farm animal welfare can be considered to be effectively managed by the food industry globally.

## 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>3</sup> Robert Black, Elisa Tjärnström, Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2021), *How investors and companies are using the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: BBFAW Company Survey 2020* (BBFAW, London) <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

## Part II: Changes to Company Scope

### Summary of proposals:

- Assessing one company under its new parent company, which is already included in the Benchmark scope, following the completion of a recent acquisition.
- Assessing one other company under a different parent company, which has not previously been included in the Benchmark scope, following the completion of recent acquisition.

For the 2021 Benchmark, we are proposing to continue to assess 150 companies. There will be some changes to the companies covered by the Benchmark to reflect recent changes to ownership as follows:

- **Dunkin' Brands Inc** will be assessed as part of its new parent company, **Inspire Brands**
- **Asda Stores Ltd** will be assessed under its new parent company, **EG Group**, following its acquisition by EG Group from **Walmart Inc.**

These changes mean that the 2021 Benchmark will now cover (see Appendix I):

- 91 public companies
- 40 private companies
- 15 cooperatives
- 4 joint stock/partnership owned companies.

### Consultation questions:

1. Do you agree with the changes to the companies to be included in the 2021 Benchmark?
2. Are there specific companies or regions that you think should be considered for future Benchmark iterations?

# Part III: Changes to the Weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact Section and Assessment of the Impact Questions

## Summary of proposals:

- Increasing the weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact section from 35% to 45% of the total score available in 2021.
- Modifying the assessment of the Impact questions, to provide greater points for partial impact reporting.

We recognise that the performance impact questions (Q28-37) are an increasingly important indicator of company performance on farm animal welfare, as investors, the BBFAW Partners and other stakeholders seek to accurately assess companies on the effectiveness of their policies, commitments and management approach. For this reason, we introduced the Impact Rating in the 2020 assessment to provide a more granular assessment of companies based on the scores achieved across the 10 Impact questions. The 2020 baseline Impact ratings clearly demonstrate that company disclosure on performance impact is underdeveloped.

**Table 1**

Impact Rating		Number of companies
A >80%	These companies are declaring improved welfare impacts for a reasonable proportion of farm animals in their operations and/or supply chains.	0
B 62-80%		4
C 44-61%	These companies are declaring improved welfare impacts for at least some farm animals in their operations and/or supply chains.	3
D 27-43%		10
E 11-26%	These companies have yet to demonstrate that they are delivering improved welfare impacts for farm animals in their operations and/or supply chains.	12
F <11%		121

\*Impact ratings are based on companies' scores for the 10 performance impact questions, namely Q28 to Q37.

The introduction of the Impact Rating was proposed in the BBFAW 2020 Consultation and, following feedback, it was decided to proceed with the introduction of the Impact Rating, but to not publish individual company ratings in the first year. Instead, individual Impact Ratings were reported to companies confidentially in their question-by-question reports. Whilst the 2020 baseline Impact ratings have only been reported publicly in aggregate, from the 2021 Benchmark, the BBFAW will proceed, as planned, to publish individual Impact Ratings for all companies on an annual basis.

In line with the BBFAW’s long-term ambition to increasingly focus on performance impact, there is a desire to further increase the weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact section as a whole. The weighting of this section of the assessment has been held at 35% for the past three Benchmarks (2018-2020). It is now proposed to increase the weighting for this section to 45% of the total score available from the 2021 BBFAW assessment. This would result in the following weightings per section of the assessment:

**Table 2**

Section	2021 Weighting	2020 Weighting
Management Commitment	22%	26%
Governance and Management	24%	28%
Innovation and Leadership	9%	11%
Performance Reporting and Impact	45%	35%

It is important to acknowledge that the BBFAW applies strict interpretation of the criteria for the Impact questions. This has previously required companies to report a single figure reflecting their impact on the issue in question across 100% of their global supply chain. Many companies fail to provide sufficient detail in their reported performance data to accurately determine the proportion of animals in their global supply chains that is impacted (“partial impact reporting”). For example, companies may report data for a particular country or a particular product line, but they do not provide any context for these data. In the absence of clarity on what these data represent as a proportion of global supply, we have previously awarded companies minimal points (0.5 points out of 5) for each of the impact questions.

For the 2021 assessment, we propose increasing the points available for partial impact reporting which is substantial in scope. This proposal is reflective of the 2020 Impact Ratings demonstrating that company disclosure on performance impact remains underdeveloped and is intended to both encourage those companies yet to start reporting impact and to better reward companies already doing so for substantial parts of their supply chains, albeit not globally (see below for detail of how this would be assessed).

Alongside this change we are proposing:

- Changing the maximum number of points per question from 5 points to 10 points (N.B. we will continue to only assess the performance impact questions that are relevant to the company. We will assess relevant questions, with the maximum possible score being 10 points per question and will use the scores to calculate the overall average for the relevant questions).
- Changing the percentage boundaries for the points awarded for the Impact questions, introducing a new 9 points option, so that the scoring aligns with the reported percentages.
- Changing the percentage bracket for full points from 100% to 99-100%, to allow a certain amount of leeway at the upper end of performance, acknowledging the

practical challenges associated with reporting 100% achievement against stated criteria.

The revised scoring for Q28-37 is presented in the table below:

**Table 3**

Percentage reported	Points
0% [of laying hens is cage-free, etc.], or no reported information.	0
1% – 20% [of laying hens is cage-free, etc.]	1
21 – 40% [of laying hens is cage-free, etc.]	3
41 – 60% [of laying hens is cage-free, etc.]	5
61 – 80% [of laying hens is cage-free, etc.]	7
81 – 98% [of laying hens is cage-free, etc.]	9
99 – 100% [of laying hens is cage-free, etc.]	10

The proposal is to increase the points awarded for partial impact reporting which is ‘substantial’ in scope from the equivalent of 1 point to 3 points out of 10. Partial impact reporting that is ‘insubstantial’ in scope will continue to be awarded 1 point out of 10 (equivalent to 0.5 points out of 5 awarded in 2020).

Examples of the difference between ‘substantial’ and ‘insubstantial’ impact reporting could include:

**Partial, substantial reporting:**

- Q28: A supermarket retailer reporting on shell eggs (as opposed to shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients combined)
- Q29: A food service company with international operations reporting on sows free from sow stalls in one or more of its most significant geographic markets
- Q36: A meat producer which primarily produces pork reporting on the percentage of pigs that are pre-slaughter stunned

**Partial, insubstantial reporting:**

- Q30: A food service company reporting on dairy cows free from tethering for a specific menu item
- Q31: A supermarket retailer reporting on broiler chickens reared at lower stocking densities in a specific higher welfare product brand
- Q32: A producer reporting on beak trimming for laying hens in a minor organic supply chain

N.B. Partial, substantial impact reporting showing 1-20% progress will be awarded 1 point, equivalent to a company reporting impact of 1-20% with a global scope.

As a result of these changes to the weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact Section and assessment of the Impact questions, and based on the 2020 company data, we anticipate that 33 companies are at risk of falling a Tier in the

2021 Benchmark. All these companies potentially adversely affected by these methodological changes will be contacted by the Secretariat in writing in May 2021.

