

# Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation on the 2021 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare

Basia Romanowicz, Nicky Amos, Dr Rory Sullivan

July 2021



# Summary

Following feedback to our public consultation in the period April-May 2021, the BBFAW Technical Working Group (TWG) has agreed to make the following changes to the 2021 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare with immediate effect:

- 1.** Dunkin' Brands Inc will be assessed under its new parent company, Inspire Brands, which is already in the Benchmark scope. Asda Stores Ltd will be assessed under its new parent company, EG Group. These changes reflect the completion of recent company acquisitions. The total number of companies covered by the Benchmark will remain at 150.
- 2.** The overall weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact section will be increased from 35% to 45% of the total score available, and the scoring approach for the 10 Impact questions (Q28-37) will be modified to provide greater points for partial impact reporting.
- 3.** The focus of two questions (Q14 and Q27) will be changed to remove the potential for double scoring within the assessment. Specifically, Q14 will focus on explanations of progress against objectives and targets and Q27 will focus on explanations of progress in performance related specifically to welfare outcome measures.

# Background

In preparation for the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare's (BBFAW's) tenth Benchmark cycle, the BBFAW consulted stakeholders<sup>1</sup> in the period 28 April to 28 May 2021 on the following issues:

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

- The scope of companies to be covered by the Benchmark.
- The weighting of the performance reporting and impact questions.
- Revisions to the evaluation criteria.
- The usefulness of the Benchmark and how this could be enhanced.

We additionally highlighted some proposals for the 2022 Benchmark in the 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.

This document summarises the feedback received and BBFAW's response to this feedback.

---

<sup>1</sup> BBFAW Consultation on 2021 Benchmark [bbfaw-2021-draft-consultation-paper-final.pdf](#)

# Public Consultation on the 2021 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare

## 1. Overview of the Responses

The BBFAW Secretariat received 20 formal written responses to its 2021 public consultation document. These were received from 16 food companies included in the BBFAW Benchmark and four other organisations. Ten of the respondents were located in Europe, five in North America, three in Australia, one in Latin America and one in Asia.

The BBFAW Secretariat held two webinars on 19 May 2021 to outline the proposed changes within the BBFAW 2021 consultation. These offered companies, investors and other stakeholders the opportunity to submit immediate responses to the consultation questions during the webinar and to ask for clarification on the proposed changes. The sessions attracted 59 attendees, of which 45 were from companies, two were from investor organisations and twelve were from other organisations.

## 2. Summary of the Responses

### 2.1 Changes to Company Scope

#### 2.1.1 BBFAW's Proposals

For the 2021 Benchmark, it was proposed to continue to assess 150 companies and to make the following changes to the companies covered by the Benchmark, following 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.

#### 2.1.2 Stakeholder Responses

All respondents were supportive of the proposed company changes and the polls conducted during the webinars also indicated unanimous support.

BBFAW is not currently looking to expand the number of companies assessed in the Benchmark, however, a number of respondents suggested potential companies or regions for inclusion for greater representation. These suggestions will be useful to informing the evolution of the BBFAW company scope in the future.

### Selected comments:

“Pork processors from Spain could be included. Spain is the biggest pork processor in Europe. There is evidence to indicate that the welfare standards in Spain lag behind countries such as Denmark & the Netherlands... Selecting two or more pork processors from Spain could generate healthy competition and raise farm welfare standards.” [European food company]

“For the Swine Business, the Benchmark should include the Top 5 Chinese Major Producers” [Asia Pacific food company]

“We think that the following geographies should be investigated deeply and included: LATAM and Eastern Europe” [European food company]

“..We would encourage a greater focus on Southeast Asia, given the trend toward increased animal protein production and consumption.” [North American food company]

“Key European retailers e.g. Albert Heijn; processors operating in multiple geographies e.g. Tonnies.” [European food company]

### 2.1.3 Our Planned Actions

Based on the feedback received, we have decided to proceed with the proposed changes to the companies assessed in the 2021 Benchmark.

