

BBFAW

Business Benchmark on
Farm Animal Welfare

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare 2025 Report

Authors: Basia Romanowicz, Nicky Amos, Dr Nathan Rhys Williams and Katherine Button





**Business Benchmark on
Farm Animal Welfare**

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare

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

The BBFAW Secretariat, managed by Chronos Sustainability, conducts independent assessments of companies covered by the BBFAW and engages with companies on their preliminary assessments. The BBFAW Secretariat also maintains the Global Investor Statement on Farm Animal Welfare and convenes the Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare, a collaborative engagement between major institutional investors and food companies on the issue of farm animal welfare. In addition, the BBFAW Secretariat manages extensive engagement programmes with companies and with investors and provides practical guidance and tools for companies and for investors on key animal welfare issues.

The programme is supported by Compassion in World Farming and FOUR PAWS, who provide technical expertise, guidance, funding and practical resources, alongside supporting the assessed food businesses with training, programmatic expertise and consultancy engagement.

More information on the programme can be found at: www.bbfa.com



Compassion in World Farming

Compassion in World Farming is the leading international farm animal welfare organisation dedicated to ending factory farming and reshaping the food system to benefit the lives of animals, people, and the health of the planet. Through campaigning, lobbying for legislative change, and positive engagement with the global food industry, we seek to influence key decision makers that shape, make and fund the food system.

Through our Food Business programme, we work in partnership with leading food companies to drive transformational change for farm animal welfare, reduce the reliance on animal sourced foods and encourage a shift to regenerative farming practices. The team offers strategic advice and expert technical support for the development, implementation and communication of higher welfare policies and practices, and solutions and frameworks for a future-fit food system.

Compassion engages directly with many of the companies evaluated in the BBFAW to highlight and support with policy development, welfare improvement and transparent reporting. The Food Business team uses the Benchmark alongside Compassion's other tools such as the Supermarket Survey, its Awards programme, EggTrack, ChickenTrack, and its advisory services to help companies understand how they are performing relative to their peers, to identify areas and mechanisms for continuous improvement, and to highlight sources of risk and opportunity.

More information on Compassion in World Farming can be found at: www.ciwf.org

More information on the work of the Food Business team at Compassion in World Farming can be found at: www.compassioninfoodbusiness.com



Animal Welfare.
Worldwide.

FOUR PAWS

FOUR PAWS is the global animal welfare organisation for animals under direct human influence, which reveals suffering, rescues animals in need and protects them. Founded in 1988 in Vienna by Heli Dungler and friends, the organisation advocates for a world where humans treat animals with respect, empathy and understanding.

FOUR PAWS' campaigns and projects focus on farm animals, companion animals and wild animals kept in inappropriate conditions or in disaster and conflict zones. To reduce the number of farm animals and therefore animal suffering, a transformation of the agricultural system is needed. FOUR PAWS promotes the 3Rs principle — Reduction, Replacement and Refinement. The aims are to reduce the consumption of animal-based products and therefore unnecessary suffering, to replace these products with plant-based alternatives as well as to refine farming practices to improve welfare. FOUR PAWS is committed to improving the living conditions of billions of farm animals with its current campaigns to reform animal welfare legislation, against live animal transport and cruel practices such as live lamb cutting (mulesing) and in favour of animal-friendly fashion. On a business level, the organisation supports the BBFAW to drive change in numerous international food sectors. FOUR PAWS also works on multiple other farm animal topics and raises awareness among the public through traditional and social media channels, lobbies politicians and runs campaigns to hold the food and textile industries to account. FOUR PAWS highlights the benefits of the reduction of the number of farmed animals and transition to high welfare production systems for public health and the environment.

With offices in Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cambodia, France, Germany, Kosovo, the Netherlands, Switzerland, South Africa, Thailand, Ukraine, the UK, the USA and Vietnam as well as 13 wild animal sanctuaries and cooperation projects across the globe, FOUR PAWS provides rapid help and long-term solutions.

For more information about FOUR PAWS please visit:
www.four-paws.org


More about FOUR PAWS work on farm animals can be found at:
www.four-paws.org/campaigns-topics/topics/farm-animals

Contents

Executive Summary	7
Key Findings	8
Recommended Actions for Companies	10
Recommended Actions for Investors	13
Acknowledgements	17
Chapter 1 Company Tier Rankings and Impact Ratings	18
Chapter 2 Analysis of Company Performance	25
Chapter 3 Detailed Results	35
Chapter 4 Trend Analysis	57
Chapter 5 Company and Investor Engagement	60
Chapter 6 Looking Ahead	64
Appendix	67
Performance by Assessment Pillar	68
Company List	71
2025 Benchmark Questions and Scoring	75
Glossary	134
Credits	139

BBFAW

Executive Summary



Executive Summary

Each year, an estimated 97.6 billion terrestrial animals are raised for food,¹ the majority within intensive production systems characterised by close confinement in cages, crates and high stocking densities, often in barren conditions, which do not meet their basic needs for freedom of movement, comfort or expressing natural behaviours.

As production volumes grow and intensive systems expand, companies face increasing exposure driven by rising consumer scrutiny, strengthening regulation and greater supply chain transparency. This evolving landscape creates heightened operational, regulatory and reputational risks. In turn, these risks can materially affect a company's ability to achieve its business objectives and sustain value for investors over the short, medium and long-term.

One Health: Integrating Animal Welfare, Human Health and Ecological Sustainability

An increasing number of investors, companies and NGOs are adopting the World Health Organization's One Health approach as a framework for understanding sustainability. Central to this approach is the recognition that "...the health of humans, domestic and wild animals, plants, and the wider environment (including ecosystems) are closely linked and interdependent".²

Within this framing, animal welfare is not a peripheral concern but a core component of sustainability. The conditions in which animals are raised directly influence animal wellbeing, environmental resilience and public health outcomes. Issues such as infectious disease emergence, food safety risks and antimicrobial resistance are all closely linked to how animals are managed within agricultural systems.^{3,4}

In practice this means that animal agriculture — and by extension animal health and welfare — should be recognised as an integral element of credible corporate and investor sustainability strategies. High standards of farm animal welfare therefore need to be pursued alongside, and as part of, broader commitments to environmental stewardship, human health and social responsibility.

The 2025 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare (BBFAW) evaluates how 149 of the world's largest food companies manage, govern and disclose farm animal welfare risks across their operations and supply chains. The Benchmark assesses corporate policies, targets and performance on key welfare risks, including close confinement practices, environmental enrichment provision, antibiotic use, routine mutilations, pre-slaughter stunning and long-distance live transportation. As such, BBFAW offers companies a practical governance and reporting framework, helping to strengthen risk management, improve transparency and drive measurable welfare improvements.

BBFAW represents the most comprehensive assessment of animal welfare management in the global food industry, providing investors with relevant insights into company exposure, risk mitigation and disclosure quality. The results enable investors to compare corporate performance and identify leaders, laggards and transition risks associated with a shift toward higher farm animal welfare standards and alternative protein systems. In turn, the results can inform investment decisions as well as the dialogue investors have with the companies in which they invest.

¹ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Crops and livestock products, March 2026

² WHO, One Health, 2026

³ FAO, 'Animal welfare for production and working animals: evidence and need for action', 2025

⁴ The Review on Antimicrobial Resistance, 2015

Executive Summary – Key Findings

1. NGO Pressure Remains a Key Driver of Corporate Commitments

Animal welfare NGOs remain a major influence on food companies, particularly on cage-free egg transitions and broiler welfare requirements aligned with the Better Chicken Commitment / European Chicken Commitment.

Over two-thirds of BFAW companies have now set targets to eliminate cages for laying hens, with 71% disclosing progress toward achieving cage-free supply chains. NGO campaigning has been focused on the most numerous farmed species — particularly laying hens and broiler chickens — and this is reflected in the high proportion of companies setting targets and reporting progress for these species.

2. The Gap Between Companies' Commitments and Implementation Persists

Of the 39 companies that have committed to the Better Chicken Commitment (BCC), only four report that at least a substantial proportion of their supply chain meets the three core requirements of the BCC (lower stocking densities, slower growing breeds and humane slaughter).

While 96 companies have set a cage-free target for laying hens, only 33 of these have set targets which are universal in scope, covering all products and geographies. Of those with universal targets, 17 companies report that 100% of their eggs is cage-free.

Companies that have yet to meet their targets point to higher production costs, resource-use trade-offs with environmental targets, avian influenza, and broader macroeconomic shocks as barriers to implementation. These factors are often referenced in relation to commitment delays, revisions to target deadlines and, in some cases, withdrawal from existing pledges — raising concerns among investors, who expect companies to follow through on their commitments.

3. Regulation and Technology Are Emerging as Structural Enablers of Change

Regulatory reform, including the ongoing comprehensive review of EU animal welfare legislation, is raising compliance expectations and intensifying policy-driven transition risks, particularly through the increased financial and operational pressures associated with higher welfare standards. For example, several countries — including Germany, Denmark, the UK, Austria, Finland and New Zealand — have announced plans to phase out farrowing crates, while Sweden, Switzerland and Norway have already implemented bans.

Key Figures

- 69% of companies have set targets to eliminate cages for laying hens.
- 71% of companies are reporting progress toward achieving cage-free egg supply chains.
- 34% of companies are reporting progress towards achieving lower stocking densities for broiler chickens.
- UK companies maintain their leading position across all pillars of the benchmark.
- Latin American companies outperform Asian, European and North American companies on farm animal welfare performance impact.
- UK companies achieved an average score of 29% for their efforts to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods, compared to a global average of 11%.

Executive Summary – Key Findings

Technological innovation is also enabling and accelerating progress. One notable example is in-ovo sexing which determines the sex of chicks before hatching and eliminates the need to cull male chicks after they hatch. In the 2025 Benchmark, the proportion of companies committing to the elimination of day-old male chick culling rose to 15% from 9% the previous year.

4. Regional Momentum is Shifting

French and Brazilian companies showed the strongest improvement in 2025, recording the largest score increases since 2022, with an average increase of 2% in both countries.

Progress differs by species focus.

The French companies covered by the Benchmark are primarily advancing broiler welfare commitments, whereas the Brazilian companies are making gains in cage-free egg sourcing and the transition to free-farrowing systems.

While multiple factors are likely contributing to these developments, NGO activity appears to be an important driver of change in both markets. In France in particular, progress is strongly shaped by coordinated NGO campaigning to implement the Better Chicken Commitment, alongside active engagement from major supermarket retailers — all of which are now committed to the BCC. This alignment between civil society pressure and retailer action has been a key factor in accelerating broader market transformation.

5. Protein Transition Remains a Nascent Business Issue

Reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is emerging as a mechanism for companies to lower their environmental impacts and mitigate animal welfare-related risks.

The evidence from the BBFAW is that protein transition — a strategy which may involve expanding plant-based or alternative protein offerings, with or without a corresponding reduction in animal sourced foods — remains a relatively underutilised risk management approach, with companies achieving an overall average score of just 11%. Progress is most advanced in European and UK retailers, with companies achieving overall average scores of 22% and 28% respectively.

This regional variation reflects evolving consumer demand in certain markets; alongside a growing recognition of the role that product portfolio diversification can play in delivering broader sustainability objectives.

Recommended Actions for Companies

Farm animal welfare represents a material, systemic risk for food companies, with implications for their costs, their brands, their supply chains, and their longer-term business resilience. Investors and other stakeholders increasingly expect companies to demonstrate that they have established robust management systems and governance frameworks that proactively address both the risks and opportunities associated with animal welfare.

1. Proactively Manage Regulatory Risk

Companies should ensure that they track new and emerging policy developments — particularly in the UK, Europe and Australia — where regulatory change is accelerating the phase-out of close-confinement systems for laying hens and sows. These developments should be systematically integrated into corporate strategy and capital expenditure planning to ensure early alignment with tightening welfare expectations and associated transition risks.

Companies should monitor broader analytical and policy frameworks such as One Health, which increasingly position animal welfare at the centre of debates on environmental and social sustainability. In parallel, the recognition of animal sentience is beginning to be embedded in public policy and investment appraisal frameworks; one recent notable example is the UK, where animal sentience is now reflected in policy assessment and evaluation guidance such as the UK Green Book. This signals a growing shift toward incorporating animal welfare considerations into public investment decision-making, reinforcing the expectation that businesses will need to account for these factors in future regulatory, financial, and reputational risk assessments.

One specific recommendation would be to:

- Leverage industry benchmarking as a strategic tool. Use the BBAFW report to identify leading practices, benchmark performance against peers, and build an evidence-based internal investment case linking animal welfare improvements to risk mitigation and value creation.

Recommended Actions for Companies

2. Protect and Strengthen Brand Trust

Companies should continue to monitor evolving consumer expectations on animal welfare and proactively address any gaps between these expectations and on-the-ground production practices. This requires not only transparent reporting and accurate marketing, but also a forward-looking approach to identifying and closing potential misalignments to mitigate reputational risk. Companies must also remain alert to greenwashing-related risks and ensure that both product-level and corporate disclosures fully comply with regulatory requirements. Public investigations, as well as media or NGO-led exposés, can quickly erode trust, weaken brand equity and affect market share, particularly where there is a perceived disconnect between stated commitments and actual practices.

In parallel, companies need to stay attuned to NGO campaigns, which are often early indicators of emerging risk areas and shifting societal expectations. This includes horizon-scanning for campaign activity, understanding priority issues (e.g. close confinement systems, fast-growing breeds), and being prepared to respond quickly and credibly. Companies that engage constructively, rather than react defensively, are typically better positioned to manage risk and maintain stakeholder confidence.

To mitigate these risks, companies should:

- Align welfare commitments with evolving consumer and societal expectations, ensuring claims are credible and substantiated.
- Implement robust supplier assurance and verification systems to ensure consistent, practical delivery of welfare standards, supported by BBFAW's tailored guidance.
- Monitor NGO activity and stakeholder sentiment to anticipate emerging issues and inform risk management strategies.
- Develop clear response protocols for potential investigations or campaigns, including escalation pathways and communications planning
- Communicate progress regularly and transparently to build trust and pre-empt reputational shocks.

