

2016 METHODOLOGY REPORT

JANUARY 2017

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: 2016 Methodology Report

Nicky Amos and Dr Rory Sullivan



[Click here to view the 2016 BBFAW Report](#)

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following for their support of this project and their contribution to the design and development of the 2016 Benchmark:

- Philip Lymbery, Dr Tracey Jones, Jemima Jewell, Jo Cooper, Dawn Rotheram and the Food Business team (Compassion in World Farming)
- Steve McIvor, Martin Cooke, Audrey Mealia, Basia Romanowicz, Kai Akram and Darren Vanstone (World Animal Protection)
- Jeremy Coller, Alan Briefel and Rosie Wardle (Coller Capital)
- Dr Steve Webster (Delta-innovation)
- Dr Heleen van de Weerd (Cerebrus Associates)
- Vanessa Gardner (Footprint Communications)
- The many companies, investors and other stakeholders who participated in meetings and teleconferences, who provided input to the 2015 Benchmark consultation process, and who provided feedback on the assessment process and methodology.

CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. About the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare**
- 3. The Structure of the Benchmark**
- 4. The Assessment Approach**
- 5. 2016 Assessment Criteria**
- 6. Company Coverage**
- 7. Future Development of the Benchmark**

Appendix 1: Glossary

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare (BBFAW) is designed to improve corporate reporting on farm animal welfare management policies, practices, processes and performance, and, over time, to drive tangible improvements in the farm animal welfare practices and performance of food companies. It is the first global measure of farm animal welfare management, policy commitment, performance and disclosure in food companies and is designed to enable investors, companies, NGOs and other stakeholders interested in understanding the relative performance of food companies in this area.

The programme is supported by founding partners, Compassion in World Farming and the World Animal Protection, who provide technical expertise, guidance, funding and practical resources. In 2014, Collier Capital joined the programme as an additional partner.

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

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare (BBFAW): 2016 Report¹, published in January 2017, provides an independent assessment of how 90 of the world's largest food companies are managing and reporting on farm animal welfare, and assesses the progress that has been made over the period August/September 2015 to August/September 2016.

This Methodology Report, which accompanies the 2016 Business Benchmark Report, describes the framework used to evaluate companies on their farm animal welfare management and reporting. It also discusses changes to the framework and methodology since the 2015 Benchmark².

This report comprises the following Chapters:

- Chapter 2: About the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare
- Chapter 3: The Structure of the Benchmark
- Chapter 4: The Assessment Approach
- Chapter 5: 2015 Assessment Criteria
- Chapter 6: Company Coverage
- Chapter 7: Future development of the Benchmark

¹ Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2017), *The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: 2016 Report* (BBFAW, London) www.bbfaw.com/report

² Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2015), *The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: 2015 Report* (BBFAW, London). <http://www.bbfaw.com/media/1338/bbfaw-2015-report.pdf>. A methodology report was also prepared to accompany the 2015 Benchmark report; see Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2016), *The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: 2015 Methodology Report* (BBFAW, London). <http://www.bbfaw.com/media/1318/bbfaw-methodology-report-2015.pdf>.

CHAPTER 2: ABOUT THE BUSINESS BENCHMARK ON FARM ANIMAL WELFARE

2.1 Why Benchmark Food Companies?

Farm animal welfare is an increasingly important issue for companies across the food sector, including retailers, service companies, manufacturers, processors and producers. This has been driven by a range of factors, including regulation, consumer concern, pressure from animal welfare organisations, and the brand and market opportunities for companies that adopt higher farm animal welfare standards³.

2.2 Programme Objectives

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare (BBFAW) is designed to help drive higher farm animal welfare standards in the world's leading food businesses. Its aims are:

- To provide investors with the information they need to understand the business implications of farm animal welfare for the companies in which they are invested.
- To provide investors, governments, academics, NGOs, consumers and other stakeholders with an independent, impartial and reliable assessment of individual company efforts to adopt higher farm animal welfare standards and practices.
- To provide guidance to companies interested in improving their management and reporting on farm animal welfare issues.

The key tool for the delivery of these objectives is an annual benchmark of food companies' approach to farm animal welfare ('the Benchmark'). To date, five Benchmarks have been completed, in August/September 2012, August/September 2013, August/September 2014, in August/September 2015 and in August/September 2016 respectively⁴. Beyond the Benchmark, BBFAW produces a range of guidance

³ See, for example, the results of the investor and food company surveys conducted by BBFAW in 2015 (Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2015): *How Are Companies Using the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare? Investor Briefing No. 16* (BBFAW, London), http://www.bbfaw.com/media/1071/investor-briefing-no-16_how-are-companies-using-the-benchmark.pdf; *How Are Investors Using the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare? Investor Briefing No. 20* (BBFAW, London), <http://www.bbfaw.com/media/1077/how-investors-are-using-the-business-benchmark-on-farm-animal-welfare.pdf>. These, together with briefing papers on the business case for action, on the regulatory case for action and on farm animal welfare and the consumer, can be obtained from <http://www.bbfaw.com/publications/>

⁴ These reports are all available from the BBFAW website, <http://www.bbfaw.com/publications/>

and other materials for companies and investors on issues such as the business case for farm animal welfare, best practices in management and reporting, and new and forthcoming farm animal welfare-related regulations and policies⁵.