**Consultation questions:**

3. Do you agree with the proposal to increase the weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact section to 45% in 2021?
4. Do you have any specific comments you would like to share on how the criteria generally are weighted in the Benchmark?
5. Do you agree with the proposal to change the assessment of the Impact questions (Q28-37) to award more points for partial but substantial impact reporting?
6. Do you agree with the revised scoring of the Impact questions (Q28-37) as presented in Table 3 above?

## Part IV: Revisions to Benchmark Assessment Criteria

The BBFAW Technical Working Group has reviewed the BBFAW assessment criteria following the 2020 evaluation and has proposed changing the focus of two questions (Q14 & Q27) to remove the potential for double scoring within the assessment. Beyond the proposals for these two questions, there are no further substantive changes to the BBFAW assessment criteria this year. The revised assessment criteria for 2021 are provided in Appendix III.

### Summary of proposals:

- Focusing Q14 and Q27 on explanations of progress to remove the potential for double scoring within the assessment.

In practice, the same evidence can provide the basis for points being awarded for question 14 (reporting against objectives and targets), question 27 (specifically the 4 and 8 points options: reporting progress on animal welfare performance measures) and other questions in the Performance Reporting and Impact section (Q20-26 and Q28-37). When this occurs, it results in companies benefitting from double scoring based on the same evidence.

The BBFAW Technical Working Group has therefore proposed focusing both question 14 and 27 on explanations of progress in performance, which is currently the distinctive part of question 27. More specifically, the proposal is to focus question 14 on the explanation of progress against objectives and targets, which may be qualitative or quantitative, and question 27 on the explanation of progress in performance for welfare outcome measures. Through these changes, we are seeking evidence that companies are monitoring progress and are actively using these insights to inform or adapt their management approach in order to deliver on their objectives and targets. These proposed changes are also in response to more companies now reporting on welfare outcome measures.

In combination with the change in focus, we propose reducing the maximum points available for question 27, from 10 to 5 points. The maximum points available for question 14 will remain unchanged at 5 points. The new proposed wording of questions 14 and 27 can be found in Appendix III.

Some good examples of companies' explanations of progress (from the 2020 assessments) include:

**Tesco PLC:** "There has been a significant year-on-year improvement in cattle mobility. This equates to an improvement from 70% of herds within mobility targets in 2017 to 96.5% during the latest recording period. This is evidence of the emphasis on and the attention to preventative foot care regimes."

**Groupe Danone:** “July 2020: 88% cage-free eggs and eggs ingredients. We are still working on transitioning the remaining volume due to the evolution in our portfolio for some countries. In order to reach our commitment, since the beginning of 2020, 100% of new contracts on eggs specify the Danone cage-free eggs commitments. We are working to reach 100% of cage-free eggs and eggs ingredients by end 2021.”

**Nestlé:** “Globally 56% of our pork volume consumption comes from open sow housing systems (4 weeks after service). This is slightly lower than last year due to an increase of our volume sourced in North America – a region where sow stalls are still used by suppliers.”

#### Consultation questions:

7. Do you agree with the proposal to focus Q14 and Q27 on explanations of progress, in order to remove the potential for double scoring within the assessment?
8. Are there any other changes or amendments to the Benchmark assessment criteria you would like to propose?

## Part V: Wider Benchmark Revisions

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 remain relevant to developments taking place in the marketplace, to reflect best practice in the welfare of animals farmed for food and to maximise the Benchmark's usefulness to investors, companies and other stakeholders.

### **Consultation questions:**

9. Do you have any wider reflections on how the Benchmark might be developed over time?

## Part VI: Feedback on the Future Evolution of the Benchmark

The following proposals are not planned for introduction this year but are potential changes that we are seeking feedback on at an early stage of consideration.

### Summary of proposals:

- Removing potential for double scoring between the Performance Reporting questions (specifically Q20, 22, 23 and 25) and the Impact questions.
- Adding a new question, or questions, addressing responsible corporate lobbying on farm animal welfare.

### Removing potential for double scoring between the Performance Reporting questions and the Impact questions

There is currently a degree of overlap between some of the Performance Reporting questions (Q20, 22, 23 and 25) and the Impact questions (Q28-37) as, in practice, the same piece of evidence can provide the basis for points to be awarded for both.

To avoid the potential for double scoring between the Performance Reporting and the Impact questions, the BBFAW Technical Working Group has considered excluding from question 20 (reporting on close confinement) and question 22 (reporting on routine mutilations) the species-specific issues covered by the Impact questions 28-34. Questions 20 and 22 would then only assess companies on the issues not otherwise addressed by the Impact questions, e.g. for species other than laying hens/pigs/dairy cattle/broiler chickens, or for other forms of close confinement and routine mutilations that are not covered by Q28-34 (e.g. respectively, farrowing crates and castration of pigs). Questions 23 and 25 (reporting on pre-slaughter stunning and transport times) are more closely mirrored within the Impact questions 36 and 37, and therefore the proposal is to remove question 23 and 25 from the assessment.

The BBFAW Technical Working Group sees it as imperative to remove the potential for double scoring from the assessment. However, in combination with the proposal to increase the weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact section in the 2021 assessment, the impact of this change would put too many companies at risk of falling a tier. For this reason, the TWG is proposing to defer this change until the 2022 assessment.

**Consultation questions:**

- 10.** Do you agree with the proposal to exclude from Q20 (reporting on close confinement) and Q22 (reporting on routine mutilations) the species-specific issues covered by the Impact questions Q28-34 and to remove Q23 and Q25 from the assessment, in order to avoid the potential for double-scoring within the assessment?

## New questions addressing responsible corporate lobbying activities

The BBFAW Technical Working Group is keen to introduce a question (or questions) on responsible corporate lobbying on farm animal welfare to the Innovation and Leadership section of the assessment. This is a topic of increasing importance for the BBFAW Technical Working Group, investors and other stakeholders, and is a topic beginning to be addressed by corporate benchmarks focusing on other sustainability issues (e.g. access to nutrition, climate change, etc).

Questions addressing responsible corporate lobbying activities might focus on whether companies have formal policies on responsible animal welfare lobbying, whether companies publish details of their animal welfare-related lobbying activities or whether companies disclose their relevant trade association memberships.

We welcome initial feedback on this proposal. Additionally, we are seeking expressions of interest from companies willing to participate in further discussions on this proposal over the coming year.

**Consultation questions:**

- 11.** Are there any initial comments you would like to make regarding the proposal to introduce a question (or questions) on responsible corporate lobbying activities?
- 12.** Would your company be interested in participating in working group discussions on this proposal over the coming year?

## Appendix I: Proposed company scope

Note: Proposed changes are shown in red.