Recommended Actions for Companies

3. Mitigate Operational and Supply Chain Risk

Poor animal health and welfare can have direct and material impacts on product quality, food safety, supply continuity and human health — including through the increased risk of disease transmission. Where these risks are not effectively managed, companies may face litigation, regulatory intervention, production disruption and costly corrective actions, as well as longer-term damage to supply chain relationships and brand integrity.

Mitigating these risks requires a more systematic integration of animal welfare into operational and supply chain management. In practice, this means:

- Embedding welfare standards into supplier contracts and sourcing policies, with clear, measurable requirements aligned to recognised benchmarks such as the BBFAW, and defined timelines for compliance.
- Integrating animal welfare into enterprise risk management frameworks, ensuring it is treated as a core operational risk alongside food safety and quality, with board-level oversight where appropriate.
- Strengthening supplier assurance and verification systems, including regular audits, outcome-based welfare indicators (e.g. mortality, lameness, lesions), and independent third-party certification where feasible.
- Improving traceability and data transparency across supply chains, enabling companies to identify risk hotspots, monitor compliance in real time, and respond quickly to emerging issues.
- Building supplier capability and resilience, through training, technical support, and longer-term contracts that incentivise investment in higher-welfare systems.
- Establishing contingency and response plans for disease outbreaks (e.g. avian influenza) or welfare failures, including alternative sourcing, crisis management protocols, and communication strategies.

Taken together, these measures help shift animal welfare from a compliance issue to a core component of supply chain resilience and risk management, reducing the likelihood and impact of operational disruptions, while supporting more stable, sustainable sourcing models.

Executive Summary

Recommended Actions for Investors

Investors are increasingly recognising farm animal welfare as a material factor in long-term value creation. While investors cannot compel companies to act, they play an important role in signalling expectations, shaping incentives, and encouraging stronger management of animal welfare risks.

BBFAW recommends the following actions:

1. Publicly Demonstrate Commitment

The BBFAW Global Investor Statement provides a practical mechanism for investors to signal their expectations and support improved standards across the market. By signing, investors can:

- Signal to companies, peers and other stakeholders that farm animal welfare is a potentially material issue for long-term value creation.
- Clarify expectations around improved governance, risk management and disclosure, and encourage corporate behaviour over time.
- Encourage greater transparency and accountability across portfolio companies.
- Reinforce market-wide norms by aligning with other investors and contributing to collective momentum on animal welfare issues.

Through these actions, investors help to create an environment in which companies are more likely to strengthen their approach to animal welfare, even where direct influence may be limited.



Executive Summary

Recommended Actions for Investors

2. Encourage Companies to Strengthen their Animal Welfare Practices, Processes and Performance

Investors should engage with the companies in which they invest to improve their policy and management commitments, their commitments to protein transition, their governance and management approach, their public targets and roadmaps and their performance reporting and impacts.

The systematic integration of animal welfare into operational and supply chain management involves:

- Embedding welfare standards into supplier contracts and sourcing policies, with clear, measurable requirements - aligned to recognised benchmarks such as the BBFAW - and defined timelines for compliance.
- Integrating animal welfare into enterprise risk management frameworks, ensuring it is treated as a core operational risk alongside food safety and quality, with board-level oversight where appropriate.
- Strengthening supplier assurance and verification systems, including regular audits, outcome-based welfare indicators (e.g. mortality, lameness, lesions), and independent third-party certification where feasible.
- Improving traceability and data transparency across supply chains, enabling companies to identify risk hotspots, monitor compliance in real time, and respond quickly to emerging issues.
- Building supplier capability and resilience, through training, technical support, and longer-term contracts that incentivise investment in higher-welfare systems.
- Establishing contingency and response plans for disease outbreaks (e.g. avian influenza) or welfare failures, including alternative sourcing, crisis management protocols, and communication strategies.



Recommended Actions for Investors

The BBFAW Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare

The BBFAW Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare is designed to support investors working with companies. It provides:

- Targeted support for individual company engagements.
- Coordination and facilitation of collective company engagements.
- Access to technical briefings and webinars.
- Access to a regular newsletter covering sector-specific welfare topics and updates on regulatory developments.
- Access to technical experts on farm animal welfare and related issues.

Currently, 32 investors, representing \$3 trillion in assets under management, are participants in the Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare.

To join the Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare or to find out more, please contact: secretariat@bbfaw.com



Executive Summary

Recommended Actions for Investors

3. Integrate BBFAW Data into Investment Analysis

Incorporate BBFAW Benchmark data into investment research and decision-making processes. BBFAW data can be used to:

- Assess risk and opportunity exposure by evaluating how companies manage animal welfare-related risks and opportunities.
- Benchmark relative performance by comparing companies against peers within the same industry or sub-sector.
- Systematically embed animal welfare factors into portfolio construction.



Acknowledgements

This report has been prepared by the BBFAW Secretariat run by Chronos Sustainability Ltd. The lead authors were Basia Romanowicz, Dr Nathan Rhys Williams, Nicky Amos and Katherine Button.


We would like to thank the following for their support of this project and their contribution to the design and development of the 2025 Benchmark:

- Philip Lymbery, Dr Tracey Jones, Louise Valducci, Amélie Legrand and the Food Business team at Compassion in World Farming.
- Dr Martina Stephany, Dr Marlene Kirchner, Dr Carolina Cardoso Nagib Nascimento, Carina Nierobisch and colleagues at FOUR PAWS.
- The many companies who have continued to engage with the BBFAW programme over the past year and who provided feedback during the assessment process.
- The many investors who have continued to engage with the BBFAW programme and the companies covered by the BBFAW.
- The team of BBFAW assessors and reviewers.



BBFAW

Company Tier rankings and Impact Ratings



Company Tier Rankings and Impact Ratings

Company Tier Rankings and Impact Ratings

This year, the Benchmark assessed 149 companies across 51 distinct criteria.² The assessment criteria are grouped into five pillars:

- **Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments — 15% of Overall Score**
- **Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management — 14%**
- **Farm Animal Welfare Targets — 7%**
- **Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact — 55%**
- **Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods — 9%**

The benchmarked companies are assigned to one of six tiers based on their overall percentage scores (see Table 1.1). A consolidated view of company performance across 2024 and 2025 company scores both by Tier ranking and by Impact Rating (IR), appears in Figure 1.1.

Impact ratings are derived from company scores across the 20 Performance Impact questions (Q30 to Q49). The Impact Rating enables investors to evaluate whether companies' farm animal welfare management efforts are translating into tangible and meaningful welfare improvements, while also helping companies identify priority areas for significant enhancement across their global supply chains.



² The new total of 149 companies being assessed reflects the merger of Marfrig and BRF, which were evaluated as a single entity, MBRF, for the first time.

Table 1.1
BBFAW Benchmark Tiers

Tier		Percentage Score
1	The company has taken a leadership position on farm animal welfare	>80%
2	The company has made farm animal welfare an integral part of its business strategy	62-80%
3	The company has an established approach to a farm animal welfare but has more work to do to ensure it is effectively implemented	44-61%
4	The company is making progress on implementing its policies and commitments on farm animal welfare	27-43%
5	The company has identified farm animal welfare as a business issue but provides limited evidence that it is managing the issue effectively	11-26%
6	The company provides limited if any evidence that it recognises farm animal welfare as a business issue	<11%

Figure 1.1

Company Tier Rankings and Impact Ratings* IR

Figure 1.1 combines company Impact Ratings and Tier Rankings in a single table, providing a comprehensive view of company performance within the Benchmark.

Tier 1 Leadership	Tier 2 Integral to business strategy	Tier 3 Established but work to be done	Tier 4 Making progress on implementation	Tier 5 On the business agenda but limited evidence of implementation	Tier 6 No evidence on the business agenda
0	4	8	18	59	60
	Greggs PLC C Marks & Spencer PLC B Premier Foods PLC B Waitrose C	Co-op UK C Cranswick PLC C Forterra B Groupe Danone SA C Hilton Food Group D MBRF D Minerva Foods D Noble Foods D	ALDI SOUTH Group E Barilla SpA E Bellis Topco Ltd./Asda E Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA E Compass Group PLC F Danish Crown AmbA D Groupe Lactalis E Hershey Co E J Sainsbury PLC D LDC Groupe E Les Mousquetaires E Maple Leaf Foods E Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund C Mitchells & Butlers PLC F Terrena Group E Tesco PLC E Whitbread PLC E Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC E	(The) Kroger Company F 2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd) F Agro Super F Ahold Delhaize F ALDI Einkauf SE & Co. oHG (ALDI Nord) F Amazon/Whole Foods Market F Aramark Corporation F Arla Foods Ltd F Bimbo E Cargill F Carrefour SA F Charoen Pokphand Foods F Chipotle Mexican Grill F Coles Group F Colruyt F ConAgra F Coop Group (Switzerland)/Coop Genossenschaft F Cooperativa Central Aurora Alimentos F Coopérative U Enseigne F Cooperl Arc Atlantique F Cremonini SpA F E.Leclerc F EDEKA Group F Elior Group F Elo Group F Ferrero Group F Gruppo Veronesi F Hormel Foods Corporation F ICA Gruppen AB F IKEA (Inter IKEA Group) F JBS SA F JD Wetherspoon PLC F Jeronimo Martins F Kraft Heinz Company F McDonald's Corporation F METRO AG F Metro Inc F Mowi ASA F Nestlé SA F New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd F OSI Group F Papa John's Pizza F Perdue Farms F Plukon Food Group F Restaurant Brands International F REWE Group F Royal FrieslandCampina F Saputo Inc F Schwarz Gruppe F Sodexo F SSP Group F The Cheesecake Factory F Tyson Foods Inc F Unilever NV F Vion Food Group F Wayne-Sanderson Farms F WH Group Ltd F Woolworths Limited F Yum! Brands Inc F	Aeon Group F Albertsons F Alimentation Couche-Tard F Avolta AG (previously Autogrill) F Beijing Dabeinong Technology Group Co., Ltd. F BJ's Wholesale Club Holdings F Bloomin' Brands Inc F C&S Wholesale F Campbell Soup Company F Camst - La Ristorazione Italiana Soc. Coop. ARL F Cencosud F Chick-fil-A F China Resources Vanguard F China Yurun Group Limited F CKE Restaurants F Conad Consorzio Nazionale F Cooke Seafood Inc F Coop Italia F Costco Wholesale Corporation F Cracker Barrel F Dairy Farmers of America F Darden Restaurants PLC F Dico's/Ting Hsin Intl Group F Dino Polska SA F Domino's Pizza Inc F Empire Company/Sobey's F Gategroup Holding AG F General Mills Inc F H E Butt Company F Habib's F Industrias Bachoco F JAB Holding Company F Kerry Group F Lianhua Supermarket Holdings Co F Loblaw Companies Limited F Mars Inc F Maruha Nichiro F Meiji Holdings F Mercadona SA F Mondelez International F Müller UTM F Nippon Ham F Premium Food Group F Publix Super Markets Inc F Roark Capital (Inspire Brands, Subway et al.) F Seaboard Corp F Seven & i Holdings F Spar Holding AG F Starbucks Corporation F Sysco Corporation F Target Corporation F UNFI F US Foods F Walmart Inc F Wendy's Company (The) F Wens Foodstuff Group F Yili Group F Yonghui Superstores Co Ltd F Yum China Holdings F Zhongpin Inc (Huayu Holdings) F

* Impact ratings are based on companies' scores for the 20 performance impact questions, namely Q30 to Q49. The scores are presented in a six-tier rating, labelled A-F, using the percentage boundaries presented in Table 1.1. The arrows indicate the change in Tier Ranking and Impact Rating compared to 2024.

Table 1.2
Comparative Tier Movements

No.	Companies Rising +1 Tier	2025 Tier	2024 Tier
1	Hilton Food Group	3	4
2	Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA	4	5
3	Bellis Topco Ltd./Asda	4	5
4	Maple Leaf Foods	4	5
5	MBRF	3	4
6	Amazon/Whole Foods Market	5	6
7	New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd	5	6
8	WH Group Ltd	5	6

No.	Companies Falling -1 Tier	2025 Tier	2024 Tier
1	Danish Crown AmbA	4	3
2	Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund	4	3
3	Arla Foods Ltd	5	4
4	JD Wetherspoon PLC	5	4
5	Unilever NV	5	4
6	Woolworths Limited	5	4
7	General Mills Inc	6	5
8	Campbell Soup Company	6	5
9	Darden Restaurants PLC	6	5
10	Sysco Corporation	6	5
11	Premium Food Group	6	5

Company Impact Ratings

The BFAW Impact Rating, introduced in 2020, provides a measure of the actual welfare benefits delivered to animals across a company’s supply chain. Companies are assigned an Impact Rating from A to F, as detailed in Table 1.3, based on their scores across 20 Performance Impact questions (Q30 to Q49).

A majority of companies have an Impact Rating of E or F, indicating that these companies have yet to report that they are delivering improved welfare impacts for farm animals in their operations and/or supply chains.

Encouragingly, for the third consecutive year, we have seen a further decrease in the numbers of companies in the lowest rating (F). This number has decreased from 126 companies in 2023 to 120 companies in 2025. While it demonstrates that there is much more to be done, it does indicate that more companies are reporting improved performance on the proportion of animals that are reared in systems that provide an opportunity for improved welfare, such as cage-free systems for laying hens and lower stocking densities for broiler chickens.

