

# The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare Consultation January 2023



# Executive Summary

Since 2012, the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare (BBFAW) has existed to help drive higher farm animal welfare standards across the world's leading food businesses. The BBFAW has become a leading global programme that has enabled investors, companies, and other stakeholders to understand how well companies are managing farm animal welfare and, crucially, to drive improved corporate practice and performance on the issue. A key tool for the delivery of these objectives is BBFAW's annual benchmark<sup>1</sup> of global food companies' policies and practices on farm animal welfare.

## 2022 Benchmark – April 2023 to August 2023

Following the first decade of BBFAW Benchmarks, the BBFAW Partners decided that it was necessary to pause the annual assessment cycle during 2022 to conduct a thorough revision of the assessment criteria, to ensure they are aligned with evolving expectations of companies. The BBFAW Partners have worked with the Secretariat to develop the proposed BBFAW 2022 assessment criteria presented in this consultation paper.

In preparation for the postponed 2022 Benchmark company assessments, to be conducted in April and May 2023, BBFAW is now inviting comments on the following issues:

- The scope of companies covered by the Benchmark.
- Changes to the weighting of the assessment pillars.
- Changes to the assessment criteria.
- The usefulness of the Benchmark and associated report.

We are proposing the following changes to the 2022 Benchmark:

- 1.** Changes to the company scope, including the assessment of two companies under their parent companies and the removal of three companies previously assessed, due to relatively small market size. Five new companies will be added to maintain the total number of companies covered by the Benchmark at 150.
- 2.** The division of the 2022 Benchmark into the following five pillars: Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments; Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management; Farm Animal Welfare Targets; Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact; and Animal-Sourced Foods. The greatest weighting will be given to the Performance Impact pillar, representing 55% of the overall score.
- 3.** Adding new questions on whether companies have commitments: to ending the use of high-performance breeds; to not produce or sell foie gras; and to ending the use of other inhumane practices. The question on whether

---

<sup>1</sup> The ten annual benchmark reports, 2012-2021, can be downloaded from [www.bbfaw.com/publications](http://www.bbfaw.com/publications)

companies have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics will be expanded to also cover metaphylactic use.

4. Adding a new sub-question on whether companies describe how they use welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in their operations or supply chain.
5. Adding new questions on whether companies have clear, time-bound targets for specific welfare improvements for laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cows.
6. Adding new species-specific Performance Impact questions, covering beef cattle and farmed salmon, in addition to laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cattle (resulting in three questions per species).
7. Adjusting the scoring of the Performance Impact questions to make the points scale exponential rather than linear (i.e., awarding fewer points than previously for lower levels of performance).
8. Introducing eight new questions on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. These questions are grouped within one *Animal-Sourced Foods* pillar but include questions which address Policy Commitments, Governance & Management, Targets, and Performance Impact.
9. Removing eleven questions that previously featured as part of the assessment criteria.

The proposed BBFAW 2022 assessment criteria contain 51 questions, compared to 37 in 2021. The scale of the proposed changes to the assessment criteria and the weighting of the assessment pillars is sufficiently large that it will not be possible to draw meaningful comparisons between company scores under the 2021 and 2022 assessment criteria. The results of the 2022 Benchmark will establish a new baseline against which investors and companies can monitor progress and we will not therefore be publishing a comparative analysis of the 2022 benchmark against the 2021 results.

In addition to feedback on the points summarised above, we are also seeking feedback on how to communicate the benchmark results. One option being considered is to *not* publish a named ranking of companies following the 2022 company assessments, in order to provide time for companies to fully understand how they perform under the new assessment criteria and respond accordingly. If a named ranking of companies was not published, companies would still receive a confidential report on their assessment, including their overall score and how they rank within the full scope of companies and by sub-sector.

## 2023 Benchmark – October 2023 to April 2024

The 2023 company assessments will take place mid-October to mid-December 2023 and the results will be published in a ranking in April 2024.

To allow companies time to familiarise with the criteria, we are not intending to make any further changes in advance of the 2023 company assessments, other than any minor modifications to questions in order to provide greater clarity, facilitate the evaluation of companies or otherwise address questions which prove challenging to assess.

# BBFAW 2022 Consultation

## Dates for feedback

The consultation will run from **24th January** to **14th February 2023**.

## How should stakeholders provide feedback?

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

This year, we will again hold interactive webinars at 9am and 4pm GMT on **2nd February 2023** as an opportunity for companies to hear more about the proposed changes. The webinars will give companies the option to provide immediate feedback through polling and an opportunity to ask questions about the proposed changes to the 2022 Benchmark.

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

## Next steps

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

We will prepare a short summary, to be posted on the BBFAW website, of the feedback received and of the changes we have made as a result of this feedback.

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

# Structure

This consultation document is structured in five parts as follows:

Part I: Background

Part II: Changes to Company Scope

Part III: Changes to the Weighting of the Assessment Pillars

Part IV: Changes to the Assessment Criteria

Part V: Wider Benchmark Revisions

Appendices:

- Appendix I: Proposed Company Scope
- Appendix II: Proposed Weighting of the Assessment Pillars
- Appendix III: Proposed 2022 Benchmark Assessment Criteria

# Part I: Background

## BBFAW Overview

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

## The 2021 Benchmark and the first 10 years

Over the past decade, the BBFAW has become the leading global measure of farm animal welfare. It has developed into a global programme that has enabled investors, companies, and other stakeholders to understand how well companies are managing farm animal welfare and, crucially, to drive improved corporate practice and performance on the issue.

The tenth Benchmark covered 150 of the world's largest food companies, including food retailers and wholesalers, restaurants and bars, and food producers and manufacturers. In August and September 2021, these companies were assessed on their approach to managing farm animal welfare, based on their publicly available information. The results, presented in the 2021 Benchmark report<sup>2</sup> published in March 2022, reveal that, of the 150 companies evaluated, 134 (89%) now acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue (compared to 71% of the 68 companies evaluated in 2012), 122 companies (81%) have formal policies on farm animal welfare (46% in 2012), and 119 companies (79%) have published formal objectives and targets for animal welfare (26% in 2012).

In total, 30 companies improved their overall average score in 2021, with six of these companies improving their score sufficiently to increase their ranking by one Tier. These achievements were particularly noteworthy given the scale of methodology changes introduced in 2021. Nonetheless, 68 companies (45%) remained in Tiers 5 and 6 (59 in 2020). These companies provided little or no information on their approach to farm animal welfare. Strikingly, 27 of the 68 companies (28 in 2020) in the lowest two rankings did not publish a formal farm animal welfare policy.

Further, in the 2021 Benchmark, 127 of the 150 companies (85%) achieved an Impact Rating of E or F, indicating that a majority of companies have yet to demonstrate that they are delivering improved welfare impacts for farm animals in their operations or supply chains.

These results indicate that, whilst the Benchmark has successfully driven significant improvement over the past ten years, the BBFAW still has a role to play in continuing to drive improved corporate practice and performance on farm animal welfare. Following the first decade of BBFAW Benchmarks, the BBFAW Partners decided that

---

<sup>2</sup> Nicky Amos, Rory Sullivan, Basia Romanowicz and Dr Heleen van de Weerd (2022), *The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: Report 2021* (BBFAW, London). <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

it was necessary to conduct a thorough revision of the assessment criteria to adapt to the changing landscape. In particular, to adapt to the increased demand for greater focus on performance impact and to incorporate the allied issue of the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods in human diets.