BBFAW also has an extensive programme of structured engagement with investors and with companies; this engagement encourages investors to pay more attention to farm animal welfare in their investment processes and in their company dialogue, and encourages companies to improve their practices, performance and reporting on farm animal welfare.

2.3 Governance

BBFAW was originally developed with the support, expertise and funding of the two leading farm animal welfare organisations Compassion in World Farming and World Animal Protection. In 2014, Collier Capital joined as an additional partner.

The BBFAW Steering Committee, comprising senior members from each of the funding partners, oversees the BBFAW programme's strategic development and budget.

The programme is managed by an independent Secretariat. In this role, Nicky Amos CSR Services Ltd, is responsible for providing an Executive Director and other resources necessary to coordinate the development of the Benchmark programme, to conduct the company research and evaluations, and to engage with investors, companies and other stakeholders.

The development of the Benchmark is overseen by a Technical Working Group (TWG) comprising technical experts, researchers and food business managers, and expert advisors on investor engagement and corporate responsibility. The members of the TWG for the 2016 benchmarking process were:

- Nicky Amos, Executive Director, BBFAW
- Jemima Jewell, Head of Food Business (and TWG Co-ordinator), Compassion in World Farming
- Dr Tracey Jones, Director of Food Business, Compassion in World Farming
- Martin Cooke, International Head of Corporate Engagement, World Animal Protection
- Audrey Mealia, Corporate Engagement Manager, World Animal Protection
- Basia Romanowicz, World Animal Protection

⁵ See, further, <http://www.bbfaw.com/publications/>

- Dr Rory Sullivan, Expert Advisor, BBFAW
- Rosie Wardle, Collier Capital

2.4 Stakeholder Engagement and the 2016 Benchmark⁶

Investor and company engagement are integral parts of the Benchmark development and improvement process. Since the launch of the fourth Benchmark report in January 2016, the BBFAW Secretariat has:

- Participated in a series of telephone calls and meetings with European, Australian and North American investors and companies;
- Surveyed food companies on how the Benchmark has influenced their approach to farm animal welfare;
- Surveyed investors on how they are using the Benchmark;
- Conducted a formal consultation in June and July 2016 on the scope and criteria for the 2016 iteration of the Benchmark;
- Participated in a series of conferences, events and webinars, including a roundtable convened by the BBFAW and hosted by Collier Capital in New York involving investors and food companies.

The feedback and comments we received through these various meetings and surveys have influenced the scope of the Benchmark, the Benchmark criteria and the benchmarking process. We discuss these in the following sections.

⁶ For further information on BBFAW's engagement with companies and investors, see Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2016), *Summary of Consultation on the 2016 Benchmark*. (BBFAW, London), <http://www.bbfaw.com/publications/>; Rory Sullivan and Nicky Amos (2016), *How are Investors Using the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare?* (BBFAW, London), <http://www.bbfaw.com/publications/>; Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2016), *How Are Companies Using the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare?* (BBFAW, London), <http://www.bbfaw.com/publications/>

CHAPTER 3: THE STRUCTURE OF THE BENCHMARK

3.1 Alignment with Corporate Responsibility Reporting

The starting point for the BBFAW was that the majority of companies will want to report on farm animal welfare in a similar manner to other corporate responsibility issues. For any particular social or environmental issue, investors and other stakeholders generally expect companies to provide⁷:

- Information on the company's activities to the extent that such information is necessary to put its social and environmental impacts into context.
- A description of the company's governance and management arrangements for the environmental or social issue(s) in question.
- Details of the business risks and impacts of the issue(s) in question, together with a clear statement on the financial implications – positive or negative – of these issues for the business.
- Details of their policies on the issue(s) in question.
- A description of the company's engagement with relevant stakeholders on the issue(s) in question.
- Their objectives, targets and key performance indicators for the issue(s) in question, together with a discussion of how they intend to deliver on these objectives and targets.
- An assessment of their progress towards meeting their objectives and targets, together with a discussion of the factors that have affected their performance.
- An assessment of their performance against their policies and against other commitments (e.g. codes of conduct) that they have made.
- Forward-looking information on how performance is expected to evolve over time and the key factors (changes in the business environment, public policy and regulation, consumer trends, stakeholder pressures, etc.) that may affect performance.

⁷ Rory Sullivan (2011), *Valuing Corporate Responsibility: How Do Investors Really Use Corporate Responsibility Information?* (Greenleaf Publishing, Sheffield).