Table 1.3
2025 Impact Ratings

Impact Rating		Number of Companies 2025	Number of Companies 2024	Number of Companies 2023
A >80%	These companies are declaring improved welfare impacts for a reasonable proportion of farm animals in their operations and/or supply chains.			
B 62-80%		3	3	
C 44-61%	These companies are declaring improved welfare impacts for at least some farm animals in their operations and/or supply chains.	5	4	6
D 27-43%		7	7	5
E 11-26%	These companies have yet to demonstrate that they are delivering improved welfare impacts for farm animals in their operations and/or supply chains.	14	14	13
F <11%		120	122	126

Table 1.4
Company Impact Rating Changes

No.	Companies Rising +1 Impact Rating	2025 IR	2024 IR
1	Cranswick PLC	C	D
2	Hilton Food Group	D	E
3	ALDI SOUTH Group	E	F
4	Bellis Topco Ltd./Asda	E	F
5	LDC Groupe	E	F

No.	Companies Rising -1 Impact Rating	2025 IR	2024 IR
1	Arla Foods Ltd	F	E

Impact Rating top performers

The following three companies have achieved an impact rating of B, which means they are declaring improved welfare impacts for a reasonable proportion of farm animals in their operations and/or supply chains:

Fonterra

Marks & Spencer PLC

Premier Foods PLC

The following five companies have achieved an impact rating of C, which means they are declaring improved welfare impacts for at least some farm animals in their operations and/or supply chains:

Cranswick PLC

Greggs PLC

Groupe Danone SA

Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund

Waitrose



BBFAW

Analysis of Company Performance




Pillar Analysis

The BBFAW Benchmark is based on five core pillars, each evaluating a distinct aspect of company management and reporting on farm animal welfare.

Overall average scores have continued to increase, rising from 16% in 2022 to 18% in 2025. The scores for the Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management pillar have

increased, while scores for the Reducing Reliance on Animal Sourced Foods pillar and Farm Animal Welfare Performance Pillar have remained the same. It is worrying that scores in the Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments and Farm Animal Welfare Targets pillars have decreased slightly in 2025, reflective of some companies stepping back or revising cage-free commitments in 2025 (see Chapter 3).

Figure 2.1
Average Score per Pillar



Top Performers by Assessment Pillar

The companies that achieved the highest scores in each assessment pillar in 2025 are listed below. While most top performers are also in the Benchmark's upper tiers (Tiers 2 and 3), several companies in Tiers 4 and 5 are also represented. This is particularly notable in the Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods pillar, where six of the top ten companies are in the lower tiers (4 and 5), suggesting that, for many companies, strategies to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods are pursued independently of their broader farm animal welfare approach.

Table 2.1
Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments

No.	Company	Region	Tier Ranking
1	Marks & Spencer PLC	United Kingdom	2
2	Greggs PLC	United Kingdom	2
3	Noble Foods	United Kingdom	3
4	Premier Foods PLC	United Kingdom	2
5	Cranswick PLC	United Kingdom	3
=	Hilton Food Group	United Kingdom	3
=	JD Wetherspoon PLC	United Kingdom	5
8	Barilla SpA	Europe (ex UK)	4
=	MBRF	Latin America	3
10	Groupe Danone SA	Europe (ex UK)	3

Farm Animal Welfare Governance

No.	Company	Region	Tier Ranking
1	Marks & Spencer PLC	United Kingdom	2
=	Noble Foods	United Kingdom	3
=	Waitrose	United Kingdom	2
4	MBRF	Latin America	3
5	Co-Op UK	United Kingdom	3
6	Premier Foods PLC	United Kingdom	2
=	Minerva Foods	Latin America	3
8	WM Morrison Supermarkets PLC	United Kingdom	4
9	Perdue Farms	North America	5
10	Hilton Food Group	United Kingdom	3

Farm Animal Welfare Targets

No.	Company	Region	Tier Ranking
1	Marks & Spencer PLC	United Kingdom	2
=	Noble Foods	United Kingdom	2
=	Fonterra	Asia Pacific	3
=	Greggs PLC	United Kingdom	3
5	Premier Foods PLC	United Kingdom	2
=	Groupe Danone PLC	Europe (ex UK)	3
7	JD Wetherspoon PLC	United Kingdom	5
8	Waitrose	United Kingdom	2
9	Terrena Group	Europe (ex UK)	4
10	Cranswick PLC	United Kingdom	3

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact

No.	Company	Region	Tier Ranking
1	Premier Foods PLC	United Kingdom	2
2	Fonterra	Asia Pacific	3
=	Marks & Spencer PLC	United Kingdom	2
4	Groupe Danone SA	Europe (ex UK)	3
=	Waitrose	United Kingdom	2
6	Cranswick PLC	United Kingdom	3
7	Greggs PLC	United Kingdom	2
8	Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund	Europe (ex UK)	4
9	Minerva Foods	Latin America	3
10	Noble Foods	United Kingdom	3

Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods

No.	Company	Region	Tier Ranking
1	Hilton Food Group	United Kingdom	3
2	Tesco	United Kingdom	4
3	Greggs PLC	United Kingdom	2
=	Minerva Foods	Latin America	3
=	Waitrose	United Kingdom	2
6	Les Mousquetaires	Europe (ex UK)	4
=	Schwarz Gruppe	Europe (ex UK)	5
8	REWE Group	Europe (ex UK)	5
9	Carrefour SA	Europe (ex UK)	5
=	Cranswick PLC	Europe (ex UK)	5

Companies with no overarching animal-welfare policy

The following 23 companies, among the largest food companies globally, do not have a published overarching farm animal welfare policy. This is concerning, as it suggests a lack of formalised commitment at the parent company level to address the risks and opportunities associated with animal welfare. These companies perform poorly across all Benchmark pillars and, with the exception of Schwarz Gruppe, also do not publish overarching policies on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. For investors, this represents a potential risk exposure, as inadequate management of farm animal welfare issues can lead to reputational, operational, and regulatory challenges that may affect long-term value.

Aeon Group
Alimentation Couche-Tard
Avolta AG (previously Autogrill)
Beijing Dabeinong Technology Group Co., Ltd.
C&S Wholesale
Cencosud
China Resources Vanguard
Colruyt
Cremonini SpA
Dico's/Ting Hsin International Group
Dino Polska SA
Gategroup Holding AG
Habib's
JAB Holding Company
Lianhua Supermarket Holdings Co
Roark Capital (Inspire Brands, Subway et al.)
Schwarz Gruppe
Spar Holding AG
Starbucks Corporation
Wens Foodstuff Group
Yonghui Superstores Co Ltd
Yum China Holdings
Zhongpin Inc (Huayu Holdings)



Sub-sector Comparison

Benchmarked companies are divided into three industry sub-sectors: Retailers and Wholesalers; Producers and Manufacturers; and Restaurants and Bars. This classification reflects their different roles in the food supply chain, varying levels of control over sourcing, and differing capacities to implement and report on animal welfare standards. These distinctions are incorporated into the assessment methodology — for example, reporting-related questions on own-brand products apply only to Retailers and Wholesalers and Restaurant and Bars. Segmenting companies in this way allows for a more accurate evaluation of performance and enables fairer comparisons amongst peers.

The 2025 results show that Producers and Manufacturers continue to outperform other sectors across most areas of the Benchmark. This includes the Performance Impact pillar, where Producers have greater control over their supply chains and better access to comprehensive performance data.

81%


of Restaurant and Bars have published a time-bound target on farm animal welfare

Restaurant and Bars lead on Farm Animal Welfare Targets, particularly regarding the phasing out of cages for laying hens: 81% of companies in this sector have published a target, compared with 73% of Retailers and Wholesalers and 58% of Producers and Manufacturers. They also lead on targets aligned with the Better Chicken Commitment and European Chicken Commitment, with 41% of companies publishing a target, compared to 27% of Retailers and Wholesalers and 24% of Producers and Manufacturers. As highly consumer-facing businesses, restaurant chains have been a significant focus of NGO campaigns pressuring companies to adopt public commitments. However, as shown in Figure 2.2, there is limited evidence of Restaurants and Bars delivering on these commitments, with this sector having the lowest average score for Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact. Restaurants and Bars score 5% on average in this Pillar, compared to 8% for Retailers and Wholesalers and 10% for Producers and Manufacturers. They also have the lowest score on the Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments Pillar, which covers a broader range of farm animal welfare issues which go beyond the focus of the headline animal welfare campaigns.

Eight major companies announced in February 2026 that they would be stepping back from the Better Chicken Commitment. These include Yum! Brands and Restaurant Brands International. This announcement came after the company assessment period in October-November 2025. These companies cited environmental

considerations and challenges related to the availability of slower growing breeds as barriers to implementation. Nonetheless, availability of chicken aligned with the BCC requirements is increasing as companies implement their commitments and significant progress has been achieved in countries including The Netherlands and Norway.

Figure 2.2 — Sub-sector Comparison
Average Scores by Sector by the Pillars of the Benchmark



Geographical Comparison

The Benchmark covers five geographical regions: Asia Pacific, Europe (excluding the UK); Latin America, North America, and the United Kingdom. Comparative regional performance is presented in Figure 2.3.

Figure 2.3
Average Scores by Geography by the Pillars of the Benchmark



Companies in the UK continue to outperform companies in other regions on all pillars of the Benchmark, reflecting the local maturity of this issue and high levels of consumer demand.

European companies score highly on Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments and Targets. However, companies in Latin America, particularly those in Brazil, are beginning to match or surpass European companies, achieving the same overall average score and higher average scores on the Governance and Management and Performance Impact pillars. Further, Latin American companies continue to outpace North American companies on all pillars of the Benchmark. While the Latin American sample is smaller — nine companies versus 51 in Europe — these companies represent some of the largest global meat producers, with the companies MBRF, Minerva and JBS dominating Brazilian meat processing and export. More than half of Latin American companies have published targets to end the use of cages for laying hens and Brazilian companies have improved their overall score by 2% on average.

In contrast, farm animal welfare appears to be a lower priority for many Asian companies. Nearly all companies from this region fall into Tiers 5 and 6, and 43% have not published an overarching animal welfare policy, compared to just 15% of companies across the Benchmark. However, there are some signs of progress in the Asia Pacific region: WH Group and New Hope Liuhe moved up one tier in the 2025 Benchmark, and four companies — New Hope Liuhe, Yili Group, WH Group and Beijing Dabeinong — increased their scores by more than 5% since 2022 (see Figure 4.2)

North American companies achieve the lowest scores of all the regions on Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact. On Animal Sourced Foods, North American companies achieve the lowest scores after companies in Asia Pacific.



BBFAW

Detailed Results



Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments

As shown in Figure 3.1, the welfare issues most frequently addressed by commitments relate to ending close confinement and ensuring humane stunning and slaughter, with 74% and 53% of companies publishing commitments on these issues, respectively.

However, it is concerning that in 2025 several major companies, including Mondelez International, Ahold Delhaize, Loblaw Companies and Unilever, either stepped


back from their global cage-free egg commitments or revised the timelines for achieving them, citing challenges with availability and cost. This has contributed to a slight decline in the average score for the Farm Animal Welfare Commitments pillar. Additionally, the introduction of a new question in the 2024 Benchmark, assessing commitments to end the use of breeds with low welfare potential, also influenced company scores on this pillar.



Farm Animal Welfare remains a key business issue

142 companies (95%) recognise its relevance (up from 94% in 2024), and of these, 67 companies (45%) acknowledge animals as sentient beings (unchanged from 2024).

Figure 3.1
Proportion of companies with partial or universal policies addressing specific farm animal welfare issues





Breeds with low welfare potential

In 2024, a new question was introduced assessing companies' commitments to ending the use of breeds with low welfare potential, covering broiler chickens, pigs and beef cattle. This question was applicable to 139 companies with these species in their supply chains, and the scores contribute to the overall company scores in the 2025 Benchmark. 31% of companies have published partial or universal policies on this issue, an increase from 26% in 2024, showing that this is an increasingly important topic for companies.

Animal welfare is influenced not only by management practices and inputs but also by genetics. Some breeds selected for high growth rates or lean meat deposition, can experience a range of physiological and metabolic issues, as well as poor immunity, lethargy and restricted behavioural expression. Consequently, the choice of breed or strain in livestock production can have a profound impact on farmed animal welfare.

The Benchmark assesses species-specific requirements based on established scientific evidence as well as practical experience within existing production systems:

- **Broiler chickens**

End the use of breeds that do not meet the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment requirements for improved welfare outcomes; or end the use of breeds without a slower growth potential, defined as <40g/d averaged over the growth cycle according to the breeding company specification.

- **Pigs**

End the use of sows with an average >16 liveborn piglets per litter.

- **Beef cattle**

End the use of double-muscled breeds, such as Belgian Blue and Piedmontese.

Case Study Examples**Q4 Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of close confinement for all species?**

We do not permit the use of production or confinement systems for any animals in our supply which don't meet our standards. These include: The use of feedlots or CAFO systems (and) tethering of dairy cows... so: [...] All eggs used in our products must be free range, whether shell egg, frozen or ingredient. For all pork (fresh, frozen, ingredient and continental) the use of sow stalls is prohibited. Short duration confinement is allowed for management purposes, such as feeding and conduction of artificial insemination, but must be restricted to four hours or less. All pork (fresh, frozen, ingredient and speciality continental) must be produced from free-farrow systems. In December 2017, we pledged our support to the Better Chicken Commitment and have committed to meet the criteria by 2026. This means by 2026, we will require our suppliers to meet the following requirements for 100% of the fresh, frozen, and processed chicken in our supply chain: Implement a maximum stocking density of 30kg/m² or less. Thinning is discouraged and if practiced must be limited to one thin per flock.

Marks & Spencer PLC

Q5 Does the company have a clear commitment to the provision of effective, species-specific enrichment for all species?

Marfrig considers it important to raise animals in an enriched environment in accordance with each species' needs. [...] By improving the environment with appropriate changes, according to each species, the new environment should promote better performance related to the species' behaviors, activating, through motivation, their natural behavior. [...] Marfrig believes that promoting enriched environments ensures better animal welfare and helps prevent issues related to stereotypies, aggression, among other undesirable behaviors that may arise due to frustration from the lack of a suitable environment for raising these animals. Specific commitments: "[...] Use environmental enrichment in 100% of the integration of poultry and swine... In broiler chicken farming, we have made progress in implementing perches, pecking objects, and platforms in the facilities, as well as in climate controlled poultry houses that provide natural light" [...]