## Investor and Stakeholder Engagement

Alongside our annual evaluations of food companies, the BBFAW maintains an active programme of engagement with investors and food companies through direct dialogue, meetings and seminars, as well as through periodic briefings and published articles on issues of relevance and interest. The feedback received has been an important influence on the proposals set out in this document.

## Part II: Changes to Company Scope

### Summary of proposals:

- Two Retailer and Wholesaler companies and two Producer and Manufacturer companies will be assessed together under their parent companies. [Net impact: -2 companies]
- One Producer and Manufacturer and two Restaurants and Bars companies will be removed. [Net impact: -3 companies]
- Two Retailer and Wholesaler companies, two Producer and Manufacturer companies and one Restaurant and Bars company will be added. [Net impact: +5 companies]

For the 2022 Benchmark, we are proposing to continue to assess 150 companies. There are a number of proposed changes to the company scope, including the removal of three companies and the addition of five new companies.

### Retailers and Wholesalers

#### Proposed changes:

- **Lidl Stiftung & Co KG** and **Kaufland** – currently assessed separately – are to be assessed under the parent company **Schwarz Unternehmens Treuhand KG**

#### Proposed new additions:

- **Spar Holding AG** – international group of retailers and wholesalers operating in 45 countries.
- **Metro Inc** – third largest Canadian retailer after Loblaw and Sobey's. Metro Inc is distinct from Metro AG, the retail group domiciled in Germany which is also included in the company scope.

### Producers and Manufacturers

#### Proposed changes:

- **Cargill** and Continental Grains have acquired **Sanderson Farms** in July 2022. Sanderson Farms will therefore be assessed as part of **Cargill**.
- **Chuying Agro-Pastoral Group** will be removed due to relatively small market revenue.

#### Proposed new additions:

- **Yili Group** – Chinese dairy company that is one of the largest in Asia.
- **Beijing Dabeinong Technology Group Co., Ltd.** – a leading Chinese pig producer.



## Restaurants and Bars

### Proposed changes:

- **Umoe Gruppen** and **CNHS** will be removed due to relatively small market revenue.

### Proposed new additions:

- **Yum China Holdings** – one of the largest restaurant groups in China and globally. Yum China Holdings is distinct from Yum! Brands, the restaurant group domiciled in the USA which is also included in the company scope.

Proposed number of companies by sub-sector:

Sub-sector	Number of companies
Retailers and Wholesalers	55
Producers and Manufacturers	63
Restaurants and Bars	32

These changes mean that the 2022 Benchmark will now cover (see Appendix I):

- 87 public companies
- 44 private companies
- 15 cooperatives
- 4 joint stock/partnership owned companies.

### Consultation questions:

1. Do you agree with the changes to the companies to be included in the 2022 Benchmark?
2. Are there specific companies or regions that you think should be considered for future Benchmark iterations?

# Part III: Changes to the Weighting of the Assessment Pillars

## Summary of proposals:

- The 2022 Benchmark will be divided into the following five pillars:
  - Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments
  - Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management
  - Farm Animal Welfare Targets
  - Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact
  - Animal-Sourced Foods (Policy Commitments, Governance and Management, Targets and Performance Impact).
- The greatest weighting will be given to the Performance Impact pillar, representing 55% of the overall score.

In 2021, the assessment criteria were divided into four pillars, as follows:

- Management Commitment
- Governance and Management
- Innovation and Leadership
- Performance Reporting and Impact

In the proposed 2022 assessment criteria, retained questions that previously formed part of the *Management Commitment*, *Governance and Management*, and *Innovation and Leadership* pillars have been combined into the new *Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments* and *Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management* pillars.

A new pillar focused on *Farm Animal Welfare Targets* has been introduced to enable greater emphasis to be placed on time-bound targets for specific animal welfare improvements. The setting of time-bound targets is the critical step required for policy commitments to be translated into action and, thereby, performance impact.

For a number of years, the BBFAW has recognised that performance impact is an increasingly important indicator of company performance on farm animal welfare, as investors, the BBFAW Partners and other stakeholders seek to accurately assess companies on the effectiveness of their policies, commitments and management approach. Accordingly, the proportion of the overall score that the Performance Impact questions represent has been increased each year since 2018. It is for the same reason the Impact Rating (A-F) was introduced in the 2020 assessment, to provide a more granular assessment of companies based on the scores achieved across the ten Performance Impact questions.

In 2022, it is proposed to further increase the weighting of the Performance Impact questions. The six Performance Reporting questions (Q20-25 in 2021) have been removed from this section as these provided potential for double-scoring against the expanded number of Performance Impact questions. The new *Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact* pillar is proposed to represent a majority – 55% – of the overall score.

The BBFAW Partners have also identified the need to introduce questions to assess how companies are acting to reduce their reliance on animal-sourced foods, as an allied issue to that of farm animal welfare. These questions, focused on companies’ policies and performance on reducing the number of animals farmed for food, mirror the *Policy Commitments, Governance and Management, Targets and Performance Impact* structure of the farm animal welfare questions, but are grouped into a single new *Animal-Sourced Foods* pillar.

The 2022 assessment criteria are proposed to be weighted as follows:

Pillar	2022 Weighting
Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments	15%
Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management	14%
Farm Animal Welfare Targets	7%
Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact	55%
Animal-Sourced Foods	9%

### Consultation questions:

3. Do you agree with the proposal to group the questions into the five pillars described?
4. Do you agree with the proposed weightings for the five pillars?
5. Do you have any further comments you would like to share on how the criteria are weighted in the Benchmark?

# Part IV: Changes to the Assessment Criteria

Following the first decade of BBFAW Benchmarks, the BBFAW Partners decided that it was necessary to conduct a thorough revision of the assessment criteria to adapt to the changing landscape. In particular, to adapt to the increased demand for greater focus on performance impact and to incorporate the allied issue of the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods in human diets. The revised assessment criteria for 2022 are provided in Appendix III and the most significant changes are summarised below.

## Summary of proposals:

- New questions will be added on whether companies have commitments: to ending the use of high-performance breeds; to not produce or sell foie gras; and to ending the use of other inhumane practices. The question on whether companies have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics will be expanded to also cover metaphylactic use.
- A new sub-question will be added on whether companies describe how they use welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in their operations or supply chain.
- New questions will be added on whether companies have clear, time-bound targets for specific welfare improvements for laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cows.
- New species-specific Performance Impact questions will be added, covering beef cattle and farmed salmon, in addition to laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cattle (resulting in three questions per species).
- The scoring of the Performance Impact questions will be adjusted to make the points scale exponential rather than linear (i.e., awarding fewer points than previously for lower levels of performance).
- Eight new questions will be introduced on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.
- Eleven questions that previously featured as part of the assessment criteria will be removed.

New questions have been added within the *Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments* pillar on whether companies have commitments:

- to ending the use of high-performance breeds (Q10);
- to not produce or sell foie gras (Q11); and
- to ending the use of other inhumane practices (Q12), including the culling of day-old male chicks in egg supply chains; cow-calf separation; fully-slatted flooring; and live plucking or live harvesting for geese.