3.2 Benchmark Structure

The Benchmark has been designed to align with the reporting expectations above. The questions – see further Chapter 5 – cover five core areas as follows:

- **Management Commitment** – description of the company's policies and positions on farm animal welfare, including specific commitments on critical animal welfare measures (e.g. the avoidance of close confinement, long distance live transportation);
- **Governance and Management** – board and senior management oversight of farm animal welfare strategy and operations, performance measurement, targets and objective setting, internal controls, the adoption of assurance standards, and reporting on progress against policy and objectives; and
- **Leadership and Innovation** – investment in projects to advance farm animal welfare; external awards and accreditations; and advocacy on farm animal welfare.
- **Performance reporting** – discussion of the company's performance against key animal welfare policies and targets, including analysis of the factors that have influenced performance.
- **Performance impact** – evidence of the company's monitoring of outcome-based measures (e.g. species-specific indicators of animal well-being).

3.3 Farm Animal Welfare-Specific Issues

While, in many ways, farm animal welfare can be reported in a similar manner to other corporate responsibility issues, there are several specific issues and data that should also be reported by companies. Those that are relevant to the Benchmark are set out briefly here:

Management Commitment and Policy

1. Companies should provide a general account of why farm animal welfare is important to their business, including a discussion of the business risks and opportunities. Examples of the business issues that may be relevant include compliance with legislation and relevant voluntary and industry standards, security and sustainability of supply, productivity, waste, stakeholder/consumer expectations, pricing, risk management, reputation management, market opportunities, and business development.

2. Companies should publish an overarching farm animal welfare policy that sets out their core principles and beliefs on farm animal welfare, and that explains how these beliefs are addressed and implemented throughout the business. The policy should include:
 - a. A clear statement of the reasons why farm animal welfare is important to the business.
 - b. A clear position on its expected standards of farm animal welfare.
 - c. A description of the processes (e.g. senior management oversight, commitments to continuous improvement, performance monitoring, corrective action processes, public reporting on performance) in place to ensure that the policy is effectively implemented.
 - d. A clear definition of the scope of the policy, specifically whether the policy applies to all relevant animal species or not (including whether the policy – or a separate policy – applies to finfish aquaculture), whether the policy applies in all geographies or not, and whether the policy applies to all products the company produces, manufactures, sells or not.
3. Companies should set out their positions on priority farm animal welfare issues, including their positions on the close confinement and intensive systems for livestock and finfish, on the use of meat from genetically modified or cloned animals or their progeny or descendants, on the use of growth promoting substances, on the use of prophylactic antibiotics, on the avoidance of routine mutilations, on the avoidance of meat from animals that have not been subject to pre-slaughter stunning, and on long distance live transportation.
4. As relevant to their activities and operations, companies should also set out their positions on the production and/or sale of controversial products and practices such as foie gras, white veal, and the religious slaughter of animals.

Governance and Policy Implementation

5. Companies should specify who (i.e. the position/title of the relevant individual(s)) is responsible for managing farm animal welfare-related issues on a day-to-day basis, and who is responsible at senior management level for overseeing the company's farm animal welfare policy and its implementation.
6. Companies should:
 - a. Publish the objectives they have set for farm animal welfare. These may include process measures (e.g. to formalise their farm animal welfare management systems, to introduce audits) and performance measures (e.g. to phase out specific non-humane practices, to ensure that specific standards are met for all species).
 - b. Specify the performance measures they are using to assess performance against these objectives and targets.

- c. Explain how these objectives and targets are to be delivered including, as appropriate, details of the capital and other costs that are expected to be incurred, and the timeframe for the delivery of these objectives and targets.
 - d. Report on their performance against the objectives and targets they have set for themselves.
- 7. Companies should describe their internal systems and controls for farm animal welfare. This should include discussion of:
 - a. Training in farm animal welfare for relevant employees.
 - b. The actions to be taken in the event of non-compliance with the farm animal welfare policy.
 - c. Pre-employment assessments (e.g. the qualifications and experience expected of employees on farm animal welfare).
 - d. Monitoring processes (e.g. CCTV, whistle-blowing processes, testing procedures) in place to ensure compliance with the farm animal welfare policy.
- 8. Companies should describe how they implement their farm animal welfare policy through their supply chains. This should include discussion of:
 - a. How farm animal welfare issues are integrated into supplier contracts or codes of conduct, including (as relevant) how farm animal welfare issues are considered in performance reviews, monitoring and auditing.
 - b. How supplier performance on farm animal welfare is promoted.
 - c. How employee and supplier competencies to effectively manage farm animal welfare are developed.
- 9. Companies should report on whether they assure their animals to a company-specific scheme, to a certified national assurance scheme or to a specific welfare scheme such as RSPCA Assured⁸, Label Rouge, GLOBALGAP 5-step or the Soil Association's organic standards.

⁸ Note that RSPCA Assured is the new name for RSPCA Freedom Food. See further: <http://www.freedomfood.co.uk/news/2015/05/rspca-assured-is-the-new-name-for-freedom-food>

Leadership and Innovation

10. Companies should indicate whether they are involved in research and development programmes to advance farm animal welfare, or industry or other initiatives directed at improving farm animal welfare.
11. Companies should describe how they engage with their customers or clients on farm animal welfare.