MBRF

Case Study Examples

Q9 Does the company have a clear commitment to humane forms of pre-slaughter stunning for all species?

Auchan France is committed to guaranteeing respect for animal welfare within slaughterhouses by carrying out systematic audits on animal welfare every two years as part of the Auchan Cultivons le Bon supply chains, and from 2021, in the slaughterhouses supplying the Auchan brand butchery and poultry department. Among the criteria of this audit, prior stunning is a notable prerequisite. To date, all partner slaughterhouses of Auchan Cultivons le Bon supply chains have been audited.*

Elo Group

Q10 Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of breeds with low welfare potential?

We have demonstrated our commitment to improving the welfare of broiler chickens by signing up to the European Chicken Commitment (ECC) which requires slower growing breeds [...] We are working with a producer to conduct trials with slower growing breeds. We are committed to ending the use of breeds with a low welfare potential in our global supply chain. For pigs, this means avoiding breeds where sows produce an average of more than 16 piglets per litter. (For beef cattle) This is considered to be double-muscled breeds, for example, Belgian Blue and Piedmontese.

Greggs PLC

“All of our fresh chicken meat products as well as frozen natural chicken products should in the future meet at least the more animal-welfare-oriented criteria of the European Broiler Chicken Initiative”. The company committed to use “Only strains or hybrids permitted that meet the RSPCA Broiler Breed Welfare Assessment Protocols.”

ALDI Nord

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management

Companies continue to invest in robust governance and management systems to oversee farm animal welfare across their supply chains. This pillar remains the highest scoring in the 2025 Benchmark, with the average score showing a steady upward trend, rising from 37% in 2022 to 39% in 2025.

Progress is Evident in Several Areas:

- Day-to-day management responsibility: 88 companies (59%) now assign clear responsibility for animal welfare, up from 55% in 2024.
- Monitoring compliance: 83 companies (56%) report the actions taken when policies are not met, compared with 51% in 2024.
- Third-party assurance: 58% of companies now report that at least a substantial proportion of their products are covered by basic or higher levels of third-party assurance. (A substantial proportion of products is considered to be all products within a significant business division, geography or product range.)

Case Study Examples

Q16 Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for farm animal welfare?

Each Brazilian unit of Minerva S.A. has at least one person solely dedicated to Animal Welfare, who monitors the area on a daily basis, manages the indicators and has the autonomy to correct non-conformities, with weekly reports to the coordination [...] Daily oversight of KPIs related to farm animal welfare and efforts to reduce our dependence on animal-based products is carried out by the entire technical staff of the Corporate Animal Welfare department [...] The Sustainability Committee discusses strategic topics related to Animal Welfare. This committee is composed of senior management members — including the CEO, CFO, CCO, COO of Related Businesses, and the Chairman of the Board of Directors. The Sustainability and Innovation Advisory Board then receives the overall results and key progress in the AW area.

Minerva Foods

Case Study Examples**Q16 Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for farm animal welfare?**

Kroger's management approach to animal welfare is led by a cross-functional internal Animal Welfare Working Group with representation from our Corporate Food Technology; Ethics & Compliance; Merchandising; Sourcing; and Corporate Affairs teams. This working group meets regularly to review strategy, goal progress and other pertinent details... Animal welfare and our broader Responsible Sourcing Framework is overseen by the Public Responsibilities Committee of Kroger's Board of Directors.

The Kroger Company

Q17b Does the company describe the actions it takes in the event of non-compliance with its farm animal welfare policy?

Our national buying policies are binding documents for our suppliers, forming an integral part of our contractual relationships. Our suppliers and business partners are expected to adhere to these standards, as well as any additional national requirements that exceed them [...] These standards must also be applied to all sub-suppliers throughout the entire production process. When instances of non-compliance with our policies are detected, suppliers are required to provide corrective action plans that clearly demonstrate how the relevant issues will be resolved within a specified timeframe.

ALDI South Group

Farm Animal Welfare Targets

The Farm Animal Welfare Target questions assess whether companies have set clear, time-bound targets or can demonstrate evidence of achievement on the most pressing welfare issues affecting the largest numbers of farmed animals globally.

The focus areas include:

- Ending the use of cages for laying hens
- Meeting the standards of the Better Chicken Commitment or European Chicken Commitment
- Eliminating gestation crates/sow stalls for sows throughout pregnancy, including and the observation period
- Phasing out farrowing crates for sows
- Ending the tethering of dairy cows

Figures 3.2 — 3.6 illustrate how company targets on these key farm animal welfare issues differ by geography and species. The targets are categorised as:


- **Partial Targets**
Apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a major business division or all own-brand products (for Retailers and Wholesalers).
- **Universal Targets**
Apply across all products, geographies and business divisions within a company's supply chain.



Laying Hens

Over two-thirds of BBFAW companies have set targets to source 100% of eggs from cage-free systems, with 2025 as a target deadline for many companies. This reflects the relative maturity of the issue, the greater feasibility of transitioning to cage-free eggs compared with other welfare improvements, and strong consumer rejection of eggs from caged hens.

Figure 3.2
The proportion of companies by region, for which laying hens are a relevant species, that have set a time-bound target or can demonstrate achievement of 100% cage-free egg sourcing




Regional Differences are Evident

UK companies lead, followed by Europe and Latin America. In contrast, fewer companies in North America and Asia Pacific have set targets, likely reflecting higher acceptance of eggs from caged hens and lower availability of cage-free eggs, making target implementation more challenging. In the EU, the European Commission has committed to proposing legislation to phase out cages for farm animals, including laying hens, while the UK government is consulting on banning all cages for laying hens by 2032.

Broiler Chickens

Since its launch by animal welfare NGOs in 2016, an increasing number of companies have published commitments to the Better Chicken Commitment (BCC) or the European Chicken Commitment (ECC), with target deadlines of 2024 and 2026, respectively. Of the 133 BFAW companies with broiler chickens in their supply chains, 39 (29%) have published a target. This trend is most pronounced among UK and European companies, reflecting companies' response to consumer demand and campaigning by European NGOs. No Latin American companies have yet set a target, likely because industry and NGOs in the region have focused more heavily on improving laying hen and pig welfare.

Figure 3.3
The proportion of companies by region, for which broiler chickens are a relevant species, that have set a time-bound target or can demonstrate achievement of the Better Chicken Commitment or European Broiler Commitment



Pigs

Only 13% of BBFAW companies have set a time-bound target to end the use of farrowing crates (up from 9% in 2024). However, the issue is gaining traction globally, with a number of companies across all regions implementing at least partial targets to end the use of farrowing crates and transition to free-farrowing systems that allow sows greater freedom of movement and interaction with piglets. Progress is supported by legislative initiatives in countries including Germany, Denmark, UK, Austria, Finland and New Zealand, which plan to phase out farrowing crates. Farrowing crates are already banned in Sweden, Switzerland and Norway.

In relation to sow stalls (gestation crates), the BBFAW assesses companies on their commitment to ending confinement throughout pregnancy, including the observation period. Companies that confine sows in gestation crates/sow stalls for a number of weeks — particularly common in Europe and North America- do not receive points. In the UK, sows are confined for a maximum of four hours under the Red Tractor Assurance Scheme that covers approximately 95% of national production, reflected in Figure 3.4, where UK companies outperform other regions on this measure.

Figure 3.4
The proportion of companies by region, for which pigs are relevant species, that have set a time-bound target or can demonstrate having ended the use of gestation crates/sow stalls





Figure 3.5
The proportion of companies by region, for which pigs are a relevant species, that have set a time-bound target or can demonstrate having ended the use of farrowing crates for sows



Dairy Cows

Companies in all regions have set at least partial targets to eliminate the tethering of dairy cows, demonstrating global attention to this issue. The complexity of dairy supply chains, with milk products often sourced from multiple countries and suppliers, often from global commodity markets, can make it challenging to achieve traceability and therefore to establish comprehensive targets, as illustrated in Figure 3.6.

Figure 3.6
The proportion of companies by region, for which dairy cows are a relevant species, that have set a time-bound target or can demonstrate having ended the use of dairy cow tethering



Targets: Key figures

**Laying Hen Welfare**

Of the 139 companies with eggs in their supply chains, 96 (69% compared with 70% in 2024) have set a time-bound target or provide evidence of achieving 100% cage-free egg sourcing.

**Broiler Chicken Welfare**

Among 133 companies with broiler chickens in their supply chain 39 (29%, unchanged from 2024) have established a time-bound target to meet the requirements for the Better Chicken Commitment or European Chicken Commitment.

**Dairy Cow Welfare**

Of 141 companies with dairy cows in their supply chains, 29 (21%, unchanged from 2024) have published time-bound targets to eliminate tethering, or can demonstrate that they have already achieved 100% zero tethering.

**Pig Welfare**

Among the 136 companies with pigs in their supply chains, 15 (11%, up from 9% in 2024) have set time-bound targets to end the use of gestation crates/sow stalls, while 17 companies (13%, up from 9% in 2024) have published targets to phase out farrowing crates.

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact

The Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact questions provide a comprehensive assessment of companies' progress on key welfare issues for the most represented species in their supply chains. This reporting is increasingly important for investors to understand the effectiveness of companies' animal welfare policy commitments and their implementation.

The 2025 Benchmark results indicate that companies are demonstrating improved performance in the welfare of laying hens, broiler chickens and farmed salmon. Progress is also evident in beef cattle welfare and the reporting of humane slaughter practices.

Laying Hen Welfare


Companies are making steady progress toward cage-free egg targets, with 71% of companies reporting that a proportion of laying hens in their supply chains are cage-free, up from 67% in 2024. However, only 39 companies (28%) report that 61% or more of the laying hens in their global supply chains are cage-free, an increase from 33 companies (24%) in 2024.

This shows that companies still need to make significant progress in sourcing cage-free eggs to achieve their targets.

In 2025, several companies, including Unilever, Mondelez International, Ahold Delhaize and Loblaw Companies revised or scaled back their cage-free egg targets, citing supply and cost challenges. While the majority of progress has been achieved in UK and European supply chains, companies face greater difficulties in other regions. In Asia, limited availability of cage-free eggs hinders target implementation, while in North America, the 2025 Avian Influenza outbreak significantly disrupted egg supply and pricing, affecting progress toward corporate cage-free commitments.

There is encouraging movement away from the culling of day-old male chicks, an emerging global welfare issue. In 2025, 15% of companies reported sourcing a proportion of eggs from laying hens in supply chains where day-old male chicks are not culled, up from 9% in 2024. All but two of the 21 companies reporting on this issue are European and UK companies. The culling of day-old male chicks remains standard practice in most egg supply chains, but it is increasingly scrutinised on welfare and ethical grounds. Legislative changes in Germany, France, Italy, Austria and Luxembourg, and the European Union's review of its animal welfare legislation, combined with technological innovations, such as in-ovo sexing, are enabling companies to move toward eliminating this practice.

Figure 3.7
Proportion of companies reporting/scoring on
species-specific performance impact measures



The following companies report 100% cage-free eggs in their global supply chains:

2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd)

Barilla SpA

Colruyt

Co-op UK

Cranswick PLC

Danish Crown AmbA

Greggs PLC

Groupe Danone SA

Hershey Co

IKEA (Inter IKEA Group)

J Sainsbury PLC

JD Wetherspoon PLC

Marks & Spencer PLC

MBRF

Premier Foods PLC

Waitrose

Whitbread PLC



Case Study Examples**Q30 What proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain is cage-free?**

We currently use 100% cage-free eggs for all human food products (e.g. confectionery, rice, sauces) in Europe, the U.S. and Canada. Together, these markets account for 76% of our total global volume of eggs, and when we deliver on our plans to source 100% cage-free eggs in Australia by 2025 that number will exceed 90% of our global volume.

Mars Inc

As of November 1, 2025, ahead of our commitment deadline, all Subway restaurants in the U.S. and Canada source 100 percent cage-free eggs. This multi-year transition fulfills our promise to source 100 percent cage-free eggs for the more than 22,000 restaurants across North America. In Europe, the Middle East, Australia, and New Zealand, 100 percent of the eggs we purchase are either free-range or cage-free. In other regions where supply is limited, we are committed to working with the industry and suppliers to find solutions to source cage-free or free-range eggs.

Roark Capital

Q32 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?

100% of our shell eggs are sexed in ovo in accordance with regulations

Coopérative U Enseigne

Broiler Chicken Welfare

Progress towards meeting the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment and European Chicken Commitment has been slower than for cage-free eggs. Of the 133 companies with broiler chickens in their supply chain, only four companies (ALDI South Group, Carrefour, Marks & Spencer and Premier Foods) report that at least a substantial proportion of their broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities (<30kg/m² or 6lbs/ft²), are of a slower growing breed and are subjected to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems.

Companies are reporting most on two areas: lower stocking densities and humane stunning. The proportion of companies reporting on the percentage of broiler chickens in their supply chain that is reared at lower stocking densities (<30kg/m² or 6lbs/ft²) has risen to 34%, up from 31% in 2024. Similarly, 31% of companies report on the percentage of broiler chickens subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without conscious inversion, up from 28% in 2024.

Controlled Atmosphere Stunning (CAS) is becoming increasingly prevalent in the UK and EU. It offers clear welfare benefits over electrical waterbath stunning, as well as advantages in efficiency, meat quality and worker welfare, and NGO pressure has helped drive adoption.

Only 20% of companies report on their sourcing of broiler chickens from strains with improved welfare outcomes or slower growth potential, a figure largely unchanged since 2022.