	Company	Ownership	ICB classification	Country of origin / incorporation
1.	Aeon Group	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Japan
2.	Ahold Delhaize	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Netherlands
3.	Albertsons	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
4.	Aldi Nord (Aldi Markt)	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
5.	Aldi Sud/Aldi Einkauf SE & Co. oHG	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
6.	Amazon/Whole Foods Market	Public	5337: Food Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
7.	Auchan Holdings	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
8.	BJ's Wholesale Club Holdings	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
9.	C&S Wholesale	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
10.	Carrefour SA	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
11.	Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
12.	Cencosud	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Chile
13.	China Resources Vanguard	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
14.	Coles Group	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
15.	Colruyt	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Belgium
16.	Conad Consorzio Nazionale	Cooperative	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Italy
17.	(The) Co-op (UK)	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
18.	Coopérative U Enseigne	Cooperative	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	France
19.	Coop Group (Switzerland)/Coop Genossenschaft	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland
20.	Coop Italia	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Italy

21.	Costco Wholesale Corp	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
22.	Couche-Tard	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Canada
23.	E Leclerc	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
24.	Edeka Group	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
25.	EG Group (including Asda Stores Ltd)	Private	5337: Food Retailers & Wholesalers	UK
26.	Empire Company/Sobey's	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Canada
27.	H E Butt Company	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
28.	ICA Gruppen AB	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Sweden
29.	IKEA (Inter IKEA Group)	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Sweden
30.	J Sainsbury PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
31.	Jeronimo Martins	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Portugal
32.	(The) Kroger Company	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
33.	Les Mousquetaires	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
34.	Lianhua Supermarket Holdings Co	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
35.	Lidl Stiftung & Co KG	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
36.	Loblaw Companies Ltd	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Canada
37.	Marks & Spencer PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
38.	Mercadona SA	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Spain
39.	Metro AG	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
40.	Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland
41.	Publix Super Markets Inc	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
42.	Rewe Group	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
43.	Schwarz Unternehmens Treuhand KG/Kaufland	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
44.	Seven & i Holdings	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Japan

45.	Sysco Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
46.	Target Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
47.	Tesco PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
48.	UNFI	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
49.	Waitrose	Partnership	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
50.	Walmart Inc	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
51.	Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
52.	Woolworths Limited	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
53.	Yonghui Superstores	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
54.	Aramark Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
55.	Autogrill SpA	Joint Stock	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
56.	Bloomin' Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
57.	Camst – La Ristorazione Italiana Soc. Coop. ARL	Cooperative	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
58.	Chick-Fil-A	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
59.	Chipotle Mexican Grill	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
60.	CKE Restaurants	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
61.	CNHLS	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	China
62.	Compass Group PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
63.	Cracker Barrel	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
64.	Cremonini SpA	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
65.	Darden Restaurants PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
66.	Dico's/Ting Hsin International Group	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	China
67.	Domino's Pizza Group PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
	<del>Dunkin' Brands Inc</del>	<del>Public</del>	<del>5757: Restaurants and Bars</del>	<del>USA</del>
68.	Elior Group	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
69.	Gategroup Holding AG	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Switzerland
70.	Greggs PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
71.	Habib's	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	Brazil
72.	Inspire Brands Inc (now including Dunkin' Brands)	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA

73.	JAB Holding Company	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	Luxembourg
74.	JD Wetherspoon PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
75.	McDonald's Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
76.	Mitchells & Butlers PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
77.	Papa John's Pizza	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
78.	Restaurant Brands International	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Canada
79.	Sodexo	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
80.	SSP Group Limited	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Sweden
81.	Starbucks Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
82.	Subway/Doctor's Associates Inc	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
83.	The Cheesecake Factory	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
84.	Umoe Gruppen AS	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Norway
85.	Wendy's Company (The)	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
86.	Whitbread PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
87.	Yum! Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
88.	2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd)	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
89.	Agro Super	Public	3570: Food Producer	Chile
90.	Arla Foods Ltd	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
91.	Associated British Foods PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
92.	Barilla SpA	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
93.	Bimbo	Public	3570: Food Producer	Mexico
94.	BRF SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
95.	Campbell Soup Company	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
96.	Cargill	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
97.	Charoen Pokphand Foods (CPF)	Private	3570: Food Producer	Thailand
98.	China Yurun Group Limited	Private	3570: Food Producer	China
99.	Chuying Agro-Pastoral Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	China
100.	ConAgra	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
101.	Cooke Seafood Inc	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
102.	Cooperativa Centrale Aurora Alimentos	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
103.	Cooperl Arc Atlantique	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
104.	Cranswick PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
105.	Dairy Farmers of America	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	USA

106.	Danish Crown AmbA	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
107.	Ferrero SpA	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Italy
108.	Fonterra	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	New Zealand
109.	General Mills Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
110.	Groupe Danone SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	France
111.	Groupe Lactalis	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
112.	Gruppo Veronesi	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
113.	Hershey Co	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
114.	Hilton Food Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
115.	Hormel Foods Corporation	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
116.	Industrias Bachoco	Public	3570: Food Producer	Mexico
117.	JBS SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
118.	Kerry Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	Ireland
119.	KraftHeinz	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
120.	LDC Groupe	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
121.	Maple Leaf Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	Canada
122.	Marfrig Global Foods SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
123.	Maruha Nichiro	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
124.	Mars Inc	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
125.	Meiji Holdings	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
126.	Minerva Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
127.	Mondelez International	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
128.	Mowi ASA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Norway
129.	Müller Group AG	Private	3570: Food Producer	Germany
130.	Nestlé SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Switzerland
131.	New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC
132.	Nippon Ham	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
133.	Noble Foods	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
134.	OSI Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
135.	Perdue Farms	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
136.	Plukon Food Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
137.	Premier Foods PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
138.	Royal FrieslandCampina	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
139.	Sanderson Farms	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
140.	Saputo Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	Canada
141.	Seaboard Corp	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
142.	Terrena Group	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	France

143.	Tönnies Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Germany
144.	Tyson Foods Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
145.	Unilever NV	Public	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
146.	US Foods	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
147.	Vion Food Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
148.	Wens Foodstuffs Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
149.	WH Group Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC
150.	Zhongpin Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC/USA

## Appendix II: Proposed changes to question scoring and weighting

Note: Proposed changes are shown in red.

Pillar	BBFAW 2021		BBFAW 2020	
	No. of Points	Weighting	No. of Points	Weighting
Management Commitment and Policy	75	22%	75	26%
Governance and Management	70	24%	70	28%
Leadership and Innovation	20	9%	20	11%
Performance Reporting and Impact	140	45%	95	35%
<i>Q20-27. Performance Reporting questions combined</i>	40	<b>40% of the Performance Reporting and Impact section</b>	45	<i>40% of the Performance Reporting and Impact section</i>
- <i>Q27. Explanations of progress in performance for welfare outcome measures</i>	5		10	
<i>Q28-37. Performance Impact questions combined</i>	100*	<b>60% of the Performance Reporting and Impact section</b>	50*	<i>60% of the Performance Reporting and Impact section</i>
<b>Total Maximum Score/Weighting</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>100%</b>	260	100%

\*For Questions 28-35, we will only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We will assess relevant questions and use the average scores to calculate the overall score for these questions, with the maximum possible score being ten points per question in 2021.

## Appendix III: Proposed 2021 Benchmark assessment criteria

Note: Proposed changes are shown in red.