Performance Reporting

12. Companies should report on their performance on farm animal welfare performance⁹. Within this, they should report on commonly accepted welfare issues (e.g. the proportion of animals free from close confinement, the proportion of animals that are pre-slaughter stunned, the maximum permitted journey times for live animals) as well as on species-specific key welfare outcome indicators (e.g. gait score and footpad dermatitis in broiler hens, tail-biting and lameness in pigs, bone breakage and feather coverage in laying hens, as well as those related to mental wellbeing and expression of natural behaviour) that they use to manage their business.

⁹ For further information, see Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2014), *Reporting on Performance Measures for Farm Animal Welfare Investor Briefing No. 14* (Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare, London). http://www.bbfaw.com/media/1074/investor-briefing-14_briefing-on-performance-measures.pdf

- **Animal welfare** encompasses not only physical wellbeing, but mental wellbeing and the ability to express important species-specific behaviours. All three aspects must be present for an animal to have a good quality of life. Animal welfare is about the welfare of the individual animal, and should be addressed through minimising the negative and maximising the positive experiences of the individual animals reared for food. Animal welfare provision is underpinned by good feeding, good housing (including appropriate design and environment provision), good health care, good breeding, and good management and stockmanship on farm, and of course good transport and slaughter conditions.
- **Performance in farm animal welfare** is the action or process of achieving an acceptable level of welfare throughout the process of breeding, rearing/finishing, transporting and slaughtering of animals in the food industry. Performance reporting of a company's practices refers to disclosure of a combination of resource/management inputs and indicators from the animals themselves (outcomes), both of which can be recorded quantitatively and objectively. Performance impact refers to the combination of these achievements on animal welfare.
- **Input-based measures** refer to the type of production system (e.g. caged, barn, free-range) used – this includes aspects of the housing (e.g. space allowance, provision of environmental enrichment), treatments and procedures, breed use, feeding and health management (e.g. the use of preventative antibiotics) – as well as the practices for transport and slaughter.
- **Outcome-based measures** focus on the most important species-specific measures (e.g. lameness and mastitis in dairy cows, gait score and footpad dermatitis in broilers, tail-biting and lameness in pigs, bone breakage and feather coverage in laying hens). Outcome-based measures are not confined to physical measures of wellbeing but also include aspects of mental wellbeing (e.g. reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort) and behaviour (e.g. time spent lying – resting, ruminating, or being active - foraging, perching, dust-bathing, socialising).

13. Companies should report on trends in performance, including discussion of the factors that have influenced performance (positively or negatively).

Performance Impact

Companies should report on their performance on key welfare outcomes for specific species, as measured by:

- a) The proportion of defined species (e.g. laying hens, sows, broiler chickens, dairy cattle) that is free from close confinement.
- b) The proportion of defined species (e.g. laying hens, pigs) that is free from routine mutilations.
- c) The proportion of all animals that is subject to pre-slaughter stunning.
- d) The proportion of animals that is transported within specified maximum journey times.

3.4 Weightings

The maximum Benchmark score is 210, awarded across 24 questions, with the scores allocated as follows:

Management Commitment and Policy:	70 points (33% of the total)
Governance and Management:	75 points (36%)
Leadership and Innovation:	30 points (14%)
Performance:	35 points (17%)

The scores for each individual question/sub-question, together with a detailed discussion of how each question/sub-question is assessed, are presented in Chapter 5.

3.5 Changes from the 2015 Benchmark

In order to ensure consistency with previous iterations of the Benchmark, the questions and the associated scoring remain relatively unchanged. We have however made some minor changes to the Benchmark questions that are used to generate the company rankings:

- We have added a new question (Question 21) on whether companies report on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations in the Performance Reporting section. This question – which offered a maximum score of five points – was included in the 2016 Benchmark scoring.
- We moved the question on the reporting of progress and trends in performance from the section on Governance and Management to the Performance Reporting section. We have not altered the wording or weighting of this question.

The overall effect of these changes is as follows:

- The maximum overall score has increased from 205 points to 210 points.
- The number of points for Management Commitment remains unchanged but the proportion of points allocated for this section has reduced from 34% in 2015 to 33%.
- The number of points for Governance and Management has been reduced by 10 points, and the proportion of points allocated for this section has reduced from 41% in 2015 to 26%.
- The number of points for Leadership and Innovation remains unchanged but the proportion of points allocated for this section has reduced from 15% in 2015 to 14%.
- The number of points for Performance Reporting has been increased by 15 points, and the proportion of points allocated for this section has increased from 10% in 2015 to 17%, in line with the Benchmark's aim to progressively increase the emphasis on performance measurement and reporting.

While not part of the company scoring, we also introduced nine questions that assess companies' impact on the well-being of animals in their global supply chains. These questions focus on the proportion of defined species (e.g. laying hens, sows, pigs, broiler chickens, dairy cattle) that are free from the most negative welfare impacts. Companies are awarded incremental points based on the proportion of key species that meet the criteria.

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

Given that companies will need time to familiarise themselves with the questions and adapt their reporting accordingly, we did not include these questions in companies' scoring or rankings in 2016. Our expectation is that these questions will be included in the overall scoring and rankings from 2017. Our current thinking is that the performance impact questions will represent approximately 15% of each company's score in 2017 and 20-25% in 2018. This is in line with our intention to increase the weighting of performance reporting and impact questions in the Benchmark to 35% by 2018. We will, however, consult on this issue (and on the weighting to be assigned to these questions) as part of the consultation around the 2017 Benchmark.