These changes reflect the importance of these issues to animal welfare and the evolving focus of corporate commitments and of the BBFAW Partners.

Further, the question on whether companies have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics (Q7) has been expanded to also cover metaphylactic use. This change recognises that metaphylactic use of antibiotics raises similar concerns around enabling 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.

A new sub-question (Q19a) has been added to assess whether companies describe how they use welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in their operations or supply chain. This question is looking for descriptions of how welfare outcome measure data are used to help drive continuous improvement, or as indicators for corrective action.

New questions have also been added within the new *Farm Animal Welfare Targets* pillar on whether companies have clear, time-bound targets for:

- ending the use of cages (battery and enriched/colony) for laying hens (Q24);
- achieving the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment (Q25);
- ending the use of gestation/sow stalls for sows, throughout pregnancy and during the observation period (Q26);
- ending the use of farrowing crates for sows (Q27); and
- ending the use of tethering for dairy cows (Q28).

These questions have been added to introduce a specific focus on time-bound targets for key animal welfare improvements. The setting of time-bound targets is the critical step required for policy commitments to be translated into action and, thereby, performance impact.

The number of species-specific Performance Impact questions has been expanded to 18, from eight in 2021. These now cover beef cattle and farmed salmon, in addition to laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cattle, with three questions per species. The two Performance Impact questions on maximum transport times and pre-slaughter stunning which apply to all species have been retained from the 2021 assessment criteria. The focus of each of the species-specific Performance Impact questions (Q30-47) is detailed in Appendix III.

The scoring of the Performance Impact questions has also been adjusted, to make the points scale exponential rather than linear (i.e., awarding fewer points for lower levels of performance).

For example, in 2021, a company would have received 5 points for reporting that 50% of the eggs in their global supply chain were cage-free. In 2022, it is proposed they receive 3 points. It is also proposed that this scale could be adjusted further in future assessments, for welfare topics that are regarded as more mature.

Percentage Impact (Progress) Reported	2022 Points Scale	2021 Points Scale
1-20%	1	1
21-40%	2	3
41-60%	3	5
61-80%	5	7
81-98%	7	9
99-100%	10	10

Eight new questions have been introduced on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. These follow the same structure as the questions on farm animal welfare, with questions under each pillar of the assessment: *Policy Commitments*; *Governance & Management*; *Targets*; and *Performance Impact*. As previously described, for the purposes of weighting within the overall score, these questions are grouped within one *Animal-Sourced Foods* pillar.

The questions on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods assess the following:

- a company's acknowledgement of the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue (Q13);
- policies on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (Q14);
- explanations of the policy scope (Q15);
- board/senior management and operational responsibility for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (Q22);
- customer communications and awareness-raising activities (Q23);
- time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (Q29);
- reporting on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) (Q50);
- reporting on progress towards its targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (Q51).

Eleven questions that previously featured as part of the assessment criteria have been removed. These are the questions that assessed:

- company commitments to genetic engineering and cloning (Q6 in 2021), due to the need to review developments on this topic that may prove beneficial to animal welfare,
- growth promoting substances (Q7 in 2021), due to the challenge of effectively assessing company positions on this issue,

- explanations of progress on objectives and targets and explanations of progress on welfare outcome measures (Q14 and Q27 in 2021), due to the greater focus being placed on Performance Impact questions,
- research and development and industry initiatives (Q18 in 2021), due to the difficulty of assessing whether these initiatives are advancing animal welfare, and
- the six Performance Reporting questions (Q20-25 in 2021), as these provided potential for double-scoring against the expanded number of Performance Impact questions.

### Consultation questions:

6. Do you agree with the proposal to add new questions on whether companies have commitments: to ending the use of high-performance breeds; to not produce or sell foie gras; and to ending the use of other inhumane practices?
7. Do you agree with the proposal to expand the question on whether companies have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics to also cover metaphylactic use?
8. Do you agree with the proposal to add a new sub-question on whether companies describe how they use welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in their operations or supply chain?
9. Do you agree with the proposal to add new questions on whether companies have clear, time-bound targets for specific welfare improvements for laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cows?
10. Do you agree with the proposal to add new species-specific Performance Impact questions, covering beef cattle and farmed salmon, in addition to laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cattle (resulting in three questions per species)?
11. Do you agree with the proposal to adjust the scoring of the Performance Impact questions to make the points scale exponential rather than linear (i.e., awarding fewer points for lower levels of performance)?
12. Do you agree with the proposal to introduce the eight new questions on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?
13. Do you agree with the proposal to remove the eleven questions that previously featured as part of the assessment criteria?
14. Do you have any comments on any further changes to the assessment criteria beyond those summarised above?
15. Are there any other changes or amendments to the Benchmark assessment criteria you would like to propose?

## Part V: Wider Benchmark Revisions

The proposed BBFAW 2022 assessment criteria contain 51 questions with a maximum of 435 points available, compared to 37 questions and a maximum of 305 points in 2021. The scale of the proposed changes to the assessment criteria and the weighting of the assessment pillars is sufficiently large that it will not be possible to draw meaningful comparisons between company scores under the 2021 and 2022 assessment criteria.

### Summary of proposals:

- BBFAW is seeking feedback on how to communicate the benchmark results. One option being considered is to not publish a named ranking of companies following the 2022 company assessments, in order to provide time for companies to understand how they perform under the new assessment criteria.

Given the scale of the proposed changes to the criteria, we are seeking feedback on how to communicate the benchmark results whilst avoiding drawing comparison between company scores under the 2021 and 2022 assessment criteria.

One option being considered is to *not* publish a named ranking of companies following the 2022 company assessments, in order to provide time for companies to fully understand how they perform under the new assessment criteria and respond accordingly. If a named ranking of companies was not published, companies would still receive a confidential report on their assessment, including their overall score and how they rank within the full scope of companies and by sub-sector. The results of the BBFAW 2023 company assessments will be published in a ranking in April 2024.

We are keen to continually evolve our approach to evaluating and reporting on the state of farm animal welfare management and reporting across the food industry, and to establish the Benchmark's extended role in assessing companies' actions to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods. We also recognise the importance of retaining the Benchmark's global relevance. As such, we are also keen to understand how we can further develop our methodology and our reporting to remain relevant to developments taking place in the global marketplace, to reflect best practice and to maximise the Benchmark's usefulness to investors, companies and other stakeholders.

### Consultation questions:

16. Do you have suggestions for how to communicate the 2022 benchmark results whilst avoiding drawing comparison between company scores under the 2021 and 2022 assessment criteria?



17. Do you have any comments on the option of *not* publishing a named ranking of companies following the 2022 company assessments, in order to provide time for companies to understand how they perform under the new assessment criteria?
18. Do you have any wider reflections on how the Benchmark might be developed over time?

# Appendix I: Proposed company scope

Note: Proposed changes are shown in red.