Management Commitment and Policy		
<b>Question 1.</b>	<b>Does the company acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence that farm animal welfare is regarded as a relevant business issue.	0
	The company identifies farm animal welfare as a relevant business issue.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<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 publish a farm animal welfare policy or statement, even if that does not explain why farm animal welfare is a relevant issue for the business, are awarded the maximum points.</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 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> <li>• The inclusion of farm animal welfare as an explicit subject in a Materiality Matrix, even if considered to be a low priority, is sufficient for points to be awarded for this question.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 2.</b>	<b>Does the company publish an overarching corporate farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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 firmly on the business agenda.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence of a formal policy statement (or equivalent) on farm animal welfare.	0

	The company has a broad commitment to farm animal welfare in a policy statement (or equivalent) but no description of how the policy is to be implemented.	5
	The company has a 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>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<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>• Policies issued by company subsidiaries are not considered as overarching policies, and companies with such policies but no overarching (i.e. at the parent company level) policy are therefore not awarded points for this question. These policies are considered when deciding whether to award points for Questions 1 and 4-11.</li> <li>• Policies focused on specific farm animal welfare issues (e.g. antibiotics where farm animal welfare is mentioned in passing) are not considered as overarching policies. Companies with such policies but no overarching policy on farm animal welfare are therefore not awarded points for this question. These policies are considered when deciding whether to award points for Questions 1 and 4-11.</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 regarding 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 if the policy is not being effectively implemented)</li> <li>— A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<b>Question 3.</b>	<b>Does the policy statement provide a clear explanation of scope?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Understanding the scope of a policy is important to understand the breadth of a company's commitment to action on farm animal welfare.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
<b>3a. Geographic scope</b>		
	Geographic scope is not specified.	0

	Scope is limited to certain specified geographies.	2
	Scope is universal across all geographies.	5
<i>3b. Species scope</i>		
	Species scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified species.	2
	Scope is universal across all relevant species.	5
<i>3c. Product scope</i>		
	Product scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified products (such as own-brand products).	2
	Scope is universal across own brand and other brand products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 15)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<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 could 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 other sub-questions).</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> <li>• 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. We ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks.</li> <li>• For companies involved in or using the products from finfish aquaculture, we do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish. If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only 3 points are awarded for the species-part of the question.</li> <li>• 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 environment enclosures, including ponds, rivers, lakes and the ocean.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 4.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement and intensive systems for livestock (e.g. cages (battery and enriched/colony) for laying hens, rabbits, other poultry; gestation/ sow stalls and farrowing crates for sows; concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs or feedlots), permanent housing for dairy cows, single penning, , tethering, veal crates; force feeding systems; high stocking densities for poultry, and, for finfish, high stocking densities and close confinement of solitary finfish species, e.g. turbot)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Many of the most significant farm animal welfare concerns result from close confinement practices (such as those listed above) or from high stocking densities. It is good practice for companies to commit to no close confinement of farm animals and to avoid excessively high stocking densities.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of confinement 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 confinement and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to avoid confinement across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation (e.g. with EU Directives referring to 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 comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy on close confinement are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits close confinement is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated 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).</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of close confinement but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, or products) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of close confinement for a minor product or limited product range are awarded a score of 1 point (in contrast to a clear scope such as a cage-free policy for all own-brand products, for which 3 points are awarded).</li> <li>• Companies that avoid close confinement for a significant product or product range (for example by using only free-range eggs), and are clear about the scope, can be awarded 3 points, even if the scope does not include all geographies or all brands.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the purposes of this question, sow-stall-free referred to the avoidance of confinement for individual sows during the gestation (pregnancy) period (i.e. it does not cover confinement for insemination and observation, or lactation). Within this definition, and in line with EU legislation, confinement of sows up to the first four weeks of pregnancy is permitted.</li> <li>Companies that do not permit any confinement or explicitly limit confinement to a maximum of the first four weeks of pregnancy are awarded a score of 3 or 5 points depending on the scope of their commitment.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 5.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the provision of effective species-specific environmental enrichment?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies are expected to provide animals with stimulating and complex environments that enable species-specific behaviours. Effective environmental modifications allow for the performance of strongly motivated species-specific behaviours and lead to the expression of a more complex behavioural repertoire. Examples include (but are not limited to) brushes for cattle; manipulable materials such as straw for pigs; pecking and dustbathing substrates, and perches for chickens; bathing water for ducks; outdoor range enhancement, such as artificial or natural shelter; (artificial) plants, floor substrates and structures for fish. Animals with outdoor access should not be excluded from enrichment (provided outdoors or indoors). The BBFAW does not score outdoor access per se as enrichment.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company makes a partial commitment to providing effective species-specific enriched environments but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company makes a partial commitment to providing effective species-specific enriched environments and the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to providing effective species-specific enriched environments across all relevant geographies, species, and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is looking for a clear position on the provision of effective species-specific environmental enrichment.</li> <li>The term environmental enrichment is often used to describe modifications to a captive environment to enhance the performance of strongly motivated species-specific behaviours or encourage the expression of natural behaviours.</li> <li>Chains for pigs and enriched/furnished cages for laying hens are not classed as effective enrichment.</li> <li>Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the provision of species-specific enrichment. 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 comply 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 specifies environmental enrichment is not treated as a proxy for having a</li> </ul>	

	<p>clearly stated position, unless the commitment to provide environmental enrichment is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the provision of species-specific enrichment).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the provision of species-specific environmental enrichment but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the provision of species-specific environmental enrichment for a minor product or limited product range are awarded a score of 1 point (in contrast to a clear scope such as a policy for all own-brand products, for which 3 points are awarded).</li> <li>• Companies that simply mention they provide enrichment, but without context or a description of the enrichment (or for which species) receive a score of 1 point and a comment that in order to keep receiving such points they would need to clarify their statements further.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 6.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering and cloning and/or their progeny and descendants throughout its products?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Both cloning and genetic engineering raise serious animal welfare concerns <sup>1</sup> . In farmed fish species this includes heat treatment of eggs to induce triploidy, which renders fish sterile.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering and cloning but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering and cloning and the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering and cloning across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<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 and 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 and 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 comply 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 stated position unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of</li> </ul>	

	<p>delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of genetically modified and cloned animals).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering and cloning and/or their progeny or descendants but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering and cloning for a minor product or limited product range are awarded a score of 1 point (in contrast to a clear scope such as a policy for all own-brand products, for which 3 points are awarded).</li> <li>• Companies that only refer to a specific genetic engineering technique (e.g. somatic cell nuclear transfer cloning), only receive 1 or 3 points depending on the scope of their commitment.</li> <li>• Companies that publish general statements on the avoidance of products or ingredients subject to genetic engineering and cloning are not awarded points unless these statements explicitly referred 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.</li> <li>• We do not award points to companies that state that they would not use products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering and 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.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 7.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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. Essential oils and organic acids are not classed as growth promoters for the purpose of this question, although they are often used to support gut health (in pigs and poultry) in the absence of antibiotic growth promoters.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has made 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 has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances, but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	

<p><b>Explanatory Notes</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances which 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 (in dairy cattle), 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>ii</sup>, (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 comply 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 the use of growth hormones is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated 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).</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Companies with a stated target to reduce the level of growth promoting substances (rather than avoidance) are not awarded points for this question (although they may have scored points for Question 13 if the target/objective had a clear link to farm animal welfare).</li> <li>• Companies that state compliance with legislation or guidance on eliminating (human) medically important antibiotics used as growth promoters, are not awarded points as we are looking for a clear position on the avoidance of all growth promoting substances.</li> <li>• In the absence of a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, companies that market a particular product line as containing zero growth hormones are not awarded any points. The rationale for this is because a) this question is looking for a clear commitment from the company on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, rather than evidence of selected products that avoid certain substances, b) the question applies to all growth promoting substances (i.e. not just hormones); and c) in certain jurisdictions (e.g. the US), It is illegal to administer steroid growth hormones to poultry and pigs (so, if a poultry or pig product states that the animals are not fed hormones, the product is simply complying with legislation).</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances for a minor product or limited product range are awarded a score of 1 point (in contrast to a clear scope such as a policy for all own-brand products, for which 3 points are awarded).</li> </ul>
---------------------------------	---