CHAPTER 4: THE ASSESSMENT APPROACH

4.1 Focus on the Corporate Entity

The focus of the evaluation was the corporate entity (i.e. the parent company) rather than subsidiaries. This reflects the aim of the Benchmark to assess how each company manages farm animal welfare issues. The Benchmark did (as is seen in Chapter 5) however give credit for the actions (e.g. innovative practices and processes) of subsidiaries or for actions in specific geographic regions.

4.2 Reliance on Published Information

Each company was assessed on the information that was publicly available *at the time of its assessment* (company assessments were conducted in August and September 2016). The information reviewed for each company included formal reports (e.g. annual reports, corporate responsibility reports), the information on the company's corporate and consumer websites, and the information provided in documents such as press releases and frequently asked questions¹⁰. We conducted similarly thorough reviews of the websites of company subsidiaries and brands, and, where relevant, postings on social media.

We did not award scores for information that was not in the public domain for two reasons. The first is that encouraging companies to provide a better account of their approach to farm animal welfare is a core objective of the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare. The second is that we wanted to ensure that companies were assessed consistently, and we wished to avoid any suggestion that companies that work with Compassion in World Farming and/or World Animal Protection were in any way favoured by the assessment methodology.

We did not give credit for information provided on other websites but that was not provided on companies' own websites or in their own publications. For example, a number of the companies assessed had received farm animal welfare-related awards but did not refer to these awards on their own websites. Our rationale was that the lack of company acknowledgement of awards (or other positive developments) suggests that the company is either not interested in or aware of these positive developments. This, in turn, raises questions about the level of attention being paid to farm animal welfare more generally.

¹⁰ One of the reasons for such a broad approach to information gathering was that, for many companies, reporting on farm animal welfare is not consolidated in a single location. Many continue to report on farm animal welfare in an unstructured manner - with disparate references to policies and programmes across their websites or obscured within FAQs and press releases, and with inadequate signposting to relevant sources of information. We also found that many companies still do not provide yearly updates on practice and performance. It is still common for farm animal welfare to get highlighted in one year, but then fail to be mentioned in the next.

4.3 Focus on Farm Animal Welfare, not Corporate Responsibility/ Sustainability

The focus of the Benchmark was on farm animal welfare rather than on corporate responsibility or sustainability. We therefore did not give credit for general corporate responsibility or sustainability disclosures unless the company explicitly linked these to farm animal welfare and/or it was clear that farm animal welfare was an integral part of the company's CSR/sustainability management system.

4.4 Company Feedback

Company reports based on our interim findings and scores were emailed to companies in October 2016. In the period October-November 2016, 37 (37% of the 99) companies assessed responded with written comments or requested further dialogue on the assessment approach and scoring. As a result of these discussions, the scores for 10 companies were revised. It is important to stress that company scores were revised only in situations where there had been errors in the assessment process, either because of incorrect scores being awarded or because information that was in the public domain at the time of the assessment (August/September 2016) had been overlooked.

The final confidential company reports, showing individual scores and comments for each question, as well as overall company scores and comparable sector scores, were sent to the companies in January 2017.

4.5 Changes from the 2015 Benchmark

There were no changes in the assessment approach compared to previous Benchmarks. We continued to emphasise the importance of companies ensuring that the information provided is both up-to-date and accurate. As a general rule, unless the company clearly indicated that the information remained relevant and current, we did not give credit for information that was more than two years old. We note that where companies had, for example, set targets more than two years ago, this information was treated as current so long as the company confirmed its continued relevance to the business.

In the 2015 Benchmark, we advised a number of companies that their information was ambiguous and that, while we were willing to give them the benefit of the doubt, we expected them to update the information and/or confirm that the information remained current. Some of these companies did not respond and saw certain of their scores reduced as a result.

One of the most encouraging findings from both the 2015 and 2016 Benchmarks has been the significant improvement we have seen in the quality of corporate reporting. An increasing number of companies now provide a consolidated and organised account of their approach to farm animal welfare. In the best cases, this

reporting not only facilitates our work when evaluating company approaches and performance, but it allows stakeholders to understand the business, to understand the relevance of farm animal welfare to the business, to understand how the company is currently managing farm animal welfare, and to understand how the company will manage farm animal welfare in the future. This, in turn, allows for more informed dialogue between companies and their stakeholders.

Despite this, however, the quantity of information provided by companies is of variable quality. While some information is of high quality and is presented in a coherent and structured way, there continue to be examples of statements that are ambiguous or vague. For example, a number of companies have made high level statements on specific issues (e.g. on the avoidance of long distance transport) but these statements do not specify what is meant in practice (e.g. live transportation is not specified in the context of maximum journey times). In our feedback, we made it clear to these companies that the Benchmark is looking for explicit statements, specific commitments and clear explanations about farm animal welfare.