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

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

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

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

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

	Sanderson Farms	Public	3570: Food Producer	
139.	Saputo Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	Canada
140.	Seaboard Corp	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
141.	Terrena Group	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	France
142.	Tönnies Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Germany
143.	Tyson Foods Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
144.	Unilever NV	Public	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
145.	US Foods	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
146.	Vion Food Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
147.	Wens Foodstuffs Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
148.	WH Group Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	China
149.	Yili Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	China
150.	Zhongpin Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	China/USA

## Appendix II: Proposed Weighting of the Assessment Pillars

Pillar	BBFAW 2022	
	No. of Points	Weighting
Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments	64	15%
Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management	56	14%
Farm Animal Welfare Targets	40	7%
Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact*	200	55%
<b>Farm Animal Welfare Total</b>	<b>360</b>	
Animal-Sourced Foods Policy Commitments	25	
Animal-Sourced Foods Governance and Management	20	
Animal-Sourced Foods Targets	10	
Animal-Sourced Foods Performance Impact	20	
<b>Animal-Sourced Foods Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*For the species-specific Performance Impact questions (Q30-47), we will only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We will assess relevant questions and use the average scores to calculate the overall score for these questions.*



# Appendix III: Proposed 2022 Benchmark assessment criteria

## Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments

<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 relevant 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. Recognising animals as sentient beings provides a strong foundation for animal welfare policies.	
<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.	2.5
	The company identifies farm animal welfare as a relevant business issue and recognises farm animals as sentient beings.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</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 relevant business issue and that farm animals are sentient beings.</li> <li>• Companies that publish policies that address farm animal welfare, even if they do not explain why this is relevant to the business, are awarded points.</li> <li>• Companies that acknowledge farm animal welfare as a relevant business issue and/or set out the reasons why it might be a business issue (e.g. because of public or customer concerns, security and sustainability of supply, cost, etc.) are awarded points.</li> <li>• Maximum points are awarded to companies that also recognise farm animals as sentient beings.</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).</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 2.</b>	<b>Does the company publish an overarching 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 within a policy statement (or equivalent).	2.5
	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.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</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 that provides a starting point for the company's accountability to its stakeholders are awarded a score of 2.5 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, 4-10 and 22-39.</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, 4-10 and 22-39.</li> <li>• Companies that supplement these commitments or principles with details of how these are to be implemented are awarded a score of 5 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> </ul> </li> </ul>	

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

<b>Question 3.</b>	<b>Does the farm animal welfare policy 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.	1.5
	Scope is universal across all geographies.	3
<i>3b. Species scope</i>		
	Species scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified species.	1.5
	Scope is universal across all relevant species.	3
<i>3c. Product scope</i>		
	Product scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified products (such as own-brand products).	1.5
	Scope is universal across own brand and other brand products.	3
	<b>(Max Score 9)</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 3 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> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 3 points for these sub-questions. When unclear, 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 partial 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 commitment to ending the use of close confinement for all species?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Many of the most significant farm animal welfare concerns result from close confinement practices (e.g. cages (battery, enriched/colony and combination/limited access systems) for laying hens; cages for rabbits and other poultry; gestation/sow stalls and farrowing crates for sows; concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs or feedlots) for beef cattle; permanent housing for dairy cows and beef cattle; single penning, tethering, veal crates for young ruminants; force-feeding systems; and, for finfish, recirculating aquaculture systems and close confinement of solitary finfish species, e.g. turbot) 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>	Not addressed.	0

	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Companies that simply mention they avoid close confinement but do not state the specific confinement to be avoided receive zero points.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. 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 any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their 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. When unclear, we ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks.</li> <li>• Regarding gestation/sow stalls, this question is looking for commitments that do not allow any time in stalls, except for a maximum of 4 hours for management purposes. Companies are expected to state the maximum time permitted within their policies and reporting.</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 partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 5.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to the provision of effective, species-specific enrichment for all species?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>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; for fish, physical enrichment such as (artificial) plants, floor substrates and structures, as well as sensory enrichment, such as cover or lighting, or occupational enrichment such as currents or water flow to induce swimming exercise. 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. See the BBFAW briefing paper on environmental enrichment for further guidance on suitable forms of enrichment per species.</p>	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Companies that simply mention they provide environmental enrichment but do not state the specific environmental enrichment to be provided, receive zero points.</li> <li>• 'Enriched' cages are not awarded points.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. 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 any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their 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. When unclear, 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 partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 6.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of routine mutilations for all species?</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 and any type of flight restraint in poultry, branding with hot irons, as well as disbudding/dehorning of ruminants and tail docking and castration in ruminants and pigs (surgical, rubber rings or clamping), tooth resection in pigs, and fin clipping in finfish aquaculture.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Companies that simply mention they avoid routine mutilations, but do not state the specific mutilations to be avoided, receive zero points.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) mutilations are still commonly performed under derogations (c) a</li> </ul>	

	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their 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. When unclear, 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 partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>
--	---

<p><b>Question 7.</b></p>	<p><b>Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic and metaphylactic use of antibiotics for all species?</b></p>
<p><b>Rationale</b></p>	<p>Prophylaxis is the treatment of animals without clinical sign of disease. Metaphylaxis is the treatment of a group of animals when some within the group are showing clinical signs of disease.</p> <p>The over-use of antibiotics in humans and in animals is directly linked to the increase in antibiotic resistance. The use of antibiotics on-farm (typically through feed or water) is frequently prophylactic or metaphylactic; 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. 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. Points are not awarded for supply chains marketed as antibiotic-free, e.g., 'no antibiotics ever' due</p>



	to the incentive this creates to withhold antibiotics from animals in need of treatment.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. 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 any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their 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. When unclear, 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 partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 8.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to ending long-distance live transport for all species?</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; less than 4 hours for poultry and rabbits, and less than 8 hours for other species. Unweaned animals, heavily pregnant animals and animals unfit for transport should not be transported. Transport of animals exceeding these limits, including loading and 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>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. 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 any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their 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. When unclear,</li> </ul>	

	<p>we ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 9.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to the use of humane methods of pre-slaughter stunning for all species?</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. For poultry, controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion, should be used. For pigs, this question is looking for commitments to end the use of high concentration CO2 gas systems. For salmon and trout, this question is looking for commitments to use percussion or electrical methods. For other fish this question is looking for commitments to end the use of ice slurry.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. 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 any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their policies.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. When unclear, 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 partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 10.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of high-performance breeds?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Breeds selected for high growth rate, lean meat deposition and high feed conversion efficiency can suffer a range of physiological and metabolic health issues, as well as poor immunity and lethargy and poor behavioural expression.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. 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 any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made</li> </ul>	

	<p>explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their 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. When unclear, 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 partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 11.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment not to produce or sell foie gras?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Welfare issues associated with the production of foie gras include over-feeding, force-feeding (gavage) and the close confinement of ducks and geese within cages.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• This question is assessed for all companies, not only those that have ducks or geese in their supply chains.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. 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</li> </ul>	

	<p>that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• Partial policies, which are limited to certain species, products or geographies, 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. When unclear, we ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 12.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of other inhumane practices?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Practices covered by this question include the culling of day-old male chicks in egg supply chains; cow-calf separation; fully slatted flooring; and live plucking or live harvesting for geese.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• This question is only assessed for companies that have laying hens, dairy cattle, beef cattle or geese in their supply chains.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. 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 any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made</li> </ul>	