These changes mean that the 2021 Benchmark will now cover:

- 91 public companies (89 in 2020)
- 40 private companies (42 in 2020)
- 15 cooperatives
- 4 joint stock/partnership owned companies.

BBFAW will consider the suggested companies and regions for inclusion to allow for greater representation should the BBFAW look to expand its coverage in future years.

## 2.2 Revisions to Weighting of Performance Questions and Introduction of Impact Rating

### 2.2.1 BBFAW's Proposals

It was proposed that the weighting of the performance reporting and impact section be increased to 45% (from 35%) of the total score available for the 2021 BBFAW assessment. This proposal is in line with the BBFAW's long-term ambition to increasingly focus on performance impact and in recognition of the fact that the performance impact questions (Q28-37) are an increasingly important indicator of company performance on farm animal welfare.

It was also proposed to increase the points available for partial impact reporting which is substantial in scope. This proposal is reflective of the 2020 Impact Ratings, which indicated

that company disclosure on performance impact remains under-developed. It is also intended to both encourage those companies yet to start reporting their performance impact and better reward those companies already doing so for substantial parts of their supply chains.

Alongside this change, it was proposed to:

- Change the maximum number of points per impact question from 5 points to 10 points (N.B. We will continue to only assess the species-specific 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 we will use the scores to calculate the overall average for the relevant questions).
- Change 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.
- Change 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.

### **Publishing of individual impact ratings in 2021**

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 were reported publicly in aggregate only, from the 2021 Benchmark, the BBFAW will proceed, as planned, to publish individual Impact Ratings for all companies on an annual basis.

### **2.2.2 Stakeholder Responses**

- a) Regarding the proposal to increase the weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact section, there was a broadly equal split in the detailed feedback between those respondents who (a) supported the proposal in principle but requested the increase in weighting be introduced more gradually, (b) were in favour of the proposal, and (c) were against the proposal. The results of the poll held during the webinars revealed that around half of the respondents were in favour of the proposal, with the remainder evenly split between those who opposed the change and those who were unsure.

- b) A majority of respondents, both in detailed feedback and in the webinar polls, agreed with the proposal to change the assessment of the Impact questions (Q28-37) to award more points for partial but substantial impact reporting.

#### **Selected comments:**

“Yes, we agree with this change.” [European food company]

“We agree with the principle of increasing the weighting of the performance and impact sections to help to focus attention on improving the well-being of the livestock. We would have preferred a more gradual increase to the weighting over two years.” [European food company]

“For retailers, performance and impact reporting is the most difficult area to address due to the complexity of our supply chains and this requires a significant investment in time and technology to develop. This section is already heavily weighted within the benchmark and is very complex for retailers to manage when considering ingredients traceability.” [Australian food company]

“The proposal will have a lot of impact in the companies that are rightly committed to improving animal welfare practices, and who are progressively advancing their animal welfare status. To the market, it may symbolize a regression in the welfare indicators widespread, even though is not necessarily true.” [Latin American food company]

“We agree with a move to a more even allocation of points according the performance and the awarding of maximum points for 99-100%.” [European food company]

### **2.2.3 Our Planned Actions**

We acknowledge the concerns expressed by some respondents about the impact of increasing the weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact Section. However, it has been a long-term ambition of the Benchmark to place a greater focus on performance impact, in order to accurately assess companies on the effectiveness of their policies, commitments and management approach. Consequently, when the 35% weighting for this section was introduced in 2018, we indicated that it was our intention to incrementally increase the weighting over time.

While two respondents raised concerns about retailers being adversely impacted by the proposed change, our analysis of the scores shows that this is not the case. The BBFAW conducts a sensitivity analysis of the annual company scores, as well as detailed modelling of company scoring against any proposed changes to the assessment methodology and scoring to check for unfair bias as a result of industry sub-sector or geographical scope. Based on these analyses, we do not consider that retailer scores will be adversely impacted.

Given this, and the fact that many of the respondents were supportive of the change in weighting, we will proceed with increasing the weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact section to 45% of the total score in 2021.