CHAPTER 5: 2016 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The 2016 assessment criteria are presented below. Each question is supported by a rationale, the scoring framework and explanatory notes on how the assessment was conducted, including any issues or questions identified in the 2016 assessment.

Notes on the scoring framework:

- A number of the questions are binary (i.e. yes/no) in nature. Examples include Question 1 and the two parts of Question 17. In these questions, companies score either full marks or zero for the question.
- Certain questions impact the scoring of related questions. For example, Question 2 will be scored only if a score has been awarded for Question 1, and Question 3 will be scored only if a score has been awarded for Question 2. That is, a score of zero for Question 1 means that a company will receive a score of zero for Question 2 and, similarly, a score of zero for Question 2 means that a company will receive a score of zero for Question 3.
- For the majority of questions, the scoring is granular, allowing for criteria that are partially met (for example, where evidence is limited to a particular geography, species or product) to be acknowledged.

Table 1: 2016 Assessment Criteria

Management Commitment and Policy		
Question 1.	Does the company acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue?	
Rationale	Acknowledging farm animal welfare as a business issue is an important first step towards implementing a comprehensive approach to farm animal welfare management. It is good practice for food companies to identify whether and why farm animal welfare is a relevant issue for the business.	
Scoring	No evidence that farm animal welfare is regarded as a relevant business issue.	0
	Farm animal welfare is identified as a relevant business issue.	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question was looking for an acknowledgement by the parent company that farm animal welfare is a business issue. • Companies that acknowledged farm animal welfare as a business issue and/or set out the reasons why farm animal might be a business issue (e.g. because of public or customer concerns, security and sustainability of supply, cost) were awarded the maximum points. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The score did not take account of the specific reasons advanced. • The score did not take account of the importance assigned by companies to farm animal welfare (e.g. relative to other corporate responsibility issues). The importance assigned by individual companies to farm animal welfare depends on factors such as the nature of their business, their existing management practices, the other business risks and priorities they need to manage, and their perceptions of customer and stakeholder pressure for action.
--	--

Question 2.	Does the company publish an overarching corporate 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 on the business agenda.	
Scoring	No evidence of a formal policy statement (or equivalent) on farm animal welfare.	0
	Broad commitment to farm animal welfare in a policy statement (or equivalent) but no description of how the policy is to be implemented.	5
	Broad commitment to farm animal welfare within a policy statement (or equivalent) and a description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy is effectively implemented.	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment did not differentiate between companies that published stand-alone farm animal welfare policies and companies that incorporated farm animal welfare into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice. • Companies that published a clear statement of commitment to farm animal welfare and/or farm animal welfare-related principles that provided a starting point for the company's accountability to its stakeholders were awarded a score of 5 points. • Companies that supplemented these commitments or principles with details of how these were to be implemented were awarded a score of 10 points. To score maximum points, company farm animal welfare policies needed to include most/all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — A clear statement of the reasons why farm animal welfare was important to the business (including both the business case and the ethical case for action) 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — A commitment to compliance with relevant legislation — A clear position with regard to expected standards of farm animal welfare — A description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy was effectively implemented (e.g. senior management oversight, commitments to continuous improvement, performance monitoring, corrective action in the event that the policy was not being effectively implemented) — A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance.
--	---

Question 3.	Does the policy statement 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	Scope not specified	0
Geographic scope	Not specified	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified geographies	2
	Scope is universal across all geographies	5
Species covered	Not specified	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified species	2
	Scope is universal across all relevant species	5
Products covered	Not specified	0
	Scope is limited to own-brand products or ingredients (i.e. the policy does not apply to imported or other brand products)	2
	Scope is universal across own brand, imported and other brand products	5
	(Max Score 15)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question was only scored if marks had been awarded for Question 2, i.e. when the company had a published farm animal welfare policy. • The sub-questions on geography, species and products were scored separately (i.e. companies could score up to 5 points in each of the three sub-questions, and the scores for each sub-question did not influence the scores awarded for the other sub-questions). 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market, across species and across product ranges. Companies were given credit if they clearly specified the limits to the application of their farm animal welfare policies. • In some cases, companies used terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we took this to mean that the policy had universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies received 5 points for these sub-questions. • For companies involved in or using the products from finfish aquaculture, we have assumed that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applied to finfish (i.e. the policy had universal application) unless the company stated otherwise. Where there was ambiguity, we highlighted this in our feedback to companies and we encouraged these companies to clarify whether their farm animal welfare policy also applied to finfish and/or to product a specific policy for finfish. • We defined finfish aquaculture as the breeding, rearing and harvesting of aquatic vertebrates (i.e. cold blooded animals with a bony or cartilaginous skeleton and a segmented spinal column) in all types of water environments, including ponds, rivers, lakes and the ocean. • We did not consider policies for finfish that focused on conservation or sustainable fishing, unless there was an explicit reference to animal welfare within these.
--	---