	<p>explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their 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. When unclear, we ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Animal-Sourced Foods Policy Commitments**

<b>Question 13.</b>	<b>Does the company acknowledge the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, which may be achieved directly or through protein diversification, is key to ensuring that all animals farmed for food are able to be produced in high welfare systems capable of delivering a good quality of life, and that the food system contributes to planetary and human health. It is good practice for food companies to identify whether and why this is a relevant issue for the business.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is regarded as a relevant business issue.	0
	The company identifies reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods as a relevant business issue.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for an acknowledgement by the parent company that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue.</li> <li>• Companies that publish policies that address reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, even if they do not explain why this is relevant to the business, are awarded points.</li> <li>• Companies that acknowledge reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods as a relevant business issue and/or set out the reasons why it may</li> </ul>	

	<p>be a business issue (e.g. because of public or customer concerns, security and sustainability of supply, cost, etc.) are awarded points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The score does not take account of the importance assigned by companies to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (e.g. relative to other corporate responsibility issues).</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 14.</b>	<b>Does the company publish an overarching policy (or equivalent) on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	It is good practice for companies to formalise their approach to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods in a policy (or equivalent document such as a statement of guiding principles, a code of practice or a sourcing charter). Reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation, changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation). While the existence of a policy may not provide a guarantee of implementation, the absence of a policy is a clear sign that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is not firmly on the business agenda.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence of a formal policy statement (or equivalent) on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	0
	The company has a broad commitment to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods within a policy statement (or equivalent).	5
	The company has a broad commitment to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods 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 policies on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods and companies that incorporate reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice.</li> <li>Companies that publish a clear statement of commitment to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods that provides a starting point for the company's accountability to its stakeholders are awarded 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 17 and 40.</li> <li>Companies that supplement these commitments or principles with details of how these are to be implemented are awarded a score of 10</li> </ul>	



	<p>points. To score maximum points, company farm animal welfare policies need to include most/all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— A clear statement of the reasons why reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is important to the business (including both the business case and the ethical case for action)</li> <li>— A description of how reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is to be achieved, such as through protein diversification, product reformulation or communication to consumers</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>
--	---

<b>Question 15.</b>	<b>Does the policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods provide a clear explanation of scope?</b>	
<i>Rationale</i>	Understanding the scope of a policy is important to understand the breadth of a company's commitment to action on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	
<i>Scoring</i>		
<i>15a. Geographic scope</i>		
	Geographic scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified geographies.	2.5
	Scope is universal across all geographies.	5
<i>15b. Business division scope</i>		
	Business division scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified business divisions.	2.5
	Scope is universal across all business divisions.	5
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<i>Explanatory Notes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only scored if marks have been awarded for Question 14, i.e. when the company has a published policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.</li> <li>• The sub-questions on geography and products are scored separately (i.e. companies could score up to 5 points in each of the two sub-</li> </ul>	

	<p>questions, and the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores awarded for the other sub-question).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across business divisions. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their policies.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management**

<b>Question 16.</b>	<b>Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for farm animal welfare?</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 effectively managed.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
	<i>16a. 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>16b. 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</li> </ul>	

	<p>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).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 17.</b>	<b>Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its farm animal welfare policies are effectively implemented?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	The effective implementation of a 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>17a. 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>17b. 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,</li> </ul>	

	<p>the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 cover farm animal welfare.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

<b>Question 18.</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>18a. 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	1.5
	The company incorporates farm animal welfare into contractual obligations for suppliers across all species, products and geographies.	3
<i>18b. 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.	3
<i>18c. 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.	3
		<b>(Max score 9)</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 partial 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 3 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, 3 points are awarded to companies that publish case studies or examples and/or provide a more comprehensive description of their approach. The award of 3 points is not dependent on the number or proportion of suppliers receiving this support and/or education. A number of companies described their support to suppliers on a range of supply chain issues. However, unless it is clear that this support also covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 19.</b>	<b>Does the company describe and report on its use of 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), as well as qualitative Behavioural Assessment (such as animals being content, happy, or fearful, agitated). 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 and cull rates, disease incidence.</li> <li>For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, feather cleanliness, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter.</li> <li>For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate, longevity, ease of calving, lesions, swellings, cleanliness, stomach ulcers, acidosis.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For sows: Longevity, lameness, body condition, shoulder and vulva lesions, ear and flank biting.</li> <li>• For pigs: lameness, cleanliness, tail bites, fight marks, bursitis and other lesions.</li> <li>• For broiler chickens: gait score, leg culls, footpad dermatitis, hock burn, breast blisters, feather cleanliness, muscle myopathies.</li> <li>• For beef: body condition, lameness, lesions, swellings, cleanliness, stomach ulcers, acidosis.</li> <li>• For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition.</li> <li>• For fish: fin and body damage, sea lice and other ectoparasite infestations, skeletal deformities, condition factor, mortality and behaviour.</li> <li>• For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort; qualitative behavioural analysis.</li> <li>• For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, bathing (ducks), socialising, swimming (fish).</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>		
<i>19a. Does the company describe how it uses welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain?</i>		
	No information provided on how the company uses welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain.	0
	The company describes how welfare outcome measures are used to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain.	2
<i>19b. Does the company report on welfare outcome measures (i.e. measures linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?</i>		
	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 7)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the sub-question on how welfare outcome measures are used to inform continuous improvement in a company's operations or supply chain, points are awarded to companies that provide a clear description of their approach to using welfare outcome measures. This may include description of how welfare outcome measure data are used to help drive continuous improvement, or as indicators for corrective action.</li> <li>• The sub-question on reporting is looking for explicit, quantitative reporting on welfare outcome measures such as:</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mortality rates (as an indicator of potential pain, suffering and suboptimal performance), for fish: mortality or 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 in poultry 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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), as these are often related to high levels of production thereby affecting welfare. Points are not awarded for production measures (e.g. egg output).</li> <li>● Similarly, scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm animal welfare standards but do not report on the welfare outcomes resulting from the implementation of these standards.</li> <li>● Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 20.</b>	<b>Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	Farm assurance schemes provide frameworks and auditing 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
	100% of products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard.	2
	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).	4
	100% of products audited to higher welfare (or company equivalent) assurance standard.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the purposes of this question, we assess farm assurance schemes as either providing a basic or higher standard of animal welfare. Higher welfare schemes include indoor and outdoor (free range, organic) production systems.</li> <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); 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), VPF (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 through input requirements, 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. Examples of higher welfare schemes include: Animal Welfare Approved; AEBEA levels A, B, C (France), Better Animal Welfare (Denmark); Beter Leven; Certified Humane; European Organic Certification; Global Animal Partnership (GAP 5-Step); KRAV; Neuland; Soil Association Organic; RSPCA Assured; Red Tractor Enhanced Welfare and Free-range; Label Rouge (for poultry, but not pigs).</li> <li>Companies may have developed their own higher welfare standards that they audit their suppliers against. Where this is the case, we need a clear description of how the company standard compares to the relevant basic or higher welfare assurance standards outlined above in order for points to be awarded.</li> <li>If companies audit against other voluntary schemes that claim to incorporate animal welfare components but without specifying them,</li> </ul>	



	they will typically not receive any point, unless they provide a clear description of the farm animal welfare requirements of such standards.
--	---