<p><b>Question 8.</b></p>	<p><b>Does the company have a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use?</b></p>
<p><b>Rationale</b></p>	<p>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>iii</sup>. Companies are expected to commit to</p>

	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has made 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 has made a partial commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics, and the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics across all geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We define antibiotics as medicines used to control infectious (bacterial) diseases in humans and animals.</li> <li>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, as assessed in Question 7). This question is looking for a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use.</li> <li>Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use.</li> <li>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 stated 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).</li> <li>In the absence of a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use, companies that market a particular product line as antibiotic-free, or focus solely on critically important antibiotics, are not awarded any points. The rationale for this is because a) this question is looking for a clear commitment from the company to the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use, b) the question applied to all antibiotics (i.e. not just antibiotics that are critical to human health).</li> <li>Companies that make a commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics for a minor product or limited product range are awarded a score of 1 point (in contrast to a clear scope such as a policy for all own-brand products, for which 3 points are awarded).</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 9.</b>	<b>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 or tipping, fin clipping)?</b>
--------------------	--

<b>Rationale</b>	Many farm animals are subjected to procedures that alter their bodies, often with no anaesthesia, causing pain and distress. Examples include beak trimming/tipping, castration of beef cattle with knives, branding with hot irons, dehorning of dairy cattle with hot irons, castration and tail docking of pigs, sheep and calves (surgical, rubber rings or clamping), and fin clipping in finfish aquaculture.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has made 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 has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations and the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations across all relevant species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations.</li> <li>• 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 comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy on the avoidance of routine mutilations are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits routine mutilations is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated 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).</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations for a minor product or limited product range are awarded a score of 1 point (in contrast to a clear scope such as a policy for all own-brand products, for which 3 points are awarded).</li> <li>• Companies that specify certain breeds (e.g. genetically polled cattle) in their supplier guidelines but do not have a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations are not awarded any points.</li> <li>• Companies that specify immuno-castration as an alternative to surgical castration are awarded points, but only if this is clarified by a commitment to the avoidance of surgical castration with a clear scope for this commitment.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 10.</b>	<b>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?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	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.

<b>Scoring</b>	No stated 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 that have not been rendered insensible but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	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 or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a 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>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear commitment to the use of stunning (typically using controlled atmosphere stunning 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 comply 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 requires pre-slaughter stunning is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated 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 or products) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to pre-slaughter stunning for a minor product or limited product range are awarded a score of 1 point (in contrast to a clear scope such as a policy for all own-brand products, for which 3 points are awarded).</li> <li>• Companies that describe the actions taken (e.g. the installation of CCTV in abattoirs) but do not make a formal policy commitment to pre-slaughter stunning are awarded a score of zero points for this question.</li> <li>• Most developed and many developing countries have legislation that requires pre-slaughter stunning. However, exceptions are made which permit some religious communities to slaughter without pre-stunning, e.g. slaughter by the Jewish method (Shechita) or by the Muslim method (Halal). Companies that make exceptions to requirements for pre-slaughter stunning to account for religious concerns are awarded 3 points, so long as the scope of the exception is clearly defined.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 11.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of long-distance live transportation?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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, and less than 8 hours. 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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated 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 clearly defined.	1
	The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of long-distance transport and the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a 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>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<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 comply 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 stated 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), or those that state distances in kilometres, 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 or products) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of long-distance live transportation for a minor product or limited product range are awarded a score of 1 point (in contrast to a clear scope such as a policy for all own-brand products, for which 3 points are awarded).</li> </ul>	

<b>Governance and Management</b>		
<b>Question 12.</b>	<b>Has the company assigned management responsibility for farm animal welfare to an individual or specified committee?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
	<i>12a. Management responsibility</i>	
	No clearly defined management responsibility.	0
	The company has published details of the management position with responsibility for farm animal welfare on a day-to-day basis.	5
	<i>12b. Board or senior management responsibility</i>	
	No clearly defined board or senior management responsibility	0
	The company has 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>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The two sub-questions are scored separately (i.e. companies could 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 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 management oversight sub-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. Therefore, 5 points are awarded if the company provides a clear account of board or senior management oversight.</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>Question 13.</b>	<b>Has the company set objectives and targets for the management of farm animal welfare?</b>	

<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No published objectives and targets.	0
	The company has published objectives and targets but with no or limited information on how these are to be achieved.	5
	The company has 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>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for evidence of explicit farm animal welfare-related objectives and targets, and for evidence that the company had a clear plan for achieving these objectives and 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 objectives and targets relating to 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).</li> <li>• Companies with multiple objectives and targets, but without further information on how these are to be achieved, are awarded 5 points.</li> <li>• Companies are awarded maximum points if they provided information on how the objectives and targets are to be achieved, e.g. by specifying the main actions to be taken, by indicating the time frame, by indicating the financial and other resources required.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 14.</b>	<b>Does the company provide an explanation of progress against its animal welfare objectives and targets?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should provide an explanation of progress against their objectives and targets	
<b>Scoring</b>	The company does not provide an explanation of progress against its objectives and targets.	0
	The company provides an explanation of progress against at least one objective or target.	3
	The company provides an explanation of progress on how it has performed against its multiple objectives and targets.	5
	<b>(Max score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of this question is to encourage companies to continuously report on progress against their objectives and targets, and to provide a narrative on current challenges and opportunities that aid or hinder achievement of these objectives and targets.</li> <li>• We do not prescribe the form in which performance data are to be reported. We award scores for reporting in absolute (e.g. number of animals) and relative (e.g. as a percentage of the total number of animals, as a proportion of the species in question) terms.</li> <li>• We do not award points if the company uses terms such as 'improved' or 'decreased' but does not provide a precise definition (e.g. a number, a rate) for these terms.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We expect companies to continue reporting when specific targets or objectives have been reached (e.g. are at 100%) to ensure that their performance is maintained at 100% and that this performance is continually monitored (e.g. a company could report that they only use 100% cage free eggs, but we still expect year-on-year reporting, and an explanation that the performance remains at 100%).</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 15.</b>	<b>Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its farm animal welfare policy is effectively implemented?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
<i>15a. Employee training</i>		
	No information provided on employee training in farm animal welfare.	0
	The company provides specific training to employees in farm animal welfare.	5
<i>15b. Actions taken in the event of non-compliance</i>		
	The company provides no information 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>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<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-question).</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 provided, the manner in which skills or competencies are assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provided.</li> <li>On internal controls, companies are only awarded 5 points if they explicitly discussed the actions that they take in relation to employee and/or supplier non-compliance with their farm animal welfare policy, e.g. when audit failures are identified. Descriptions of internal controls in relation to CSR or product quality-related policies are scored zero for this sub-question unless it is clear that these policies and processes also covered farm animal welfare.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 16.</b>	<b>Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain?</b>
---------------------	---