Question 4.	Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement and intensive systems for livestock (e.g. sow stalls, concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), feedlots, farrowing crates, single penning, battery cages, tethering, veal crates, force feeding and, for finfish, high stocking densities and close confinement of solitary finfish species)?	
Rationale	Many of the most significant farm animal welfare concerns result from close confinement practices (such as those listed above) or from high stocking densities in the case of finfish. It is good practice for companies to commit to no close confinement of farm animals and to avoid excessively high stocking densities.	
Scoring	No stated position.	0
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of confinement but the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of confinement and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly	3

	defined.	
	Universal commitment to avoid confinement across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking for a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement. Simply stating compliance with legislation (e.g. with EU Directives on egg laying hens and sow stalls) was not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all close confinement practices, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that stated that they complied with legislation but did not have a formal policy on close confinement were, therefore, awarded zero points. Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits close confinement was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of close confinement). Companies that made a commitment to the avoidance of close confinement but were not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) were awarded a score of 1 point. Companies that made a commitment to the avoidance of close confinement for a specific product or product range (e.g. using only free-range eggs) were awarded a score of 1 point. 	

Question 5.	Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants throughout its products?	
Rationale	Both cloning and genetic engineering raise serious animal welfare concerns ¹¹ . In farmed fish species this includes heat treatment of eggs to induce triploidy, which renders fish sterile.	
Scoring	No stated position.	0
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning	1

¹¹ For a detailed discussion of the animal welfare implications of cloning and genetic engineering, see Peter Stevenson (2012), *Cloning and Genetic Engineering of Farm Animals*. BBFAW Investor Briefing No. 6 (September 2012) (BBFAW, London), http://www.bbfaw.com/media/1083/briefing-no6_cloning-and-genetic-engineering-of-farm-animals.pdf

	but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.	3
	Universal commitment to avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question was looking for a clear position on the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants. • Simply stating compliance with legislation was not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that stated that they complied with legislation but did not have a formal policy were, therefore, awarded zero points. • Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits genetic modification was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of genetically modified or cloned animals). • Companies that made a commitment to the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants but were not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) were awarded a score of 1 point. • Companies that published general statements on the avoidance of products or ingredients subject to genetic engineering or cloning were not awarded points unless these statements explicitly referred to animals as a part of these products or ingredients. For example, we did not consider statements relating to genetically modified crops used in animal feed. • We did not award points to companies that stated that they would not use products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants so long as these were prohibited by legislation or opposed by consumers. That is, we were looking for unqualified rather than 	

	qualified commitments.
--	------------------------

Question 6.	Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances?	
Rationale	Antibiotics given at low doses improve food conversion rates, most likely by changing the composition of gut microbiota in a way that enables animals to grow faster using less feed. Hormonal growth promoters are used to specifically promote abnormal muscle growth or milk production in animals farmed for food. The use of growth promoting substances can undermine animal welfare, as they may enable animals to grow or produce milk in a way that puts excessive strain on their physiological capabilities. While the use of hormonal growth promoters and the use of antibiotics for growth promotion are banned in the EU, their use is widely practised outside of Europe.	
Scoring	No stated position.	0
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances, but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances, but the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.	3
	Universal commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking for a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances which are typically used to increase the muscle (meat) or milk production of animals farmed for food. Examples include the hormone BST used to increase milk production, hormone feed additives in pig production (e.g. ractopamine) and low dose antibiotics. Simply stating compliance with legislation was not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues¹², (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that stated that they complied with legislation but did not have a formal policy were, therefore, awarded zero points. 	

¹² For example, the use of hormone and antibiotic growth promoters is not permitted by EU legislation. While products treated with hormone growth promoters cannot be imported into the EU, the same is not true of products produced with antibiotic growth promoters.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits the use of growth hormones was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances). • Companies that stated that they avoided the use of antibiotics as preventative measures but did not explicitly prohibit their use as growth promoters were not awarded points for this question. • Companies with a stated target to reduce the level of growth promoting substances (rather than avoidance) were not awarded points for this question (although they may have scored points for Question 11 if the target/objective had a clear link to farm animal welfare). • In the absence of a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, companies that marketed a particular product line as containing zero growth hormones were not awarded any points. The rationale for this is because a) this question is looking for a clear commitment from the company on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, rather than evidence of selected products that avoid certain substances, b) the question applies to all growth promoting substances (i.e. not just hormones); and c) in certain jurisdictions (e.g. the US), It is illegal to administer hormones to poultry and pigs (so, if a poultry or pig product states that the animals are not fed hormones, the product is simply complying with legislation).
--	--

Question 7.	Does the company have a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use?	
Rationale	<p>The over-use of antibiotics in humans and in animals is directly linked to the increase in antibiotic resistance. The use of antibiotics on-farm (typically through feed or water) is frequently prophylactic; effectively 'propping up' intensive farming systems where animals are kept in confined and stressful conditions and where their immune systems are compromised and disease outbreaks can spread rapidly¹³. Companies are expected to commit to reducing the levels of antibiotics they administer routinely and to develop animal production systems that are not reliant on the routine use of antibiotics for disease prevention.</p>	
Scoring	No stated position.	0