<b>Question 21.</b>	<b>Does the company communicate to customers on higher farm animal welfare 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 communicating to customers on higher farm animal welfare.	0
	At least one example of communicating to customers on higher farm animal welfare.	5
	Multiple examples of communicating to customers on higher farm animal welfare.	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 these issues 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>• 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 animal welfare are awarded five points, unless it is clear that these are linked to separate consumer engagement programmes or themes.</li> <li>• Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to communicate to consumers.</li> </ul>	

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

**Animal-Sourced Foods Governance and Management**

<b>Question 22.</b>	<b>Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	When looking at the management of reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, which may be achieved through protein diversification, both oversight and implementation responsibilities are important. Oversight is necessary to ensure that senior management is aware of the business implications of reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods and is prepared to intervene when needed (e.g. if there are tensions between the organisation's policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods 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 reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. It is, therefore, important that there are individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is implemented and effectively managed.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
<i>22a. Management responsibility</i>		
	No clearly defined management responsibility.	0
	The company has published details of the management position with responsibility for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods on a day-to-day basis.	5
<i>22b. 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 policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	5
	<b>(Max score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question recognises reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation, changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation). Points may therefore be awarded for clear statements of day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for protein diversification, provided the company has made clear that protein diversification is</li> </ul>	

	<p>being pursued as a route to achieving reductions in consumption of animal-sourced foods.</p> <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 reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods on a day-to-day basis and 5 points for publishing details of senior management responsibility for overseeing the policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods).</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 reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (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 reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods 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 reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. General information on the management or oversight of CSR or sustainability is only credited if it is clear that this includes reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 23.</b>	<b>Does the company communicate to customers on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods through education and/or awareness-raising activities?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies have an important role to play in raising awareness of reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods among their customers and clients. This, in turn, should contribute to shifts in dietary consumption away from animal-sourced foods.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence of communicating to customers on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	0
	At least one example of communicating to customers on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	5
	Multiple examples of communicating to customers on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question recognises reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation, changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation). Points may therefore be awarded for evidence of communications to consumers on protein diversification, provided the company</li> </ul>	

	<p>has made clear that protein diversification is being pursued as a route to achieving reductions in consumption of animal-sourced foods.</p> <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 information on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods or protein diversification on the company's website. Note: This is not just about providing information in the corporate responsibility section of the website but making these issues 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.</li> <li>○ Customer farm visits, seminars or roundtables.</li> <li>○ Social media campaigns.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Initiatives aimed at showing how products are sourced or produced but without an explicit focus on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods are not scored in the assessment.</li> <li>• Companies that produce multiple consumer-facing videos on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods are awarded five points, unless it is clear that these are linked to separate consumer engagement programmes or themes.</li> <li>• Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to communicate 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>	
--	---	--

**Farm Animal Welfare Targets**

**Laying Hens**

<b>Question 24.</b>	<b>Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of cages (battery and enriched/colony) for laying hens, or provide evidence that this has already been achieved?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company publishes a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	5
	The company publishes a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 for a clear target for ending the use of cages (battery and enriched/colony) for laying hens within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved. It is anticipated that this question will expand in scope to also cover combination and limited access systems in future assessments.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of cages. 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 cages are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits cages 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 cages).</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> </ul>	

**Broiler Chickens**

Question 25.	<b>Does the company publish a clear target for achieving the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment for broiler chickens as a minimum, or provide evidence that this has already been achieved?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company publishes a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	5
	The company publishes a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 for a clear target for achieving the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment for broiler chickens as a minimum, by 2030 in North America and by 2026 in Europe, or evidence that this has already been achieved (see <a href="http://www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/">www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/</a>).</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant 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 the relevant practices are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the relevant practices).</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> </ul>	

Pigs

<b>Question 26.</b>	<b>Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of gestation/sow stalls for sows, throughout pregnancy and during the observation period, or provide evidence that this has already been achieved?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company publishes a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	2.5
	The company publishes a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant 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 only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking for a clear target for ending the use of gestation/sow stalls for sows, throughout pregnancy and during the observation period, within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of gestation/sow stalls. 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 gestation/sow stalls are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits gestation/sow stalls 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 gestation/sow stalls).</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> </ul>	
<b>Question 27.</b>	<b>Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of farrowing crates for sows, or provide evidence this has already been achieved?</b>	

<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company publishes a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	2.5
	The company publishes a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant 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 only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking for a clear target for ending the use of farrowing crates for sows within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of farrowing crates. 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 farrowing crates are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits farrowing crates 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 farrowing crates).</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> </ul>	

### Dairy Cows

<b>Question 28.</b>	<b>Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of tethering for dairy cows, or provide evidence this has already been achieved?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0



	The company publishes a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	5
	The company publishes a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 for a clear target for ending the use of tethering for dairy cows within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of tethering. 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 tethering are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits tethering 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 tethering).</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> </ul>	

### Animal-Sourced Foods Targets

<b>Question 29.</b>	<b>Has the company set time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No published time-bound targets.	0

	The company publishes a partial time-bound target and the scope (in terms of geography or business division) is clearly defined.	5
	The company publishes a universal time-bound target, across all geographies and business divisions.	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, time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods within a reasonable timeframe.</li> <li>This question recognises reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation, changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation). Points may therefore be awarded for targets on protein diversification provided the company has made clear that protein diversification is being pursued as a route to achieving reductions in consumption of animal-sourced foods.</li> <li>We do not award points for targets adopted for other purposes (e.g. quality), unless reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is an explicit aim of these targets.</li> <li>For the purposes of scoring, we do not differentiate between targets relating to process (e.g. to formalise management systems, to introduce reporting) and performance (e.g. to achieve a specific reduction).</li> </ul>	

## Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact

### Laying Hens

<b>Question 30.</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 should report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free. 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.	2
	41 – 60% of laying hens is cage-free.	3
	61 – 80% of laying hens is cage-free.	5
	81 – 98% of laying hens is cage-free.	7
	99 – 100% of laying hens is cage-free.	10

	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 laying hens in the company's global supply chain that is cage-free, including battery and enriched/colony cages. It is anticipated that this question will expand in scope to also cover combination and limited access systems in future assessments.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of laying hens affected. Companies that report on the total number of laying hens 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 are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of laying hens managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about "Our laying hens" or "All laying hens" being cage-free 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 laying hens ...').</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 31.</b>	<b>What proportion of laying hens (for shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients) 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. 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.	2
	41 – 60% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	3
	61 – 80% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	5
	81 – 98% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	7

	99 – 100% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 laying hens in the company’s global supply chain that is 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, (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 free from beak trimming or tipping but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about “Our laying hens” or “All chickens” being free from beak trimming or tipping are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our animals...’).</li> <li>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 (for shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients) in the company’s global supply chain is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	1
	21 – 40% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	2
	41 – 60% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	3