Salmon

With millions of salmon farmed globally each year, NGOs have increasingly targeted companies to adopt improved welfare standards, focusing on stocking density, pre-slaughter stunning and limiting fasting prior to slaughter. The BFAW 2025 results indicate gradual but measurable improvements:

Humane Slaughter

25% of companies report that at least some salmon are stun-killed using percussion or electrical methods, or pre-slaughter stunned following a kill method before recovery of consciousness, up from 23% in 2024.

Fasting

13% of companies report that at least a proportion of salmon are not fasted for more than 72 hours, up from 11% of companies in 2024.

Stocking Density

Only 11% of companies report that a proportion of salmon in their supply chains is reared at <10Kg/m³, reflecting the challenges of implementing this change, especially as this requirement goes beyond the level required by most farm assurance schemes.

Humane Slaughter Across Species

Encouragingly, 38% of companies now report on the proportion of animals in their global supply chains that have been pre-slaughter stunned, up from 32% in 2024. More humane slaughter practices not only improve outcomes for animals, but can also enhance production efficiency, meat quality and worker health and welfare. Only nine companies report this figure universally across all species, geographies and products, but this demonstrates that comprehensive supply chain-wide commitments to humane slaughter are achievable.



Case Study Examples

Q49 What proportion of animals (including fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?

As per our policy, 100% of our livestock and farmed finfish in our global own-brand supply chains are pre-slaughter stunned. Unfortunately, this information is not always available for all branded goods that we sell. Overall, we sell around 60% own-brand products by volume. However, by far the majority of the fresh, frozen and ingredient meat, eggs & dairy in Waitrose & Partners products comes from our own supply chains, so we calculate that well over 80% of the meat, eggs & dairy sold in store - including brands - is pre-stunned before slaughter. The reality is likely to be considerably higher, as many of our key branded suppliers have pre-stun policies of their own.

Waitrose

Volumes of Animal-Sourced Foods by Type and Production Method

Companies are expected to report on the volumes of animals in their supply chains, providing a clear measure of their global impact on farmed animals. In 2025, 23% of companies disclosed volumes by type and/or production method, up from 21% in 2024. However, only eight companies (5%) reported data comprehensively, covering all geographies, products and species.

Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods

Reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is an increasingly important business issue, driven by sustainability and health goals, shifting consumer preferences, and perceived business risks including supply chain disruption and policy shifts. Animal welfare cannot be addressed in isolation: food companies must balance improvements in animal welfare with broader sustainability priorities, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions, conserving natural resources, and protecting biodiversity. With approximately 98 billion animals farmed for food annually, meaningful welfare improvements are constrained by the predominantly intensive production systems. Significant progress will require both higher welfare standards and a reduction in overall consumption of animal-sourced foods.

On this issue, Retailers and Wholesalers outperform the other sectors, with an average score of 14%, compared to the overall average of 11%. UK and European retailers lead this pillar, scoring 28% and 22% respectively, while North American retailers average just 1%. This reflects the relative agility of retailers in reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, as well as stronger consumer demand and ESG pressures helping drive this transition in the UK and Europe. The three top performing companies — Hilton Food Group, Waitrose and Greggs PLC — are all UK-based.

Case Study Examples

Q51 Does the company report on progress towards its targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?

Our specific goal is to increase the share of plant-based products in the total quantities purchased by REWE and PENNY Germany to 60 percent by 2035. For 2024, we collected data on the quantity split of plant-based and animal-based products in our entire product range (excluding beverages) for the first time, based on the current WWF methodology. The result: The share of plant-based quantities purchased in 2024 was 54 percent.

REWE Group

Plant-Based Menus: 43% of new entrée recipes developed in 2024 were plant-based, up from 30% the previous year.

Elior Group

BBFAW

Trend Analysis



Trend Analysis

In 2022, the BBFAW underwent substantial revisions to align with rising stakeholder expectations of food companies and the urgent need to accelerate the delivery of welfare benefits for farm animals across global operations and supply chains. This was followed by a pilot assessment of the 150 companies (BBFAW 2022 Benchmark Pilot), the results of which were shared with the companies but not made publicly available. The BBFAW 2025 Benchmark therefore represents the third year of published results using the new Benchmark criteria.

The chart below highlights the companies with the most significant score changes between 2022 and 2025, defined as an increase or decrease of at least four percentage points. Overall, the results are encouraging, showing that more companies improved their farm animal welfare performance than experienced declines over the period.





Figure 4.2
Most and least improved companies 2022 – 2025



BBFAW

Company and Investor Engagement



Company and Investor Engagement

- 68 companies reviewed their preliminary assessment, with 45 companies providing detailed feedback on their assessment.
- 29 companies responded to a letter sent to their CEOs on behalf of investors in the BBFAW Investor Collaboration who wrote to all 150 companies covered by the 2024 Benchmark.
- 34 investors, representing \$3.5 trillion USD in assets under management, are signatories to the BBFAW Global Investor Statement. As signatories, these investors identify farm animal welfare as being potentially material to long-term investment value creation in the food sector and commit to taking account of farm animal welfare in their investment analyses and in their engagement with portfolio companies.

46%

of companies (68 companies) reviewed their 2025 preliminary assessments

- 32 investors, representing \$3 trillion USD in assets under management, participate in the Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare. The Collaboration facilitates engagement between investors, companies, policymakers and other stakeholders. A key activity is the annual letter to all companies covered by the Benchmark, which commends high-performing companies and improving companies while encouraging lower performers to take action. The letters invite companies to engage with investors, helping them understand how business risks and opportunities related to animal welfare are being managed. Investors also leverage BBFAW tools to support their broader engagement with companies. Green Century and Handelsbanken Fonder are the latest investors to join the Investor Collaboration.

Case Study:
**Investor Briefing on the EU
Consultation on the Revision of
EU Animal-Welfare Legislation**

In September 2025, the BBFAW, together with partners Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) and FOUR PAWS, hosted a dedicated investor briefing on the European Commission's consultation for the review and modernisation of EU animal welfare legislation. This consultation represented the most significant opportunity in decades to revise EU farm animal welfare laws, with far-reaching implications for food companies, farmers, consumers and investors. The webinar provided an overview of the consultation, proposed timelines, the implications of transitioning to cage-free farming, and explored opportunities for investors to contribute to the process.

This consultation offered a pivotal moment for investors to support higher animal welfare standards in Europe. Strong, harmonised EU legislation could:

- Prevent progressive companies from being undercut by competitors using lower welfare systems.
- Provide consistent rules across Member States, reducing compliance complexity.
- Encourage innovation and transparency, aligning with growing consumer expectations.
- Mitigate systemic risks linked to poor welfare practices, such as antimicrobial resistance.
- Give confidence to farmers and food businesses to make long-term investments, reducing market volatility.

The BBFAW secretariat encouraged investors to participate in the public consultation, ensuring investor perspectives inform the legislative process, and to amplify resources and awareness within investor networks, highlighting the commercial rationale for strong welfare legislation. Support, briefing materials and coordination were provided to make the engagement straightforward and impactful, without requiring specialist animal welfare expertise. Following the webinar, nine investors signed a collective letter to the European Commission, coordinated by the BBFAW Secretariat, supporting an ambitious review and reform of the EU's animal welfare legislation that would further promote humane, sustainable and ethical food systems.

Case Study:**BBFAW Investor Collaboration
Engagement with Cranswick PLC**

In May 2025, Cranswick suspended operations at a supplying farm following reports of serious animal welfare incidents relating to handling and slaughter, documented by Animal Justice Project (AJP). Additional incidents at two other farms emerged in August and September 2025. In response, Cranswick commissioned an independent veterinarian review, published in November 2025, and outlined a six-point plan to improve animal welfare.

In February 2026, the BBFAW Secretariat convened a meeting with Cranswick and investors following requests from concerned investors. Attendees included Robeco, Greenbank and Evelyn Partners, and members of Cranswick's senior management and agriculture team. The meeting provided investors with the opportunity to:

- Hear directly about the incidents and the company's corrective actions.
- Clarify expectations on governance, reporting, and transparency.
- Review Cranswick's farm onboarding processes, whistleblowing mechanisms, CCTV monitoring and allocation of investment toward governance and management, and welfare improvements.

This engagement demonstrates the importance that investors place on animal welfare and the management of associated risks. It highlights how investors hold companies accountable, influence corporate behaviour, and encourage transparency and long-term improvement.

BBFAW

Looking Ahead



Looking Ahead

The BBFAW benchmarking process has been highly effective in driving improvements in corporate practices and processes on farm animal welfare, as well as building investor awareness of farm animal welfare as an investment issue. While benchmarking will remain central to BBFAW's approach, we recognise that the annual cycle can, at times concentrate attention on benchmark performance itself, rather than on the broader strategic context in which companies manage animal welfare or the specific interventions required to accelerate real-world improvements.

We have therefore decided to move to a biennial benchmarking cycle (with the next Benchmark to be published in 2028). The intervening period will be used to deepen impact and ensure the BBFAW continues to drive meaningful progress and deliver improved welfare of animals globally. As such, the BBFAW will:

Work Intensively with Investors to:

- Strengthening their understanding of animal welfare as an investment issue.
- Increase visibility of the investment implications of key global trends in animal agriculture, such as the intensification of farming systems, and the continued routine use of antibiotics.
- Build deeper familiarity with the BBFAW framework and datasets, with a clear focus on how these can be more effectively applied to inform investor decision-making.
- Strengthen the BBFAW Investor Coalition, including more in-depth analysis of priority companies and geographies.

Work More Closely with Companies to:

- Support the translation of commitments into implementation, with a focus on closing the gap between policy and practice.
- Provide targeted guidance on key welfare issues (e.g. close confinement, antibiotic use, live transportation and humane slaughter).
- Share emerging best practice and facilitate peer learning across sectors and regions.
- Encourage more consistent, decision-useful disclosure aligned with BBFAW expectations.

**Refine and Strengthen
the BBFAW Benchmark:**

- Establish a cross-sector working group comprising representatives from the food industry, investors, industry experts and NGOs.
- Use this group to advise on targeted refinements to the research process and assessment criteria, ensuring continued relevance to both companies and investors.
- Review broader strategic questions, including the scope of companies covered and the relationship between animal welfare and wider environmental, social and public health considerations.

This work will be undertaken in a way that maintains the continuity, stability, and comparability of the Benchmark over time, while allowing for carefully considered improvements and evolutionary enhancements where appropriate.

The next formal assessment of companies against the BBFAW criteria will take place in October and November 2027, with the Benchmark Report published in early 2028. In the interim, companies are strongly encouraged to maintain and regularly update their public disclosures on farm animal welfare, as these are increasingly used by stakeholders to track progress against stated commitments and targets.



BBFAW

Appendix



Performance by assessment pillar (quintiles)

Figure A1
Performance by assessment pillar (quintiles)

This chart shows the performance of each company in the Benchmark across the four assessment pillars relative to other companies. Company scores for each pillar have been split into five equal groups, or quintiles. Companies scoring in the top 20% for each pillar are in Quintile 1, companies scoring in the bottom 20% for each pillar are in Quintile 5. Because of limited variation in scores in the Animal Sourced Foods pillar, the distribution cannot be evenly divided into five distinct groups and the data effectively collapses into fewer visible quintiles. The companies are listed in alphabetical order.

Figure A.1
Company Score Quintiles by Pillar





Figure A.1
Company Score Quintiles by Pillar


Quintile Number
1,000 5,000



Quintile Number
1,000 5,000

Figure A.1
Company Score Quintiles by Pillar

Quintile Number
1,000 5,000



Quintile Number
1,000 5,000

² Score Quintiles (colour) broken down by Pillars vs. Company Name, with Quintile¹ = top-scoring companies and Quintile⁵ = lowest-scoring companies.

2025 Company List

	Company	ICB classification	Ownership	Country of origin / incorporation	Laying Hens	Broiler Chickens	Pigs	Dairy cows	Beef Cattle	Farmed Salmon	Ducks or Geese
1	(The) Kroger Company	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
2	2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd)	3570: Food Producer	Private	UK	•	•	•	•	•	•	
3	Aeon Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Japan	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
4	Agro Super	3570: Food Producer	Public	Chile	•	•	•	•	•	•	
5	Ahold Delhaize	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Netherlands	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
6	Albertsons	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
7	ALDI Einkauf SE & Co. oHG (ALDI Nord)	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Germany	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
8	ALDI Süd/ALDI Einkauf SE & Co. OHG	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Germany	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
9	Alimentation Couche-Tard	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Canada	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
10	Amazon/Whole Foods Market	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
11	Aramark Corporation	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
12	Arla Foods Ltd	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	Denmark				•			
13	Asda (Bellis Topco Ltd.)	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	United Kingdom	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
14	Avolta AG	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	Switzerland	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
15	Barilla SpA	3570: Food Producer	Private	Italy	•	•	•	•	•		
16	Beijing Dabeinong Technology Group Co., Ltd.	3570: Food Producer	Private	China			•	•			
17	Bimbo	3570: Food Producer	Public	Mexico	•			•			
18	BJ's Wholesale Club Holdings	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
19	Bloomin' Brands Inc	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	
20	C&S Wholesale	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
21	Campbell Soup Company	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•		
22	Camst — La Ristorazione Italiana Soc. Coop. ARL	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Cooperative	Italy	•	•	•	•	•	•	
23	Cargill	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	
24	Carrefour SA	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	France	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
25	Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	France	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
26	Cencosud	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Chile	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
27	Charoen Pokphand Foods	3570: Food Producer	Private	Thailand	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
28	Chick-fil-A	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•		
29	China Resources Vanguard	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	China	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
30	China Yurun Group Limited	3570: Food Producer	Private	China		•	•		•		•
31	Chipotle Mexican Grill	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•		
32	CKE Restaurants	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•		
33	Coles Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Australia	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
34	Colruyt	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Belgium	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
35	Compass Group PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
36	Conad Consorzio Nazionale	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	Italy	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
37	ConAgra	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	
38	Cooke Seafood Inc	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA			•			•	
39	Coop Group (Switzerland)/Coop Genossenschaft	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	Switzerland	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
40	Coop Italia	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	Italy	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Company	ICB classification	Ownership	Country of origin / incorporation	Laying Hens	Broiler Chickens	Pigs	Dairy cows	Beef Cattle	Farmed Salmon	Ducks or Geese
41	Co-op UK	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	UK
42	Cooperativa Central Aurora Alimentos	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	Brazil
43	Coopérative U Enseigne	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	France
44	Cooperl Arc Atlantique	3570: Food Producer	Public	France
45	Costco Wholesale Corporation	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA
46	Cracker Barrel	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
47	Cranswick PLC	3570: Food Producer	Public	UK
48	Cremonini SpA	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	Italy
49	Dairy Farmers of America	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	USA
50	Danish Crown AmbA	3570: Food Producer	Joint Stock	Denmark
51	Darden Restaurants PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
52	Dico's/Ting Hsin International Group	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	China
53	Dino Polska SA	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Poland
54	Domino's Pizza Inc	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
55	E.Leclerc	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	France
56	EDEKA Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Germany
57	Elior Group	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	France
58	Elo Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	France
59	Empire Company/Sobey's	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Canada
60	Ferrero Group	3570: Food Producer	Joint Stock	Italy
61	Fonterra	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	New Zealand
62	Gategroup Holding AG	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	Switzerland
63	General Mills Inc	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
64	Greggs PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK
65	Groupe Danone SA	3570: Food Producer	Public	France
66	Groupe Lactalis	3570: Food Producer	Private	France
67	Gruppo Veronesi	3570: Food Producer	Private	Italy
68	H E Butt Company	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	USA
69	Habib's	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	Brazil
70	Hershey Co	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
71	Hilton Food Group	3570: Food Producer	Public	UK
72	Hormel Foods Corporation	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
73	ICA Gruppen AB	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Sweden
74	IKEA (Inter IKEA Group)	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Sweden
75	Industrias Bachoco	3570: Food Producer	Public	Mexico
76	J Sainsbury PLC	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	UK
77	JAB Holding Company	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	Luxembourg
78	JBS SA	3570: Food Producer	Public	Brazil
79	JD Wetherspoon PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK
80	Jeronimo Martins	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Portugal