<b>Rationale</b>	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).	
<b>Scoring</b>		
	No description of processes for implementing farm animal welfare policy through supply chain.	0
<i>16a. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain via supplier contracts?</i>		
	No information on how farm animal welfare is included in supplier contracts.	0
	The company incorporates farm animal welfare into contractual obligations for suppliers, but this is limited by geography and/or certain products or species	3
	The company incorporates farm animal welfare into contractual obligations for suppliers across all species, products and geographies.	5
<i>16b. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain via monitoring and auditing?</i>		
	No information provided on how supplier compliance with contract conditions is monitored.	0
	The company specifies farm animal welfare as part of supplier auditing programme.	5
<i>16c. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain via education and support?</i>		
	No information provided on the specific support and/or education provided to suppliers.	0
	The company provides specific support and/or education provided to suppliers on farm animal welfare policy/issues.	5
	<b>(Max score 15)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<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 indicated that they included farm animal welfare in contracts but do not indicate whether this applied to all relevant contracts or if they indicated 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 covered farm animal welfare. Many of the companies reviewed reported that they audited their suppliers against safety and/or quality standards but, unless it is clear that these audit processes covered farm animal welfare, companies scored 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 provided 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 described their support to suppliers on a range of supply chain issues. However, unless it is clear that this support also covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 17.</b>	<b>Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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 minimum. Where there is no species-specific legislation, assurance standards are increasingly important for protecting welfare. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No assurance standard specified.	0
	A proportion of products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard.	3
	A proportion of products audited to a combination of basic and higher farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard.	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>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<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: Assured British Meat Scheme; Aquaculture Standards Council (ASC); Best Aquaculture Practice (BAP); BFC Certification de Conformité de Produits; Global Standards; FMI Animal Welfare Standards; GLOBALG.A.P.; North American Meat Institute; Red Tractor Farm Assurance Scheme (standard production) Viande de Porc Française.</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: Animal Welfare Approved; Better Animal Welfare (Denmark); Beter Leven; Certified Humane; European Organic Certification; Global Animal Partnership (GAP 5-Step); KRAV; Neuland; Soil Association Organic; RSPCA Assured; Red Tractor Enhanced Welfare and Free-range; Label Rouge (for certain species, also note that Label Rouge pork is not systematically higher welfare, except if "fermier").</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>
--	---

Innovation and Leadership		
<b>Question 18.</b>	<b>Is the company currently investing in projects dedicated to advancing farm animal welfare practices within the industry?</b>	
<i>Rationale</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>Scoring</i>		
	<i>18a. Involvement in research and development</i>	
	No evidence of company involvement in research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare.	0
	Evidence of current company involvement in research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare.	5
	<i>18b. Involvement in industry or other initiatives</i>	
	No evidence of active company involvement in industry or other initiatives directed at improving farm animal welfare.	0
	Evidence of active company involvement in industry or other initiatives (e.g. working groups, supporting NGO activities, responding to government consultations) directed at improving farm animal welfare.	5
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<i>Explanatory Notes</i>	<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-question).</li> <li>• Companies that reported 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> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 initiatives had a meaningful farm animal welfare dimension but that the company had played a significant role in the initiative. That is, companies had 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 had attended roundtables or working groups with industry peers. However, if a company had initiated or become a founding member of an initiative aimed at advancing farm animal welfare, a score of 5 points would have been awarded.</li> <li>Regarding research, points are only awarded for recent, updated information. If similar information appeared to be repeated year on year, a comment is added to prompt for an update to keep receiving points in future Benchmarks.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 19.</b>	<b>Does the company promote higher farm animal welfare to consumers through education and/or awareness-raising activities?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The activities that could be considered in this question are defined broadly. Examples included: <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 – provided 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 of activities 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> <li>Companies that produce multiple consumer-facing videos on farm welfare issues are awarded five points, unless it is clear that these are linked to separate consumer engagement programmes or themes.</li> <li>Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to promote higher animal welfare to consumers.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social media channels are not separately reviewed, so companies have to link to these channels from their webpages in order to receive points (e.g. for YouTube videos).</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

Performance Reporting and Impact		
<b>Question 20.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of animals (or volume of fresh or frozen animal products and its ingredients) in its global supply chain that is free from close confinement (i.e. those in barn, free-range, indoor group housed, indoor free-farrowing, outdoor bred/reared)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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 used for animals in their supply chains. This is because many of the most significant farm animal welfare concerns result from close confinement practices (such as barren battery cages, sow stalls, farrowing crates, veal crates, concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs or feedlots), permanent housing for dairy cows, tethered systems, close confinement of solitary finfish species, e.g. turbot). For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on the proportion of animals free from close confinement	0
	The company reports on the proportion of animals free from close confinement, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals free from close confinement, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is free from close confinement. Companies that report using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) are not awarded points unless they explicitly state that the standard meant that the relevant animals are free from close confinement.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” being free from close confinement are not awarded points unless they can demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our animals...’).</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 21.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that is provided with effective species-specific enriched environments?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict reporting criteria for animals in their supply chain. Examples can include (but are not limited to) brushes for cattle; manipulable materials such as straw for pigs; pecking and dustbathing substrates, and perches for chickens; bathing water for ducks; outdoor range enhancement, such as artificial or natural shelter; (artificial)	

	plants, floor substrates and structures for fish. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on the proportion of animals provided with effective species-specific enriched environments.	0
	The company reports on the proportion of animals provided with effective species-specific enriched environments, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportions of animals provided with effective species-specific enriched environments across all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is specifically looking for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is provided with effective species-specific environmental enrichment.</li> <li>• Chains for pigs and enriched/furnished cages for laying hens are not classed as effective enrichment.</li> <li>• Companies that report using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) are not awarded points unless they explicitly state that the standard meant that the relevant animals are provided with environmental enrichment.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being provided with environmental enrichment are not awarded points unless they could demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• Companies that just mention that they provided enrichment to a proportion of their animals, but without context or a description of the enrichment (or for which species) receive partial points and a comment that in order to keep receiving such points they should clarify their statements further.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 22.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that is free from routine mutilations (i.e. castration, teeth clipping, tail docking, toe clipping, dehorning, desnooding, de-winging, disbudding, mulesing, beak trimming/tipping, fin clipping)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on the proportion of animals that is free from routine mutilations	0
	The company reports on the proportion of animals that is free from routine mutilations, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals that is free from routine mutilations, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	5

	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is free from routine mutilations. Companies that report using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) are not awarded points unless they explicitly state that the standard meant that the relevant animals are free from routine mutilations.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” being free from routine mutilations are not awarded points unless they can demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our animals...’).</li> <li>Companies that report on the use of anaesthesia or analgesics in association with routine mutilations are not awarded points because this question is looking for an explicit commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations.</li> </ul>