	61 – 80% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	5
	81 – 98% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	7
	99 – 100% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 laying hens in the company's global supply chain that is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.</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, (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 from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</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 from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our laying hens" or "All chickens" being from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed (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>	

**Broiler Chickens**

<b>Question 33.</b>	<b>What proportion of broiler chickens (for fresh/frozen chicken products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 30kg/m<sup>2</sup> or 6lbs/sq ft or less)?</b>
---------------------	---

<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 30kg/m <sup>2</sup> or 6lbs/sq ft or less). 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.	2
	41 – 60% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	3
	61 – 80% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	5
	81 – 98% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	7
	99 – 100% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 chickens in the company's global supply chain that is reared at lower stocking densities, specifically, 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> or 6Lbs/sq ft or less.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of broiler chickens affected. Companies that report on the total number of broiler chickens affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of broiler chickens 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 broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities, but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens 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 broiler chickens" being reared at lower stocking densities are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that is free from close confinement (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our broiler chickens ...').</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 34.</b>	<b>What proportion of broiler chickens (for fresh/frozen chicken products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is from approved breeds with improved welfare outcomes or with a slower growth potential)?</b>
---------------------	--

<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes or with a slower growth potential. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of products is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	1
	21 – 40% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	2
	41 – 60% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	3
	61 – 80% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	5
	81 – 98% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	7
	99 – 100% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 chickens in the company's global supply chain that is from approved breeds with improved welfare outcomes or with a slower growth potential, defined as &lt;35g/d averaged over the growth cycle according to the breeding company specification (see <a href="http://www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/">www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/</a>).</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of broiler chickens affected. Companies that report on the total number of broiler chickens affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of broiler chickens 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 broiler chickens that is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes or a slower growth potential but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the breeds with improved welfare outcomes or with slower growth potential in line with these standards.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Companies that make general statements about "Our broiler chickens" or "All broiler chickens" being from breeds with improved welfare outcomes or a slower growth potential are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes or slower growth potential (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our broiler chickens ...').</li> <li>Where companies report on their own breeds with improved welfare outcomes or 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 or a slower growth potential.</li> <li>We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy-to-understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by this data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 35.</b>	<b>What proportion of broiler chickens (for fresh/frozen chicken products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion?</b>	
<i>Rationale</i>	Companies should report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion. For all companies, this question applies to all products (own-brand and other).	
<i>Scoring</i>	0% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	1
	21 – 40% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	2
	41 – 60% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	3
	61 – 80% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	5
	81 – 98% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	7
	99 – 100% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	10



	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 chickens in the company's global supply chain that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of broiler chickens affected. Companies that reported on the total number of broiler chickens affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of broiler chickens 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 broiler chickens that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of broiler chickens managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our broiler chickens" or "All broiler chickens" being subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our broiler chickens ...').</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>

**Pigs**

<b>Question 36.</b>	<b>What proportion of sows (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from gestation/sow stalls?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation/sow stalls throughout pregnancy and during the observation period. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.

<b>Scoring</b>	0% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	1
	21 – 40% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	2
	41 – 60% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	3
	61 – 80% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	5
	81 – 98% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	7
	99 – 100% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	10
		<b>(Max Score 10)</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 sows in the company's global supply chain that is free from gestation/sow stalls throughout pregnancy and during the observation period (i.e are group housed from weaning to pre-farrowing).</li> <li>• This question is looking for commitments that do not allow any time in stalls, except for a maximum of 4 hours for management purposes. Companies are expected to state the maximum time permitted within their policies and reporting.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of sows affected. Companies that report on the total number of sows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of sows 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 sows that is free from gestation/sow stalls but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of sows managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation/sow stalls in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our sows" or "All sows" being free from gestation/sow stalls are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation/sow stalls (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our sows...').</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 37.</b>	<b>What proportion of sows (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from farrowing crates?</b>
---------------------	---

<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of sows that is free from farrowing crates. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of sows is free from farrowing crates, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	1
	21 – 40% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	2
	41 – 60% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	3
	61 – 80% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	5
	81 – 98% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	7
	99 – 100% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 sows in the company's global supply chain that is free from farrowing crates.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of sows affected. Companies that report on the total number of sows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of sows 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 sows that is free from farrowing crates but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of sows managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of sows that is free from farrowing crates in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our sows" or "All sows" being free from farrowing crates are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of sows that is free from farrowing crates (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our sows...').</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 38.</b>	<b>What proportion of pigs (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) 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. 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.	2
	41 – 60% of pigs is free from tail docking.	3
	61 – 80% of pigs is free from tail docking.	5
	81 – 98% of pigs is free from tail docking.	7
	99 – 100% of pigs is free from tail docking.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 pigs in the company's global supply chain that is free from tail docking.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of pigs affected. Companies that reported on the total number of pigs affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of pigs 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 pigs that are free from tail docking but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of pigs 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 pigs...').</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>	

### Dairy Cows

<b>Question 39.</b>	<b>What proportion of dairy cattle (for fresh/frozen milk or milk products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from tethering?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from tethering. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.

<b>Scoring</b>	0% of dairy cows is free from tethering, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	1
	21 – 40% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	2
	41 – 60 of dairy cows is free from tethering.	3
	61 – 80% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	5
	81 – 98% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	7
	99 – 100% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that is free from tethering.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of dairy cows affected. Companies that report on the total number of dairy cows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of dairy cows 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 dairy cows that is free from tethering but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows 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 dairy 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 dairy cows...').</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 40.</b>	<b>What proportion of dairy cattle (for fresh/frozen milk or milk products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is provided with pasture access?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is provided with pasture access (at least 6 hours per day for 120 days per year). For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access, or no reported information.	0

	1 – 20% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	1
	21 – 40% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	2
	41 – 60 of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	3
	61 – 80% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	5
	81 – 98% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	7
	99 – 100% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that is provided with pasture access for at least 6 hours per day for 120 days per year.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of dairy cows affected. Companies that report on the total number of dairy cows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of dairy cows 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 dairy cows that is provided with pasture access but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is provided with pasture access in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being provided with pasture access are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that is provided with pasture access (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our dairy cows...').</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 41.</b>	<b>What proportion of dairy cows (for fresh/frozen milk or milk products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from disbudding/dehorning?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning, or no reported information.	0

	1 – 20% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	1
	21 – 40% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	2
	41 – 60% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	3
	61 – 80% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	5
	81 – 98% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	7
	99 – 100% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that is free from disbudding/dehorning.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of dairy cows affected. Companies that reported on the total number of dairy cows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of dairy cows 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 dairy cows that is free from disbudding/dehorning but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from disbudding/dehorning in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being free from disbudding/dehorning are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from disbudding/dehorning (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our dairy cows ...').</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>	

**Beef Cattle**

<b>Question 42.</b>	<b>What proportion of beef cattle (for fresh/frozen beef products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots?</b>
---------------------	--