We will also proceed with the proposal to change the assessment of the Impact questions to award more points for partial but substantial Impact reporting.

## 2.3 Revisions to Benchmark Evaluation Criteria

### 2.3.1 BBFAW's Proposals

It was proposed to focus Q14 and Q27 on explanations of progress to remove the potential for double scoring within the assessment. More specifically, the proposal was to focus Q14 on explanations of progress against objectives and targets and Q27 on explanations of progress in performance on welfare outcome measures.

Through these changes, BBFAW is seeking evidence that companies have effective systems in place for monitoring progress and are actively using these insights to inform or adapt their management approach in order to deliver on their objectives and targets.

For the purpose of this question, the objectives and targets can be linked either to processes (e.g. the introduction of new management processes, introduction of new standards, or staff training) or to performance (e.g. to phase out cages for laying hens).

In order to provide further clarification, below are some examples of reporting that would meet the revised criteria for Q14:

“In 2016 we set a target for farm assurance – requiring all suppliers across all species to source from nationally recognised farm assurance schemes by 2021. We are on track to reach this target for poultry and pork. This target has proven more difficult within our dairy supply chain where we increased our dairy supply base in France, and this has decreased the overall percentage of supply that is compliant as a result.”

“In 2018 we set a target of training all staff in animal welfare by 2021. Following the acquisition of a new company in late 2020, 80% of all staff have been trained and we are working on training the remaining staff by 2022.”

“In 2019 we committed to sourcing 100% of eggs and egg ingredients from cage-free systems by end 2021. In July 2020 80% of eggs and egg ingredients were cage-free. We are still working on transitioning the remaining volume due to the addition of new egg containing product lines in some countries in the last 12 months. We are working to reach 100% of cage-free eggs and eggs ingredients by end 2021.”

“Globally 50% of our pork comes from open sow housing systems (4 weeks after service). This is slightly lower than last year due to an increase of our pork sourced in North America – a region where sow stalls are still used by suppliers.”

“In 2016 we committed to achieving 100% cage free status on all whole shell eggs by the end of 2022 and sourcing 100% cage free eggs for all ingredient egg products by 2025 across all our brands in the UK. We have made good progress and 50% of our whole shell eggs are already cage free, meaning we are on track to meet our 2022 target. We have now



completed the task of mapping our supply base for liquid egg used in manufactured product. This demonstrates that at present 10% is of cage-free origin. This provides the base line against which to monitor progress against our commitment as a whole.”

Below are some examples of company reporting which meet the revised criteria for Q27 on explanations of progress in performance on welfare outcome measures. To gain points, companies should provide an explanation of progress on performance in welfare outcome measures in terms of the percentage or number of animals as a proportion of the global supply chain.

“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% during the latest recording period. This is evidence of the emphasis on and the attention to preventative foot care regimes.”

“In 2019 we saw an increase in mortality figures in both colony cages and free range. We saw a 3% increase in mortality over the previous two years in colony and a 4% increase in free range. The increase in mortality figures was driven mainly by health issues on two large sites and the increased length of flock cycles also had a significant impact. “

“Our average Somatic Cell count across the whole supply base is 182,000/ml. After remaining relatively static we have seen a slight increase this year. The main driver has been the move to more therapeutic treatment methods for mastitis now being adopted to reduce the reliance on antibiotics”.

In combination with the change in focus, it was proposed to reduce the maximum points available for Q27, from 10 to 5 points. The maximum points available for Q14 will remain unchanged at 5 points. The new proposed wording of Q14 and Q27 can be found in the Appendix.

### **2.3.2 Stakeholder Responses**

The majority of respondents, both in detailed feedback and in the webinar polls, were supportive of the proposal to change the focus of Q14 and Q27. However, there was some uncertainty as to how these questions will be scored, and whether explanations of negative progress would allow a company to score points on these questions.