<b>Question 23.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of animals (including finfish) in its global supply chain that is subject to pre-slaughter stunning?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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 products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is subject to pre-slaughter stunning. Companies that report using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) are not awarded points unless they explicitly state that the standard meant that the relevant animals are subject to pre-slaughter stunning.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” being subject to pre-slaughter stunning are not awarded points unless they can demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our animals...’).</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 24.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of animals (excluding finfish) in its global supply chain that is ineffectively stunned, i.e. is subject to back-up or repeat stunning?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. 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. This question is looking specifically at monitoring the effectiveness of pre-slaughter stunning of animals (excluding finfish) in their supply chains as well as the attentiveness of operators to identify when a back-up stun or a repeat stun is required. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on the proportion of animals subject to back-up or repeat stunning.	0
	The company reports on the proportion of animals subject to back-up or repeat stunning, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals subject to back-up or repeat stunning, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that are subjected to back-up or repeat stunning.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the effectiveness of stunning may be able to receive points under question 26.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "None of our animals" or "No animals" required back-up or repeat stunning, are not awarded points unless they can demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 25.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the average, typical or maximum permitted live transport times for the animals in its global supply chain?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on live transport times.	0
	The company reports on the live transport times for animals, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
	The company reports fully on the live transport times for animals, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the average, typical or maximum live transport times for animals. Companies that report using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) are not awarded points unless they explicitly state that the standard meant that the transport times are limited to eight hours or less.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the average, typical or maximum transport times for animals affected. Companies that report on the average, typical or maximum distance travelled by animals without specifying transport times are not awarded points.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being subject to average, typical or maximum journey times are not awarded points unless they can demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• Companies that report on measures taken to the comfort of animals during transportation (e.g. stocking levels, access to water, rest breaks, etc.) are not awarded points as this question is looking explicitly at journey times for animals.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 26.</b>	<b>Does the company report on welfare outcome measures (i.e. measures linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>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. There is an increasing focus on positive outcome measures (e.g. active and play behaviour). For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.</p> <p>WOMs might include for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For all species: mortality rates.</li> <li>• For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter.</li> <li>• For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate, longevity.</li> <li>• For pigs: lameness, tail bites and other lesions.</li> <li>• For broiler chickens: gait score, footpad dermatitis, hock burn, breast blisters.</li> <li>• For beef: body condition, lameness.</li> <li>• For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition.</li> <li>• For fish: fin and body damage, sea lice infestation.</li> <li>• For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, socialising.</li> <li>For transportation: injuries, slips and falls, fatigue, road traffic incidents, mortality (dead-on-arrival/DOA).</li> <li>For slaughter: effectiveness of stunning.</li> </ul>	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on welfare outcome measures.	0
	The company partially reports on welfare outcome measures but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	1
	The company reports fully on one welfare outcome measure for each relevant species, covering all geographies and products.	3
	The company fully reports on multiple welfare outcome measure for each relevant species, covering all geographies and products	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on welfare outcome measures such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mortality rates (as an indicator of potential pain, suffering and suboptimal performance), for fish: survival rates.</li> <li>Bone breakages (as an indicator of pain, suffering, suboptimal performance, and poor house design).</li> <li>Lameness (as an indicator of potential pain, behavioural restriction and suboptimal environmental and housing conditions).</li> <li>Body marks/injuries (as an indicator of aggressive fight damage, especially during mixing or competition at feeding, or from sexual behaviours).</li> <li>Body condition (as an indicator of good feed management, or competition at feeding).</li> <li>Cleanliness (as an indicator of good environmental control, thermal comfort).</li> <li>Positive flock or herd behaviour (as an indicator of a varied stimulating environment, good management and suitable breed for production system).</li> <li>Negative flock or herd behaviour, such as injurious feather pecking or tail biting in pigs (as a signpost of a barren non-stimulating environment, poor environmental control, low space allowance, feed and health problems).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Scores are not awarded for reporting on input-based measures (i.e. measures relating to the type of production system, e.g. caged, barn, free-range, as well as to the practices for transport and slaughter).</li> <li>Scores are awarded for some health indicators (e.g. somatic cell count and mastitis for dairy cows), although strictly speaking these are not regarded as WOMs. However, points are not awarded for production measures (e.g. egg output).</li> <li>Similarly, scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm animal welfare standards but do not report on the welfare outcomes resulting from the implementation of these standards.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 27.</b>	<b>Does the company provide an explanation of progress in performance for welfare outcome measures?</b>
---------------------	---

<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should provide an explanation of progress in performance and clearly define the scope of reporting (i.e. by geography, by species, by production system, by welfare outcome). For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	The company does not provide an explanation of progress in performance for welfare outcome measures.	0
	The company provides an explanation of progress in performance for at least one welfare outcome measure, but this is limited to certain geographies, species, or products.	3
	The company provides an explanation of progress in performance for at least one welfare outcome measurer for each relevant species across all geographies and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We award scores for companies that provide an explanation of progress for outcome-based measures (which are indicators that relate to the physical and mental wellbeing of the animals themselves, e.g. lameness and mastitis in dairy cows, gait score and footpad dermatitis in broilers, tail-biting and lameness in pigs, bone breakage and feather coverage in laying hens).</li> <li>The purpose of this question is to encourage companies to provide a narrative on current challenges and opportunities that aid or hinder progress on welfare outcome measures.</li> <li>We do not prescribe the form in which performance data are to be reported. We award scores for reporting in absolute (e.g. number of animals) and relative (e.g. as a percentage of the total number of animals, as a proportion of the species in question) terms.</li> <li>'Relevant' means all species that are in the company's supply chain.</li> <li>We do not award points if the company uses terms such as 'improved' or 'decreased' but does not provide a precise definition (e.g. a number, a rate) for these terms.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 28.</b>	<b>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>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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 is from cage-free hens. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of shell eggs or eggs as ingredients that is sourced from laying hens that are cage-free but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of laying hens is cage-free, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of laying hens is cage-free.	1
	21 – 40% of laying hens is cage-free.	3
	41 – 60% of laying hens is cage-free.	5
	61 – 80% of laying hens is cage-free.	7
	81 – 98% of laying hens is cage-free.	9
	99 – 100% of laying hens is cage-free.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)<sup>i</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products.</li> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of shell eggs or eggs as ingredients in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from laying hens that are cage-free.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies <b>are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 3 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</b></li> <li>• If the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that are cage-free in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” being free from close confinement are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our animals...’).</li> <li>• In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company, with operations in three countries, reported that 14% its laying hens in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C are cage free but do not provide any information on the proportion of its laying hens that is in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>• We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain that this data represented (i.e., it should not be necessary for the assessor to have to calculate the data in order to arrive at a percentage of the global supply chain).</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 29.</b>	<b>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?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies making public commitments to source sow-stall-free or gestation-crate-free pork should report on the proportion of sows that are free from stalls. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients that is sourced from pigs that are free from sow stalls but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of sows is free from sow stalls, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of sows is free from sow stalls.	1
	21 – 40% of sows is free from sow stalls.	3
	41 – 60% of sows is free from sow stalls.	5
	61 – 80% of sows is free from sow stalls.	7
	81 – 98% of sows is free from sow stalls.	9
	99 – 100% of sows is free from sow stalls.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)<sup>i</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from sows that are free from sow stalls.</li> <li>• For the purposes of this question, sow-stall-free referred to the avoidance of confinement for individual sows during the gestation (pregnancy) period (i.e. it does not cover confinement for insemination and observation, or lactation). Within this definition, and in line with EU legislation, confinement of sows up to the first four weeks of pregnancy is permitted.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of sows that is free from sow stalls but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies <b>are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 3 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</b></li> <li>• If the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of sows that is free from sow stalls in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our sows" or "All sows" being free from sow stalls are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of sows that is free from sow stalls (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of sows in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C are free from sow stalls but do not provide any information on the proportion of its sows that is in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>• We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without having to do any calculations.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 30.</b>	<b>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?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>NB. Companies that report on the proportion of milk or milk products and ingredients that is sourced from cows that are free from tethering but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.</p>	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of dairy cows is free from tethering, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	1
	21 – 40% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	3
	41 – 60 of dairy cows is free from tethering.	5
	61 – 80% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	7

	81 – 98% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	9
	99 – 100% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)<sup>i</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy-based products.</li> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of milk or milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from dairy cows that are free from tethering.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that report on the proportion of cows that are free from tethering but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies <b>are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 3 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</b></li> <li>If the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All cows" being free from tethering are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its dairy cows in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C are free from tethering but do not provide any information on the proportion of its dairy cows that is in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without having to do any calculations.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 31.</b>	<b>What proportion of broiler chickens for fresh/frozen products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> or less)?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	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 meat that is sourced from broiler chickens reared at lower stocking densities but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. 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.