<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	1
	21 – 40% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	2
	41 – 60 of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	3
	61 – 80% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	5
	81 – 98% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	7
	99 – 100% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 beef or beef-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of beef cattle in the company's global supply chain that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots. CAFOs and feedlots are defined as systems in which beef cattle are kept at high stocking densities, indoors on fully slatted or solid floors or outdoors, and there is no opportunity for grazing, instead, feed is brought to the animals.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of beef cattle affected. Companies that report on the total number of beef cattle affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of beef cattle 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 beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of beef cattle managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our beef cattle" or "All beef cattle" being free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our beef cattle ...').</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 43.</b>	<b>What proportion of beef cattle (for fresh/frozen beef products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is group housed throughout rearing?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is group housed throughout rearing, including calves from birth (minimum pairs) and calves originating from the dairy supply. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	1
	21 – 40% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	2
	41 – 60% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	3
	61 – 80% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	5
	81 – 98% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	7
	99 – 100% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 beef or beef-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of beef cattle in the company's global supply chain that is group housed throughout rearing.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of beef cattle affected. Companies that reported on the total number of beef cattle affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of beef cattle 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 beef cattle that is group housed throughout rearing but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of beef cattle managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of beef cattle that is group housed throughout rearing in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our beef cattle" or "All beef cattle" being group housed throughout rearing are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of beef cattle that is group housed throughout rearing (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our beef cattle ...').</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 44.</b>	<b>What proportion of beef cattle (for fresh/frozen beef products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from disbudding/dehorning?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	1
	21 – 40% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	2
	41 – 60% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	3
	61 – 80% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	5
	81 – 98% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	7
	99 – 100% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 beef or beef-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of beef cattle in the company's global supply chain that is free from disbudding/dehorning.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of beef cattle affected. Companies that reported on the total number of beef cattle affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of beef cattle 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 beef cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of beef cattle managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our beef cattle" or "All beef cattle" being free from disbudding/dehorning are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our beef cattle ...').</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</li> </ul>	

	represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.
--	--

**Farmed Salmon**

<b>Question 45.</b>	<b>What proportion of farmed salmon (for fresh/frozen salmon products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 10kg/m<sup>3</sup> or less)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	1
	21 – 40% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	2
	41 – 60 of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	3
	61 – 80% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	5
	81 – 98% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	7
	99 – 100% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 farmed salmon or farmed salmon-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon in the company's global supply chain that is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 10kg/m<sup>3</sup> or less).</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of farmed salmon affected. Companies that report on the total number of farmed salmon affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of farmed salmon 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 farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of farmed salmon managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our farmed salmon" or "All farmed salmon" being reared at lower stocking densities are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of</li> </ul>	

	<p>farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our farmed salmon ...').</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 46.</b>	<b>What proportion of farmed salmon (for fresh/frozen salmon products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	1
	21 – 40% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	2
	41 – 60% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	3
	61 – 80% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	5
	81 – 98% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	7
	99 – 100% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 farmed salmon or products containing farmed salmon.</li> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon in the company's global supply chain that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of farmed salmon affected. Companies that reported on the total number of farmed salmon affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of farmed salmon 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 farmed salmon that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of farmed salmon managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about “Our farmed salmon” or “All farmed salmon” being free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our farmed salmon ...’).</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 47.</b>	<b>What proportion of farmed salmon (for fresh/frozen salmon products and ingredients) in the company’s global supply chain is stun-killed using percussion or electrocution or is pre-slaughter stunned using effective percussion or electrocution followed up by a kill method before recovery of consciousness?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is stun-killed using percussion or electrocution or is pre-slaughter stunned using effective percussion or electrocution followed up by a kill method before recovery of consciousness. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	1
	21 – 40% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	2
	41 – 60% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	3
	61 – 80% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	5
	81 – 98% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	7
	99 – 100% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</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 farmed salmon or products containing farmed salmon.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon in the company’s global supply chain that is stun-killed using percussion or electrocution or is pre-slaughter stunned using effective percussion or electrocution followed up by a kill method before recovery of consciousness.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of farmed salmon affected. Companies that reported on the total number of farmed salmon affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of farmed salmon used or processed</li> </ul>	

	<p>globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is effectively stunned and killed but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of farmed salmon managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is effectively stunned and killed in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about “Our farmed salmon” or “All farmed salmon” being effectively stunned and killed are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon that is effectively stunned and killed (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our farmed salmon ...’).</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>
--	--

**All Species**

<b>Question 48.</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>	Companies should report on the proportion of animals that is transported within specified maximum journey times. 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; less than 4 hours for poultry and rabbits, and less than 8 hours for other species. Transport of animals exceeding these limits, including loading and unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. For all companies, this question applies to all products (own-brand and other).	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	1
	21 – 40% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	2
	41 – 60% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	3
	61 – 80% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	5

	81 – 98% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	7
	99 – 100% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is assessed for all companies.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the company’s global supply chain that are transported within specified maximum journey times.</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 (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of animals that is transported within specified maximum journey times but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</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 within specified maximum journey times 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 within specified maximum journey times (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 49.</b>	<b>What proportion of animals (including fin fish) in the company’s global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of animals that is pre-slaughter stunned. It is essential to render an animal unconscious (through for example captive bolt and stun-to-kill methods including electrical stunning, gas stunning) before the animal is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. 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.	2
	41 – 60% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	3
	61 – 80% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	5
	81 – 98% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	7
	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 assessed for all companies.</li> <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 (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) 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 are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that is pre-slaughter stunned in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being pre-slaughter stunned are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• 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>	

**Animal-Sourced Foods Performance Reporting**

<b>Question 50.</b>	<b>Does the company report on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs)?</b>
---------------------	--



<b>Rationale</b>	Companies are expected to publish volumes of animal-sourced foods by type, increasing transparency of the extent to which the company is reliant on animal-sourced foods. Volumes may be reported as numbers of animals.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs).	0
	The company reports on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs), but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	5
	The company reports fully on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs), covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	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 volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) in the company's supply chain.</li> <li>Reporting should reflect volumes, by weight, of product sold (for companies in the Retailers and Wholesalers, and Restaurants and Bars sub-sectors) or produced (for companies in the Producers and Manufacturers sub-sector). Alternatively, numbers of animals may be reported.</li> <li>Volumes of different forms of meat, dairy, fish or eggs may be reported separately or combined. For example, one combined volume of meat may be reported for pork, beef and poultry. However, this question is looking for volumes of each category (meat, dairy, fish and eggs) to be reported separately.</li> <li>For maximum points, the question is looking for reporting that covers all relevant geographies, species and products, and encompasses all products containing meat, dairy, fish or eggs as ingredients.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 51.</b>	<b>Does the company report on progress towards its targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to develop reporting criteria and publish details of progress made against targets set for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on progress towards targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	0
	The company reports on progress towards targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies or business divisions.	5
	The company reports fully on progress towards targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, covering all relevant geographies and business divisions.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	

<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This question is only scored if Question 40 is met fully or partially.</li><li>• This question recognises reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation, changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation). Points are awarded for targets on protein diversification provided the company has made clear that protein diversification is being pursued as a route to achieving reductions in consumption of animal-sourced foods.</li><li>• This question is looking specifically for explicit monitoring data, this can be quantitative (e.g., reporting on the proportion by which the company has reduced its sales of animal-sourced foods, or the proportion by which the company has increased its sales of alternative proteins) or qualitative (development of management systems), and based on process or performance.</li></ul>
--------------------------	--