#### **Selected comments on the proposals for Q14 and Q27:**

“We agree with this move as it encourages more collaborative working with suppliers to understand how progress has been made and how to make further improvements.”  
[European food company]

“Is the intention of the question(s) specifically targeted for transparency and an explanation of progress (whether forward or backward)? What if the progress that’s reported trends negatively?” [North American food company]

“If a company’s objectives and targets are based on welfare outcome measures, how should/can responses for Q14 and Q27 differ?” [North American food company]

### 2.3.3 Our Planned Actions

Given that a majority of respondents were supportive of this change, we will proceed with the proposal to focus Q14 and Q27 on explanations of progress. We will also proceed with the proposal to reduce the maximum points available for Q27, from 10 to 5 points.

In response to one question on whether objectives and targets can include welfare outcome measures, we have sought to clarify this in the explanatory notes for Q14. Explanations of progress on objectives and targets related to Welfare Outcome Measures will not be considered for this question, instead they may be awarded points under Q27.

## 2.4 General Feedback on Improvements to the Benchmark

### 2.4.1 Request for Wider Reflections on How the Benchmark Might be Developed Over Time

We are keen to continually evolve our approach to evaluating and reporting on the state of farm animal welfare management and reporting across the global food industry. As such, we invited suggestions as to how we could 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.

### 2.4.2 Stakeholder Responses

We received several comments on how the Benchmark and the criteria review process could be improved.

#### Selected comments:

"We are supportive of the current approach. Businesses would benefit from a longer-term view for example following a three-year rolling plan. This would help provide time to implement and plan progress on FAW with suppliers." [European food company]

"Recent results indicate that processors are, on average, performing better than mainstream retailers in the BBFAW. In the interest of fair representation, could a consideration be made to develop assessments which reflect the diversity of product ranges which come from different species and geographies (and the complexities associated with managing secondary or tertiary suppliers)." [European food company]

"More focus and weighting on actual progress in outcomes. Acknowledgment of trade-offs with certain welfare practices that are favored by assessment that have overall negative impacts on overall sustainability. Only 6 companies reviewed in South America; 2 in Central America [Mexico]; 3 in China; 2 in Australia/1 in New Zealand; 0 in Africa – Benchmark is targeted at a comparison of US and UK/European companies. If this is intended to be world view, there should be more countries represented." [North American food company]

### 2.4.3 Our Planned Actions

We appreciate the suggestions provided. We will reflect on these, and the other suggestions provided in the detailed feedback and during the webinars, as we evolve the Benchmark in future years.

## 3. Feedback on the Future Evolution of the Benchmark

### 3.1 BBFAW's Proposals

The following proposals are not planned for introduction in 2021 but are potential changes that BBFAW was seeking feedback on at an early stage of consideration.

#### **Proposal to Remove the 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 evidence can provide the basis for points to be awarded in both sections.

To avoid the potential for double scoring between the Performance Reporting and the Impact questions, it was proposed to exclude from Q20 (reporting on close confinement) and Q22 (reporting on routine mutilations) the species (e.g. laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs, dairy cows) covered by the species-specific issues covered by the Impact questions Q28-34. It was also proposed to remove Q23 and Q25 (reporting on pre-slaughter stunning and transport times) as these are more closely mirrored within the Impact questions Q36 and Q37.

There was overall support for the proposal to remove the potential for double scoring between the Performance Reporting questions and the Impact questions. However, concerns were raised by some respondents about the potential impact on company scores and rankings.

It was agreed that this proposal will be looked at in more detail ahead of the 2022 consultation and detailed modelling will be carried out to assess the potential impact of the changes on individual companies.

#### **Proposal to Include Questions on Responsible Corporate Lobbying**

There was significant interest from companies in participating in a working group discussion on the issue of corporate lobbying, as well as interest in what these questions would cover. The BBFAW Secretariat will develop a proposal for consulting relevant stakeholders on this topic in the coming months. We will invite stakeholders who expressed an interest in participating in the working group to become involved in the process.

## 4. Closing Remarks

We are grateful for all the feedback received in response to this consultation, and to the companies, investors and other stakeholders that have engaged with the BBFAW programme over the last year. The annual public consultation forms an integral part of our Benchmark cycle. The feedback received is essential for the development of the Benchmark and helps to ensure its relevance and continued role as a key driver of change in investment and corporate practice.