<b>Scoring</b>	0% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	1
	21 – 40% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	3
	41 – 60% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	5
	61 – 80% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	7
	81 – 98% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	9
	99 – 100% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	10
		<b>(Max Score 10)<sup>i</sup></b>
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products.</li> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler meat in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from broiler chickens that are reared at lower stocking densities.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies <b>are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 3 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</b></li> <li>If the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about "Our broiler chickens" or "All meat chickens" being reared at lower stocking densities are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that are reared at lower stocking densities (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in 3 countries reported that 14% of its broiler chickens in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C are reared at lower stocking densities but do not provide any information on the proportion of its broiler chickens that is in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>	
<b>Question 32.</b>	<b>What proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain is free from beak trimming or tipping?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping. NB. Companies that report of the proportion of shell eggs or eggs as ingredients that is sourced from laying hens that are free from beak trimming or tipping but do not specify the scope will be awarded	

	minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	1
	21 – 40% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	3
	41 – 60% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	5
	61 – 80% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	7
	81 – 98% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	9
	99 – 100% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)<sup>ii</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of shell eggs or eggs as ingredients in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from laying hens that are free from beak trimming or tipping.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies <b>are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 3 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</b></li> <li>• If the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our laying hens" or "All chickens" being free from beak trimming or tipping are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its laying hens in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C is free from beak trimming or tipping but do not provide any information on the proportion of its laying hens that are in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>• We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>	
<b>Question 33.</b>	<b>What proportion of pigs in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of pigs that is free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients that is sourced from pigs that are free from tail	

	docking but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of pigs is free from tail docking, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of pigs is free from tail docking.	1
	21 – 40% of pigs is free from tail docking.	3
	41 – 60% of pigs is free from tail docking.	5
	61 – 80% of pigs is free from tail docking.	7
	81 – 98% of pigs is free from tail docking.	9
	99 – 100% of pigs is free from tail docking.	10
		<b>(Max Score 10)<sup>ii</sup></b>
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from pigs that are free from tail docking.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies <b>are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 3 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</b></li> <li>• If the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our pigs" or "All pigs" being free from tail docking are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its pigs in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C is free from tail docking but do not provide any information on the proportion of its pigs that are in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>• We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain this data represented, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>	
<b>Question 34.</b>	<b>What proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of fresh/frozen milk products and ingredients that is sourced from cows that are free from tail	

	docking but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of dairy cows is free from tail docking, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of dairy cows is free from tail docking.	1
	21 – 40% of dairy cows is free from tail docking.	3
	41 – 60% of dairy cows is free from tail docking.	5
	61 – 80% of dairy cows is free from tail docking.	7
	81 – 98% of dairy cows is free from tail docking.	9
	99 – 100% of dairy cows is free from tail docking.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)<sup>ii</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products.</li> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of fresh/frozen milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from dairy cows that are free from tail docking.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tail docking but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies <b>are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 3 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</b></li> <li>If the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tail docking in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being free from tail docking are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of cows that is free from tail docking (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in 3 countries reported that 14% of its cows in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C are free from tail docking but do not provide any information on the proportion of its cows that is in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 35.</b>	<b>What proportion of the company's supply of chicken meat (fresh/frozen/processed and ingredient) comes from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential (defined as &lt;55g/d averaged over the growth cycle according to the breeding company specification)?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	Breeds of chicken selected for high growth rate, lean meat deposition and high feed conversion efficiency suffer a range of physiological and

	<p>metabolic health issues, as well as poor immunity and walking ability. Such breeds are lethargic and have increasing meat quality issues. Breeds with slower growth potential tend to have better welfare outcomes. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of chicken meat that is sourced from slower growing strains but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.</p>	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	1
	21 – 40% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	3
	41 – 60% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	5
	61 – 80% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	7
	81 – 98% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	9
	99 – 100% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)<sup>iii</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of chicken meat in the company's global supply chain that is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of chicken meat that is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies <b>are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 3 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</b></li> <li>• If the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of chicken meat from birds managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with slower growth potential in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our chicken meat" or "All chicken " being from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of chicken meat that is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and slower growth potential (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• Where companies report on their own breeds with improved welfare outcomes and slower growth potential, they needed to provide a clear</li> </ul>	

	<p>description of how the company's breed standard(s) compare to other breeds with improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its bird strains in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C are from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential but do not provide any information on the proportion of strains that is in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by this data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 36.</b>	<b>What proportion of animals (including fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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) before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For all companies, this question applies to all products (own-brand and other).	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	1
	21 – 40% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	3
	41 – 60% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	5
	61 – 80% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	7
	81 – 98% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	9
	99 – 100% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the company's global supply chain that had been pre-slaughter stunned.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that report on the proportion of animals that is pre-slaughter stunned but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies <b>are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 3 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</b></li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that is pre-slaughter stunned in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” being pre-slaughter stunned are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our animals...’).</li> <li>• In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its animals in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C are pre-slaughter stunned but do not provide any information on the proportion of the animals that is in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>• We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 37.</b>	<b>What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is transported within specified maximum journey times?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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 on the proportion of animals that have been transported in 8 hours or less but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. This question currently excludes finfish because the key welfare issues concern the pumping, crowding and poor handling of finfish, as well as the deterioration of water quality, especially the depletion of oxygen or accumulation of carbon dioxide and ammonia. For all companies, this question applies to all products (own-brand and other).	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less.	1
	21 – 40% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less.	3
	41 – 60% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less.	5
	61 – 80% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less.	7
	81 – 98% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less.	9
	99 – 100% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the company's global supply chain that are transported in 8 hours or less.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of animals that is transported in 8 hours or less but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 3 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• If the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that is transported in 8 hours or less in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is transported in 8 hours or less (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our animals...’).</li> <li>• In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its animals in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C are transported for 8 hours of less, but do not provide any information on the proportion of the animals that is in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>• We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>
--	--

\*Notes

<sup>i</sup> For questions 28-31 (on close confinement), we only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We assess relevant questions, with the maximum possible score being five (5) points per question and we use the scores to calculate the overall average for these relevant questions.

<sup>ii</sup> For questions 32-34 (on mutilations), we only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We assess relevant questions, with the maximum possible score being five (5) points per question and we use the scores to calculate the overall average for these relevant questions.

<sup>iii</sup> For question 35 (on strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential), we only assess this question if it is relevant to the company. The maximum possible score for this question is five (5) points.