	Company	ICB classification	Ownership	Country of origin / incorporation	Laying Hens	Broiler Chickens	Pigs	Dairy cows	Beef Cattle	Farmed Salmon	Ducks or Geese
81	Kerry Group	3570: Food Producer	Public	Ireland	•	•	•	•	•		•
82	Kraft Heinz Company	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	
83	LDC Groupe	3570: Food Producer	Private	France	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
84	Les Mousquetaires	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	France	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
85	Lianhua Supermarket Holdings Co	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	China	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
86	Loblaw Companies Limited	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Canada	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
87	Maple Leaf Foods	3570: Food Producer	Public	Canada	•	•	•	•	•		
88	Marks & Spencer PLC	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	UK	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
89	Mars Inc	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•		
90	MBRF	3570: Food Producer	Public	Brazil	•	•	•	•	•		
91	McDonald's Corporation	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	
92	Meiji Holdings	3570: Food Producer	Public	Japan	•	•	•	•	•		
93	Mercadona SA	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Spain	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
94	METRO AG	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Germany	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
95	Metro Inc	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Canada	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
96	Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	Switzerland	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
97	Minerva Foods	3570: Food Producer	Public	Brazil	•	•	•	•	•	•	
98	Mitchells & Butlers PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
99	Mondelēz International	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA	•			•			
100	Mowi ASA	3570: Food Producer	Public	Norway	•		•	•		•	
101	Nestlé SA	3570: Food Producer	Public	Switzerland	•	•	•	•	•	•	
102	New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd	3570: Food Producer	Public	China	•	•	•	•	•		•
103	Nippon Ham	3570: Food Producer	Public	Japan	•	•	•	•	•	•	
104	Noble Foods	3570: Food Producer	Private	UK	•						
105	OSI Group	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	
106	Papa John's Pizza	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	
107	Perdue Farms	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	
108	Plukon Food Group	3570: Food Producer	Private	Netherlands	•	•	•	•	•	•	
109	Premier Foods PLC	3570: Food Producer	Public	UK	•	•	•	•	•		
110	Premium Food Group	3570: Food Producer	Private	Germany	•	•	•	•	•		
111	Publix Super Markets Inc	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
112	Restaurant Brands International	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	Canada	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
113	REWE Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	Germany	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
114	Roark Capital (Inspire Brands, Subway et al.)	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
115	Royal FrieslandCampina	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	Netherlands	•			•			
116	Saputo Inc	3570: Food Producer	Public	Canada	•	•	•	•	•		
117	Schwarz Gruppe	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Germany	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
118	Seaboard Corp	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA			•				
119	Seven & i Holdings	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Japan	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
120	Sodexo	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	France	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Company	ICB classification	Ownership	Country of origin / incorporation	Laying Hens	Broiler Chickens	Pigs	Dairy cows	Beef Cattle	Farmed Salmon	Ducks or Geese
121 Spar Holding AG	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Switzerland	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
122 SSP Group	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
123 Starbucks Corporation	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•		
124 Sysco Corporation	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
125 Target Corporation	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•		•
126 Terrena Group	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	France	•	•	•	•	•		•
127 Tesco PLC	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	UK	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
128 The Cheesecake Factory	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
129 Tyson Foods Inc	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•		•
130 Umios (previously Maruha Nichiro)	3570: Food Producer	Public	Japan	•	•	•	•	•	•	
131 UNFI	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
132 Unilever NV	3570: Food Producer	Public	Netherlands	•	•	•	•	•		
133 Unternehmensgruppe Theo Müller	3570: Food Producer	Private	Germany	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
134 US Foods	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	
135 Vion Food	3570: Food Producer	Public	Netherlands	•	•	•	•	•		
136 Waitrose	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Partnership	UK	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
137 Walmart Inc	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
138 Wayne-Sanderson Farms	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA		•		•			
139 Wendy's Company (The)	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	USA	•	•	•	•	•		
140 Wens Foodstuff Group	3570: Food Producer	Private	China	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
141 WH Group Ltd	3570: Food Producer	Public	China	•	•	•	•	•		•
142 Whitbread PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
143 Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	UK	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
144 Woolworths Limited	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Australia	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
145 Yili Group	3570: Food Producer	Public	China				•			
146 Yonghui Superstores Co Ltd	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	China	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
147 Yum China Holdings	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	China	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
148 Yum! Brands Inc	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA	•	•	•	•	•		
149 Zhongpin Inc (Huayu Holdings)	3570: Food Producer	Private	China		•	•		•		

2025 Benchmark Questions and Scoring

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitment		
Question 1.	Does the company acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • Maximum points are awarded to companies that also recognise farm animals as sentient beings. This may be through recognition of the 'Five Freedoms of Animal Welfare' in combination with recognition of the need to promote positive welfare states, recognition of the 'Five Domains of Animal Welfare', or explicit recognition of animal sentience. • The score does not take account of the importance assigned by companies to farm animal welfare (e.g. relative to other corporate responsibility issues). 	

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Question 2.	Does the company publish an overarching farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent)?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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, 4-12, 24-28 and 30-50. • 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, 4-12, 24-28 and 30-50. • 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"> — 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) — A clear position regarding expected standards of farm animal welfare — 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) — A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Question 3.	Does the farm animal welfare policy provide a clear explanation of scope?	
Rationale	Understanding the scope of a policy is important to understand the breadth of a company's commitment to action on farm animal welfare.	
Scoring	3a. Geographic scope	
	Geographic scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified geographies.	1.5
	Scope is universal across all geographies.	3
	3b. Species scope	
	Species scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified species.	1.5
	Scope is universal across all relevant species.	3
	3c. Product scope	
	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
		(Max Score 9)

Explanatory Notes

- This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 2, i.e. when the company has a published farm animal welfare policy.
- 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).
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Question 4.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of close confinement for all species?	
Rationale	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; 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 high stocking densities.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • Companies that simply mention they avoid close confinement but do not state the specific confinement to be avoided receive zero points. • Statements on ending the use of cages for broiler chickens are not suitable for points, unless the company makes clear that chicken is sourced from a region where these systems are in use (e.g., Asia). • 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. • 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. 	

Explanatory Notes
Continued

- 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.
 - Regarding CAFOs and feedlots, these 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.
 - 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.
-

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Question 5.	Does the company have a clear commitment to the provision of effective, species-specific enrichment for all species?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • Companies that simply mention they provide environmental enrichment but do not state the specific environmental enrichment to be provided, receive zero points. • ‘Enriched’ cages are not awarded points. • 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Question 6.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of routine mutilations for all species?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • Companies that simply mention they have a commitment to ending routine mutilations but do not state the specific mutilations they are looking to end the use of receive zero points. • 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 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Question 7.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic and routine metaphylactic use of antibiotics for all species?	
Rationale	<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 due to the incentive this creates to withhold antibiotics from animals in need of treatment.</p> <p>For farmed fish, this question is looking for a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics only.</p>	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. • Partial points may be awarded for commitments focused on prophylactic use in the absence of a commitment on routine metaphylactic use. • 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. • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Question 8.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending long-distance live transport for all species?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • The question covers animals transported on land and by sea, and companies are expected to include sea transport in their policies and reporting on transport times. We encourage companies to clearly state whether sea transport is included in their policies, or clearly state that they do not transport animals by sea. • 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Question 9.	Does the company have a clear commitment to the use of humane methods of pre-slaughter stunning for all species?	
Rationale	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 CO ₂ 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.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 	

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Laying Hens, Pigs and Beef Cattle		
Question 10.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of breeds with low welfare potential?	
Rationale	<p>The welfare of farmed animals is not only influenced by management practices and the inputs provided to them, but also by their genetics. For example, some breeds selected for high growth rate and lean meat deposition can suffer a range of physiological and metabolic health issues, as well as poor immunity and lethargy and poor behavioural expression. Double-muscled breeds of beef cattle are associated with higher rates of dystocia (difficulty calving). The choice of breed or strain of animals used in livestock production can therefore have a significant impact on animal welfare.</p> <p>Specific requirements for the species covered by this question are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broiler chickens: end use of breeds that do not meet the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment requirements for improved welfare outcomes; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>or</u> end use of breeds without a slower growth potential, defined as <40g/d averaged over the growth cycle according to the breeding company specification • Pigs: end use of sows with an average >16 piglets liveborn per litter • Beef cattle: end use of double-muscled breeds (e.g. Belgian Blue and Piedmontese) in pure-bred and cross-bred form. 	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. 	

Explanatory Notes
Continued

- Partial points may be awarded for commitments limited to certain species covered by this question.
 - 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.
-

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Ducks or Geese		
Question 11.	Does the company have a clear commitment not to produce or sell foie gras or meat from birds reared for foie gras?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • This question is only assessed for those companies that have ducks or geese in their supply chains. • Companies that only mention they do not produce or sell foie gras products do not qualify for points. Companies are required to also include meat from birds reared for foie gras within their commitments. • 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. • 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). • Partial policies, which are limited to certain species, products or geographies, are not awarded points. • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Laying Hens, Pigs, Dairy Cattle, Beef Cattle, Ducks or Geese		
Question 12.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of other inhumane practices?	
Rationale	Practices covered by this question include the culling of day-old male chicks in egg supply chains; cow-calf separation in dairy and beef supply chains; fully slatted flooring for pigs, dairy and beef cattle, ducks; and live plucking or live harvesting for geese.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • This question is only assessed for those companies that have laying hens, pigs, dairy cattle, beef cattle, ducks or geese in their supply chains. • Acceptable alternative practices to the culling of day-old male chicks include the use of in-ovo sexing methods and the use of dual-purpose breeds. • 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. • 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. 	

Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods Policy Commitments		
Question 13.	Does the company acknowledge the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue?	
Rationale	Reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, 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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking for an acknowledgement by the parent company that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue. • 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. • Companies that acknowledge reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods as a relevant business issue and/or set out the reasons why it may be a business issue (e.g. because of public or customer concerns, security and sustainability of supply, cost, etc.) are awarded points. • Companies that only provide evidence related to protein diversification, without any acknowledgement of the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods, are not awarded points. • 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). 	

Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods Policy Commitments		
Question 14.	Does the company publish an overarching policy (or equivalent) on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 12, i.e., if the parent company recognises that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue. • 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. • 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. • 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 22 and 28. • Companies that supplement these commitments or principles with details of how these are to be implemented are awarded a score of 10 points. To score maximum points, company policies need to include most/all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — 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). — 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 — 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) — A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance. 	

Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods Policy Commitments		
Question 15.	Does the policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods provide a clear explanation of scope?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	15a. Geographic scope	
	Geographic scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified geographies.	2.5
	Scope is universal across all geographies.	5
	15b. Business division scope	
	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 13, i.e. when the company has a published policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. • 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-questions, and the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores awarded for the other sub-question). • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management		
Question 16.	Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for farm animal welfare?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	16a. Management responsibility	
	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
	16b. Board or senior management responsibility	
	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). For the purposes of scoring on day-to-day responsibility, the question is not looking for named individuals, but evidence of roles with responsibility for farm animal welfare (e.g. a statement that this is the responsibility of a dedicated technical or sourcing manager, or a statement that responsibility is divided among a number of functions, with information on the various roles and responsibilities). 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. 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management		
Question 17.	Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its farm animal welfare policies are effectively implemented?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	17a. Employee training	
	No information provided on employee training in farm animal welfare.	0
	The company provides specific training to employees in farm animal welfare.	5
	17b. Actions taken in the event of non-compliance	
	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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. • The training question does not address the quality of the training provided, the manner in which skills or competencies are assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provided. • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management		
Question 18.	Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain?	
Rationale	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).	
Scoring	No description of processes for implementing farm animal welfare policy through supply chain.	0
	18a. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain via supplier contracts?	
	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
	18b. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain via monitoring and auditing?	
	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
	18c. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain via education and support?	
	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	
	(Max Score 9)	

Explanatory Notes
Continued

- 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).
- 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.
- On auditing, companies are only awarded 3 points if it is clear that their auditing processes explicitly covered farm animal welfare. Many companies report that they audit their suppliers against safety and/or quality standards but, unless it is clear that these audit processes cover farm animal welfare, companies score zero for this sub-question.
- On auditing, companies are expected to explain how they monitor or audit their farm animal welfare policy requirements through their supply chain. Simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard or evidence of the use of third-party assurance schemes that include welfare requirements is not sufficient in itself to be awarded points for this question. Whilst third-party assurance schemes may feature as part of a company's approach to monitoring and auditing its supply chain, in order to receive points for this question, companies are required to clearly state this is the case or evidence it through, e.g., stating which of the company's animal welfare requirements are assessed by the assurance schemes.
- 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.