The BBFAW partners, Compassion in World Farming and FOUR PAWS, and the Secretariat would like to thank the organisations that took the time to respond to our 2021 public consultation, and we look forward to continued engagement with our stakeholders as we further develop the Benchmark.

# The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare (BBFAW) is the leading global measure of farm animal welfare management, policy commitment, performance and disclosure in food companies. It enables investors, companies, NGOs and other stakeholders to understand corporate practice and performance on farm animal welfare, and it drives – directly and through the efforts of others – corporate improvements in the welfare of animals reared for food.

BBFAW maintains the Global Investor Statement on Farm Animal Welfare and convenes the Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare, a collaborative engagement between major institutional investors and food companies on the issue of farm animal welfare. In addition, BBFAW manages extensive engagement programmes with companies and with investors, and provides practical guidance and tools for companies and for investors on key animal welfare issues.

The programme is supported by BBFAW’s partners, Compassion in World Farming and FOUR PAWS, who provide technical expertise, guidance, funding and practical resources.

More information on the programme can be found at [www.bbfaaw.com](http://www.bbfaaw.com)



# Appendix: 2021 Benchmark assessment criteria

Note: 2021 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>		
<i>3a. Geographic scope</i>		
	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> <li>• For the purposes of this question, sow-stall-free referred to the avoidance of confinement for individual sows during the gestation (pregnancy)</li> </ul>	

	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 clearly stated position, unless the commitment to provide environmental enrichment is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is</li> </ul>	

	<p>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 delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of genetically modified and cloned animals).</li> </ul>	

	<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>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<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</li> </ul>	

	<p>the hormone BST used to increase milk production (in dairy cattle), hormone feed additives in pig production (e.g. ractopamine) and low dose antibiotics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Question 8.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	<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 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.</p>

<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	1

	stunning or from finfish that have not been rendered insensible but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	
	The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning or from finfish that have not been rendered insensible and the scope (in terms of geography, species 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><b>Objectives and targets can also be linked to welfare outcome measures but the reporting on progress against these is assessed in Question 26 and Question 27.</b></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>For the purposes of scoring, we do not differentiate between explanations of progress on 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>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 to comment on 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 explanations that the performance remains at 100%).</li> <li>Explanations of progress on objectives and targets related to Welfare Outcome Measures will not be considered for this question, instead they may be awarded points under Question 27.</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</li> </ul>	

	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.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<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</li> </ul>	

	<p>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").</p> <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</li> </ul>	

	<p>quality grounds, for example, are not awarded a score unless there is a clearly defined farm animal welfare element to these initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly, only those industry initiatives that are explicitly directed at improving farm animal welfare are eligible to be scored.</li> <li>• In order to receive a score of 5 points for either sub-question, it is necessary for companies to demonstrate not only that the 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> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <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> <li><b>Companies that make statements on the proportion of sows that are free from stalls, (after the insemination period) need to be transparent and clearly state how long this confinement period is, in order to receive 3 or 5 points.</b></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> </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 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> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <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> </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 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 measure 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. See Q26 for specific examples.</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 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 (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear), 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>• 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>• 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> <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</li> </ul>	



	<p>number of animals used or processed globally are awarded minimal points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 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 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>• 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> <li>• Companies that make statements on the proportion of sows that are free from stalls, (after the insemination period) need to be transparent and clearly state how long this confinement period is, in order to receive points.</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>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>0% of dairy cows is free from tethering, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 – 20% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 – 40% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 – 60 of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 – 80% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 – 98% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 – 100% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;"><b>(Max Score 10)<sup>i</sup></b></td> </tr> </table>	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>		
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> </ul>																	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>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,</b></li> </ul>	

	<p>depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</p> <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 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>• 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> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>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>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>• 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 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.	
<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 description of how the company's breed standard(s) compare to other breeds with improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential.</li> </ul>	

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

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



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

---