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management	
Question 19.	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)?
Rationale	<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 and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.</p> <p>WOMs might include for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all species: mortality and cull rates, disease incidence. • For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, feather cleanliness, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter. • For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate, longevity, ease of calving, lesions, swellings, cleanliness, stomach ulcers, acidosis. • For sows: Longevity, lameness, body condition, shoulder and vulva lesions, ear and flank biting. • For pigs: lameness, cleanliness, tail bites, fight marks, bursitis and other lesions. • For broiler chickens: gait score, leg culls, footpad dermatitis, hock burn, breast blisters, feather cleanliness, muscle myopathies. • For beef: body condition, lameness, lesions, swellings, cleanliness, stomach ulcers, acidosis. • For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition. • For fish: fin and body damage, sea lice and other ectoparasite infestations, skeletal deformities, condition factor, mortality and behaviour. • For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort; qualitative behavioural analysis. • For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active — foraging, perching, dustbathing, bathing (ducks), socialising, swimming (fish). • For transportation: injuries, slips and falls, fatigue, road traffic incidents, mortality (dead-on-arrival/DOA). • For slaughter: effectiveness of stunning.

	19a. Does the company describe how it uses welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain?	
	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
	19b. Does the company report on welfare outcome measures (i.e. measures linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?	
	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
	(Max Score 7)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • The sub-question on reporting is looking for explicit, quantitative reporting on welfare outcome measures such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mortality rates (as an indicator of potential pain, suffering and suboptimal performance), for fish: mortality or survival rates. – Bone breakages (as an indicator of pain, suffering, suboptimal performance, and poor house design). – Lameness (as an indicator of potential pain, behavioural restriction and suboptimal environmental and housing conditions). – Body marks/injuries (as an indicator of aggressive fight damage, especially during mixing or competition at feeding, or from sexual behaviours). – Body condition (as an indicator of good feed management, or competition at feeding). – Cleanliness (as an indicator of good environmental control, thermal comfort). – Positive flock or herd behaviour (as an indicator of a varied stimulating environment, good management and suitable breed for production system). – 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). 	

Explanatory Notes
Continued

- 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).
 - 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).
 - 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.
 - 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.
-

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management		
Question 20.	Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?	
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	No assurance standard specified.	0
	A substantial proportion of products audited to either basic or higher farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard.	1
	All products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard across all species, products and geographies.	2
	All products audited to a combination of a basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard and a higher welfare assurance (or company equivalent standard), across all species, products and geographies.	4
	All products audited to higher welfare (or company equivalent) assurance standard, across all species, products and geographies.	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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). • 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). • 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. • If companies audit against other voluntary schemes that claim to incorporate animal welfare components but without specifying them, they will typically not receive any point, unless they provide a clear description of the farm animal welfare requirements of such standards. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management		
Question 21.	Does the company communicate to customers on higher farm animal welfare through education and/or awareness-raising activities?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activities that could be considered in this question are defined broadly. Examples included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — 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. — On-pack or on-shelf labelling — provided this is evidenced on the company’s website, in its published reports or on social media platforms. — Information leaflets or information packs. — Media promotions. — Supporting third party campaigns or programmes e.g. the RSPCA Farm Animal Week. — Customer farm visits, seminars or roundtables. — Social media campaigns. • 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. • 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. • Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to communicate to consumers. • 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). 	

Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods Governance and Management		
Question 22.	Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	22a. Day-to-day management responsibility	
	No clearly defined day-to-day 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
	22b. Board or senior management responsibility	
	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 12, i.e., if the parent company recognises that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue. • 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). • 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). • 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). • 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. • 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. 	

Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods Governance and Management		
Question 23.	Does the company communicate to customers on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods through education and/or awareness-raising activities?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 12, i.e., if the parent company recognises that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue. • 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). • The activities that could be considered in this question are defined broadly. Examples included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — 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. — On-pack or on-shelf labelling — provided this is evidenced on the company’s website, in its published reports or on social media platforms. — Information leaflets or information packs. — Media promotions. — Supporting third party campaigns or programmes. — Customer farm visits, seminars or roundtables. — Social media campaigns. • 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. • Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to communicate to consumers. • 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). 	

Farm Animal Welfare Targets		
Laying Hens		
Question 24.	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?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	No stated position.	0
	The company has published a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	5
	The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products. • 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. • 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. • 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). • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Targets									
Broiler Chickens									
Question 25.	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?								
Rationale	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.								
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>No stated position.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The company has published a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	No stated position.	0	The company has published a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	5	The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10	(Max Score 10)	
No stated position.	0								
The company has published a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	5								
The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10								
(Max Score 10)									
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products. • This question is looking for a clear target for achieving the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment or European Chicken Commitment for broiler chickens or evidence that this has already been achieved (see www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/ and www.welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/). • To qualify for points, companies need to explicitly state their commitment to the Better Chicken Commitment or the European Chicken Commitment. • 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. • 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). • 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. 								

Farm Animal Welfare Targets		
Pigs		
Question 26.	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?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	No stated position.	0
	The company has published 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 has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products. • 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 (the period between weaning and pregnancy confirmation), within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved. • This question is looking for targets 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. • 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. • 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). • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Targets		
Pigs		
Question 27.	Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of farrowing crates for sows, or provide evidence this has already been achieved?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	No stated position.	0
	The company has published 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 has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products. • 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. • In order to continue to receive points from the 2026 assessments onwards, companies will be required to provide make clear whether sows are subject to any close confinement in the alternative farrowing systems used. Specifically, we are looking for companies to make clear whether temporary crating is used and, if so, specify the duration of such confinement. Companies not reporting clearly on temporary crating practices will be provided a warning in the 2025 assessments that they will need to amend their reporting in order to continue to receive points in the 2026 assessment. 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. • 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). • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Targets		
Dairy Cows		
Question 28.	Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of tethering for dairy cows, or provide evidence this has already been achieved?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	No stated position.	0
	The company has published a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	5
	The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products. • 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. • 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. • 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). • 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. 	

Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods Targets		
Question 29.	Has the company set time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	No published time-bound targets.	0
	The company has published a partial time-bound target and the scope (in terms of geography or business division) is clearly defined.	5
	The company has published a universal time-bound target, across all geographies and business divisions.	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 12, i.e., if the parent company recognises that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue. • This question is looking for evidence of explicit, time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods within a reasonable timeframe. • 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). • Targets explicitly focused on efforts to decrease volumes or proportions of animal sourced foods will be eligible for maximum points (10 points), whereas targets which imply reductions in animal sourced foods (e.g. focused on increasing the proportion of alternative proteins menu items) will be eligible for partial points (5 points). 	

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Laying Hens																	
Question 30.	What proportion of laying hens (for shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is cage-free?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of laying hens is cage-free, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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	(Max Score 10)	
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																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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). 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Laying Hens																	
Question 31.	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 and tipping?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming and tipping. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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 and tipping.	1	21 — 40% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.	2	41 — 60% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.	3	61 — 80% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.	5	81 — 98% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.	7	99 — 100% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.	10	(Max Score 10)	
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 and tipping.	1																
21 — 40% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.	2																
41 — 60% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.	3																
61 — 80% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.	5																
81 — 98% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.	7																
99 — 100% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping.	10																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain that is free from both beak trimming and tipping. Partial points are awarded if companies report on the proportion of animals free from beak trimming or tipping. • 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. • Companies that report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming and 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. • 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 and tipping in line with these standards. • Companies that make general statements about "Our laying hens" or "All chickens" being free from beak trimming and tipping are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming and tipping (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Laying Hens																	
Question 32.	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?																
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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	(Max Score 10)	
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																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Broiler Chickens																	
Question 33.	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 ² or 6lbs/sq ft or less)?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 30kg/m ² or 6lbs/sq ft or less). For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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	(Max Score 10)	
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																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products. • 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, 30kg/m² or 6Lbs/sq ft or less. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Broiler Chickens																	
Question 34.	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)?																
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of products is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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	(Max Score 10)	
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																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens in the company's global supply chain that is from breeds that meet the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment requirements, with improved welfare outcomes according to the breeding company specification (see www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/ and www.welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/); or breeds with a slower growth potential, defined as <40g/d averaged over the growth cycle. • Companies should state the breeds used or that the breeds are RSPCA or GAP-approved within their reporting. • 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. • 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. • 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. 																

Explanatory Notes
Continued

- 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 ...').
- 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.
- 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.

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact		
Broiler Chickens		
Question 35.	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?	
Rationale	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 retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
		(Max Score 10)
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products. • 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. • 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. • 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. 	

Explanatory Notes
Continued

- 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.
- Companies that make general statements about “Our broiler chickens” or “All broiler chickens” being subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multiphase 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 ...’).
- 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.

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Pigs																	
Question 36.	What proportion of sows (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from gestation crates /sow stalls?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation crates /sow stalls throughout pregnancy including the observation period. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	0% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls, or no reported information.	0	1 — 20% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	1	21 — 40% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	2	41 — 60% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	3	61 — 80% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	5	81 — 98% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	7	99 — 100% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	10	(Max Score 10)	
0% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls, or no reported information.	0																
1 — 20% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	1																
21 — 40% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	2																
41 — 60% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	3																
61 — 80% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	5																
81 — 98% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	7																
99 — 100% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	10																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of sows in the company's global supply chain that is free from gestation crates/sow stalls throughout pregnancy and during the observation period (i.e are group housed from weaning to pre-farrowing). • 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. • 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. • Companies that report on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation crates/ 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. • 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. • Companies that make general statements about "Our sows" or "All sows" being free from gestation crates/sow stalls are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation crates/sow stalls (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our sows...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Pigs																	
Question 37.	What proportion of sows (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from farrowing crates?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of sows that is free from farrowing crates. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of sows is free from farrowing crates, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of sows is free from farrowing crates.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of sows is free from farrowing crates.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of sows is free from farrowing crates.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of sows is free from farrowing crates.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of sows is free from farrowing crates.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of sows is free from farrowing crates.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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	(Max Score 10)	
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																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products. • 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. • In order to continue to receive points from the 2026 assessments onwards, companies will be required to make clear whether sows are subject to any close confinement in the alternative farrowing systems used. Specifically, we are looking for companies to make clear whether temporary crating is used and, if so, specify the duration of such confinement. Companies not reporting clearly on temporary crating practices will be provided a warning in the 2025 assessments that they will need to amend their reporting in order to continue to receive points in the 2026 assessment. 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact		
Pigs		
Question 38.	What proportion of pigs (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of pigs that is free from tail docking. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Dairy Cows																	
Question 39.	What proportion of dairy cattle (for fresh/frozen milk and milk products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from tethering?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from tethering. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of dairy cows is free from tethering, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	0% of dairy cows is free from tethering, or no reported information.	0	1 — 20% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	1	21 — 40% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	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	(Max Score 10)	
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																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Dairy Cows																	
Question 40.	What proportion of dairy cattle (for fresh/frozen milk and milk products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is provided with pasture access?																
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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	(Max Score 10)	
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																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Dairy Cows																	
Question 41.	What proportion of dairy cows (for fresh/frozen milk and milk products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from disbudding and dehorning?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from disbudding and dehorning. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	0% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning, or no reported information.	0	1 — 20% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	1	21 — 40% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	2	41 — 60% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	3	61 — 80% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	5	81 — 98% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	7	99 — 100% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	10	(Max Score 10)	
0% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning, or no reported information.	0																
1 — 20% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	1																
21 — 40% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	2																
41 — 60% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	3																
61 — 80% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	5																
81 — 98% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	7																
99 — 100% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning.	10																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products. This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that is free from both disbudding and dehorning. Reporting related to the proportion of polled breed animals in the company's global supply chain will also be taken into account. Partial points are awarded if companies report on the proportion of animals free from disbudding or dehorning. 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. Companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from disbudding and 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. 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 and dehorning in line with these standards. Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being free from disbudding and dehorning are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from disbudding and dehorning (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our dairy cows ...'). 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Beef Cattle																	
Question 42.	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?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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	(Max Score 10)	
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																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell beef or beef-based products. • 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. • This question is looking for reporting to cover all beef cattle in the company's supply chain, including veal calves and calves originating from dairy supply chains. • Points are only awarded if the company explicitly mentions CAFOs or feedlots and 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Beef Cattle																	
Question 43.	What proportion of beef cattle (for fresh/frozen beef products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is group housed as calves, throughout rearing?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is group housed throughout rearing. Calves should be reared in groups (minimum pairs) from birth. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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	(Max Score 10)	
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																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell beef or beef-based products. • 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, from birth (minimum pairs). • This question is looking for reporting to cover all beef cattle in the company's supply chain, including veal calves and calves originating from dairy supply chains. • Animals that are diseased or injured may be kept in hospital pens as required to protect the animals' health and welfare. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Beef Cattle																	
Question 44.	What proportion of beef cattle (for fresh/frozen beef products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from disbudding and dehorning?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding and dehorning. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	0% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning, or no reported information.	0	1 — 20% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	1	21 — 40% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	2	41 — 60% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	3	61 — 80% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	5	81 — 98% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	7	99 — 100% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	10	(Max Score 10)	
0% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning, or no reported information.	0																
1 — 20% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	1																
21 — 40% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	2																
41 — 60% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	3																
61 — 80% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	5																
81 — 98% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	7																
99 — 100% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning.	10																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell beef or beef-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of beef cattle in the company's global supply chain that is free from both disbudding and dehorning. Reporting related to the proportion of polled breed animals in the company's global supply chain will also be taken into account. Partial points are awarded if companies report on the proportion of animals free from disbudding or dehorning. • This question is looking for reporting to cover all beef cattle in the company's supply chain, including veal calves and calves originating from dairy supply chains. • 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. • Companies that report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding and 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. • 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 and dehorning in line with these standards. • Companies that make general statements about "Our beef cattle" or "All beef cattle" being free from disbudding and dehorning are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding and dehorning (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our beef cattle ...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact																	
Farmed Salmon																	
Question 45.	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 ³ or less)?																
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.																
Scoring	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>0% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 — 20% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 — 40% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 — 60% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 — 80% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81 — 98% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>99 — 100% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	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	(Max Score 10)	
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																
(Max Score 10)																	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell farmed salmon or farmed salmon-based products. • 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/m³ or less). • Scores are not awarded for companies that report average stocking densities for salmon. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our farmed salmon ...'). • 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. 																

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact		
Farmed Salmon		
Question 46.	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?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
		(Max Score 10)
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell farmed salmon or products containing farmed salmon. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact		
Farmed Salmon		
Question 47.	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?	
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
		(Max Score 10)
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell farmed salmon or products containing farmed salmon. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact		
All Species		
Question 48.	What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is transported within specified maximum journey times?	
Rationale	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).	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is assessed for all companies. • 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. • Companies are expected to include transport by sea within their reporting on transport times. We encourage companies to clearly state whether sea transport is included in their reporting, or clearly state that they do not transport animals by sea. • 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. 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact		
All Species		
Question 49.	What proportion of animals (including fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?	
Rationale	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).	
Scoring	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
		(Max Score 10)
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is assessed for all companies. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact		
All Species		
Question 50.	Does the company report on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production?	
Rationale	Companies are expected to publish volumes of animal-sourced foods by type and/or by method of production, increasing transparency of the extent to which the company is reliant on animal-sourced foods and supporting higher welfare production. Volumes may be reported as numbers of animals.	
Scoring	No reporting on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production.	0
	The company reports on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production, 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) and/or by method of production, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production in the company's supply chain. • 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. Companies can report volumes in the context of overall volumes, i.e., to demonstrate a relative change in volume. Scores are not awarded for companies that report on proportions of animal sourced foods vs. other proteins. • 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. • 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. 	

Reducing Reliance on Animal-Sourced Foods Performance Reporting		
Question 51.	Does the company report on progress towards its targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if Question 28 is met fully or partially. • 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). • Reporting on targets explicitly focused on efforts to decrease volumes or proportions of animal sourced foods will be eligible for maximum points (10 points), whereas reporting on targets which imply reductions in animal sourced foods (e.g. focused on increasing the proportion of alternative proteins menu items) will be eligible for partial points (5 points). • 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). 	

Alternative farrowing systems

Generic reference to farrowing systems which vary from those with zero confinement practices (the sow is always free within the farrowing accommodation, prior, during, and after farrowing) to those with the option to temporarily crate the sow. The following types are used:

Pens with the option to routinely or temporarily crate

Indoor farrowing pens which allow for the routine (always) or temporary confinement of the sow, particularly around farrowing (usually for 3–7 days)

Free farrowing pens

Indoor farrowing pens without the option to confine the sow, which allows freedom of movement at all times. Sows can be very briefly confined for stockperson safety and management purposes (less than 1–2 hours)

Animal-sourced foods

Food items coming from an animal source such as fish, meat, dairy and eggs.

Animal welfare

The physical and mental wellbeing of animals and the freedom to express behaviours that are important to them.

Basic farm assurance

Certification schemes that ensure certain standards of safety and quality are met (on-farm), often including some animal welfare standards similar to the legislative requirements of the market(s) in which they operate.

**Barren battery cage
(or: conventional cage)**

A cage used to house several laying hens, usually providing space equivalent to less than an A4 sheet of paper per hen; provision is limited to food and water; barren battery cages are prohibited by EU legislation although they are common in other parts of the world.

Battery caged hens

Hens housed in barren battery cages.

**Beak trimming or
beak conditioning**

Removal of part of the beak (equal shortening of the upper and lower mandibles) of laying hens, parent broilers and turkeys (and sometimes of quail and ducks) using a hot blade, secateurs or an infra-red beam. Infra-red is the only method permitted in the UK; in the EU no more than a third of the beak may be removed.

Beak tipping

Is an alternative to trimming and removes only the hook of the upper beak.

Broiler chickens

Chickens reared for meat.

**Cage-free egg production
(laying hens)**

Production systems which do not use barren, enriched, or combi cages. Hens are instead housed with full access to the floor and any structures within the building. Hens may also have access to a wintergarden and/or an outdoor range.

Castration	By scrotal incision, removal of the testes that are cut or torn at the spermatic cord (pigs, cattle), using a rubber ring or bloodless castration method (sheep, cattle). Generally done without anaesthetic or post-procedural pain relief
Close confinement	Provision of very limited space, representing inadequate space to allow an animal to move around or express normal patterns of behaviour.
Combi systems (laying hens)	Multi-tiered structures that have doors, so although birds can roam when the doors are open, the system can be converted into a caged system when the doors are closed.
Concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs)	Also known as a factory farm, a CAFO is a production process for meat or dairy that confines many cattle at high stocking densities. The animals have very little room to move and the land is bare of vegetation so, instead of grazing, feed is brought to the animals.
Disbudding	Removal of the horn buds in young animals (calves, kids) using a hot iron or chemical cauterisation, generally done without anaesthetic or post-procedural pain relief.
Dehorning	Removal of the horns of adult animals by cutting or sawing.
Dry sows	Sows in the herd other than those during the period of farrowing (giving birth) and lactation (this includes pregnant sow and sows awaiting impregnation).
Enriched cages or furnished cages (laying hens)	A cage used to house several laying hens, in the EU providing at least 750 cm ² per hen (which is just a bit larger than an A4 sheet of paper per hen) and with some cage furnishings (perch, nest box, scratching area).
Environmental enrichment	Material that is provided to an animal to encourage natural behaviours such as foraging, rooting, pecking, hiding, perching, rooting.
Farm animal welfare	See animal welfare, where farmed animals refer to those animals reared for food, fibres and other commodities.
Farrowing crate	A metal cage used to confine a single sow during farrowing (birth) and lactation (a period lasting ~ 4–5 weeks); the crate is designed to limit the crushing of piglets when the sow lies down and does not allow the sow to turn around or engage properly with her piglets. See also: alternative farrowing systems.
Feedlot	An intensive animal feeding operation used to fatten livestock prior to slaughter. Animals such as pigs, sheep or cattle are confined in small areas and supplied with a high protein feed.

Finfish	So-called 'true fish', this term is used to distinguish fish with gills, fins and a backbone from other aquatic animals such as shellfish and jellyfish.
The Five Domains	Animal welfare framework for guiding systematic and thorough assessments of animal welfare states, that sees welfare as the subjective (emotional) experience of an animal. This framework aims to quantify how changes in four "physical/functional" domains (Nutrition, Physical Environment, Health, and Behavioural Interactions) impact a fifth domain (Mental State), which ultimately determines an animal's welfare. The Five Domains framework explicitly includes quantification of both positive and negative states.
The Five Freedoms and Five Provisions	Animal welfare framework which sets out the conditions necessary to avoid poor welfare - the freedoms - and the means by which this can be achieved — the provisions. Similarly to the Five Domains (see above), this framework covers aspects of nutrition, physical environment, health, behaviour, and mental state, but does not present them in a hierarchical form but as equal conditions. The Five Freedoms focus on the prevention of negative states.
Food companies	Food businesses including producers, processors, manufacturers, food retail and service companies (e.g. restaurants, bars, catering).
Foie gras	Translated from French as 'fat liver', this is a product produced by force-feeding young ducks or geese, causing the liver to increase in size through the deposition of fat. The birds are typically housed in cages in the final weeks before slaughter, during the force-feeding phase. The process of force-feeding is also known as 'gavage'.
Free range	Free range livestock have access to an outdoor area for at least part of the day, allowing greater freedom of movement.
Gait score	A method for assessing lameness in poultry, cattle, pigs, using indicators such as balance, stride length, and the position of the feet.
Gestation crate	See sow stall.
Gilts	Young female pigs that have yet to be pregnant or have their first litter.
In-ovo sex identification (sexing)	Various methods to determine the sex of laying hen hybrid chicks in the 21-day incubation period before the chick hatches from its egg, aimed at avoiding the routine culling of day-old male chicks. In-ovo (= inside the egg) sexing technology has two main categories, optical (e.g. Nuclear magnetic resonance, NMR; Visible-near-infrared, VIS—NIR, spectroscopy) or non-optical (e.g. DNA analysis; immunosensing; mass spectrometry).

Lairage	Holding pens for livestock in slaughterhouses, in which they are placed following transport.
Long distance live transportation	Any transport of a live animal that exceeds 4 hours for poultry and rabbits and 8 hours for other species, from loading to unloading. Welfare has been shown to decrease significantly in journeys lasting longer.
Metaphylactic antibiotic use	Giving antibiotics to an entire group of animals after some of them have shown signs of illness. The goal is to treat the sick animals and prevent the disease from spreading to others in close contact, who might also be at risk, even if they are not showing symptoms (yet).
Mulesing	Removal of skin from the hindquarters of sheep breeds with excess folds of skin on their rumps, to manage fly strike. Generally done without anaesthetic or post-procedural pain relief.
Mutilation	A procedure that interferes with the bone structure or sensitive tissues of an animal, usually done to manage undesirable behaviour such as tail biting (pigs) and injurious pecking (laying hens). Generally done without anaesthetic or post-procedural pain relief.
Polled breeds	Typically refers to breeds or strains of ruminants that are naturally polled (without horns) through selective breeding (as opposed to being disbudded or dehorned).
Prophylactic antibiotic use	Giving an antibiotic treatment to an animal or group of animals in anticipation of a disease or when there is a risk of infection, rather than treatment when clinical disease has been identified (therapeutic use) or giving treatment when some animals in a group or on a farm are showing signs of illness (see metaphylactic use).
Routine Mutilations	The use of mutilations (see mutilation) on a routine basis, e.g. at a certain stage of production, rather than first addressing the underlying issues within the system and only using mutilations as a risk-based last resort.
Sow stall (or gestation crate)	A narrow metal crate used to confine individual sows for their 16-week pregnancy, without sufficient room for sows to turn around. Sows are generally confined in stalls during service, observation period (until confirmation of pregnancy) and throughout gestation until the sow is moved to the farrowing accommodation — usually one week prior to farrowing.
Stockmanship	The knowledgeable and skilful handling of and caring for livestock in a safe, efficient, effective, professional and low-stress manner.

Tail docking

Removal of part of the tail (usually up to two-thirds) using a hot docking iron, sharp blade (pigs) or tight rubber ring (lambs, cattle); routine tail docking of pigs is not permitted by EU legislation. Generally done without anaesthetic or post-procedural pain relief.

Teeth reduction

Reduction of a piglet's 8 sharp needle teeth, shortly after birth, using sharp clippers or pliers (cutting) or shortening with a grinding device; to manage damage to the sow's teats and to other piglets. Routine teeth clipping is not permitted by EU legislation. Generally done without anaesthetic or post-procedural pain relief.

Tethering

Tying of an animal indoors (usually done to cattle and goats, but also to sows) to a fixed point; tethering prevents an animal from carrying out its normal behaviour, not permitted in the EU for calves (certain exceptions) and pigs.

Toe clipping

The removal of the ends of toes, including the whole toenail, in poultry to prevent scratching damage. Generally done without anaesthetic or post-procedural pain relief.

Veal crate

A small pen or box to confine a single dairy calf; calves are often tethered in these systems and do not have adequate space to turn around or have adequate social contact. The use of veal crates is prohibited in the EU and some US states.

Welfare outcome measures

Animal-based method of assessing an animal's physical wellbeing and increasingly their behavioural expression and mental wellbeing.

Credits

Photography

Front Cover

[Samarn Plubkilang](#)

Page 6

[Phil West](#)

Page 13

[Marianne Macdonald](#)

Page 14

[Kenneth Schipper](#)

Page 15

[Slowmotiongli](#)

Page 16

[Michel Stockman](#)

Page 17

[Daniel Quiceno M](#)

Page 18

[Stephanie Poepken](#)

Page 19

[Steven Van Elk](#)

Page 24

[Mircea Costina](#)

Page 25

[Konstantin Novikov](#)

Page 30

[Peter Steiner](#)

Page 34

[Unsplash](#)

Page 35

[Zlikovec](#)

Page 36

[Lightpoet](#)

Page 38

[Denis Plénat](#)

Page 43

[Clara Bastian](#)

Page 51

[SoFlo Shots](#)

Page 54

[Ranko Maras](#)

Page 57

[Kishyru](#)

Page 58

[Grant Durr](#)

Page 60

[Vlodos Rozhkov](#)

Page 64

[Jamiee Hoffman](#)

Page 66

[Kishyru](#)

Page 67

[Manny Becerra](#)

Back Cover

[Damian Hadjiyvanov](#)

Design

Superfried design studio

[superfried.com](#)

BBFAW

Business Benchmark on
Farm Animal Welfare

bbfaw.com