¹³ See, further, Vicky Bond and Jemima Jewell (2014), The Impacts of Antibiotic Use in Animals on Human Health and Animal Welfare. BBFAW Investor Briefing No. 17 (BBFAW, London).
<http://www.bbfa.com/media/1070/briefing-17-impacts-of-antibiotic-use-in-animals-on-human-health-and-animal-welfare.pdf>

	The company has made a partial commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics, but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics, and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.	3
	Universal commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics across all geographies, species and products.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We defined antibiotics as medicines used to control infectious diseases in humans and animals. There are four broad categories of on-farm use of antibiotics, namely: therapeutic (i.e. giving a treatment when clinical disease is identified), metaphylactic (i.e. giving treatment to a group of animals when some are showing signs of illness), prophylactic (i.e. giving a treatment to an animal or group of animals in anticipation of a disease or when there is a risk of infection), and growth promotion (i.e. giving antibiotics to improve the growth rates of animals). This question was looking for a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use. Simply stating compliance with legislation was not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use. Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits or restricts antibiotic use was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to reduction or avoidance of antibiotic use was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the reduction or avoidance of antibiotic use). <p>In the absence of a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, companies that marketed a particular product line as containing zero growth hormones were not awarded any points. The rationale for this is because a) this question is looking for a clear commitment from the company on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, rather than evidence of selected products that avoid certain substances, b) the question applies to all growth promoting substances (i.e. not just hormones); and c) in certain jurisdictions (e.g. the US), It is illegal to administer hormones to poultry and pigs (so, if a poultry or pig product states that the animals are not fed hormones, the product is simply complying with legislation).</p>	

Question 8.	Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations (castration, teeth clipping, tail docking, toe clipping, dehorning, desnooding, de-winging, disbudding, mulesing, beak trimming, fin clipping)?	
Rationale	Many farm animals are subjected to procedures that alter their bodies, often with no anaesthesia, causing pain and distress. Examples include beak trimming, castration of beef cattle with knives, branding with hot irons, dehorning of dairy cattle with hot irons, castration and tail docking of pigs, and fin clipping in finfish aquaculture.	
Scoring	No stated position.	0
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.	3
	Universal commitment to avoidance of routine mutilations across all relevant species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking for a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations. Simply stating compliance with legislation was not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations. The reasons are (a) legislation does not cover all routine mutilations, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that stated that they complied with legislation but did not have a formal policy were, therefore, awarded zero points. Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits routine mutilations was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations). Companies that made a commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations but were not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) were awarded a score of 1 point. Companies that specified certain breeds (e.g. genetically polled cattle) in their supplier guidelines but did not have a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations were not awarded any 	

	points. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Companies that specified immunocastration as an alternative to surgical castration were awarded zero points, because this question is looking for the universal avoidance of castration (in any form).
--	---

Question 9.	Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning, or (in the case of finfish) meat from animals that have not been rendered insensible?	
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.	
Scoring	No stated position.	0
	The company has made a partial commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning or from finfish that have not been rendered insensible but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning or from finfish that have not been rendered insensible and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.	3
	Universal commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning or from finfish that have not been rendered insensible across all species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking for a clear commitment to the use of stunning (typically using carbon dioxide or electrical stunning methods) to render animals unconscious immediately prior to slaughter (or rendered insensible in the case of finfish) Simply stating compliance with legislation was not treated as a proxy for having a clear commitment to pre-slaughter stunning. The reasons are (a) legislation may not be comprehensive, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that stated that they complied with legislation but did not have a formal policy were awarded zero points. Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that requires pre-slaughter stunning was not treated as a 	

	<p>proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Companies that made a commitment to pre-slaughter stunning but were not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) were awarded a score of 1 point. • Companies that described the actions taken (e.g. the installation of CCTV in abattoirs) but did not make a formal policy commitment to pre-slaughter stunning were awarded a score of zero points for this question. • Some companies made exceptions to requirements for pre-slaughter stunning to account for religious concerns (e.g. for Halal meat for Muslim communities, Kosher or Shechita meat for Jewish communities). In these situations, so long as the scope of the exception was clear, companies were awarded 3 points for this question.
--	--

Question 10.	Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of long distance live transportation?	
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. Specifically, any transport of a live animal that exceeds 8 hours, from loading to unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. In the case of farmed fish, handling practices and water quality conditions, particularly oxygenation, can have a significant impact on welfare.	
Scoring	No stated position.	0
	The company has made a partial commitment to avoid the use of long distance transport but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to avoid the use of long distance transport and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.	3
	Universal commitment to avoidance of long distance live transportation across all species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	

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

Governance and Management	
Question 11.	Has the company assigned management responsibility for farm animal welfare to an individual or specified committee?
Rationale	<p>When looking at the management of farm animal welfare, both oversight and implementation responsibilities are important. Oversight is necessary to ensure that senior management is aware of the business implications of farm animal welfare and is prepared to intervene when needed (e.g. if there are tensions between the organisation's farm animal welfare policy and other business objectives). However, it is often the case that those charged with oversight know relatively little about the specific details of how to effectively manage farm animal welfare. It is, therefore, important that there are individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the farm animal welfare policy is implemented and that farm animal welfare is effectively managed.</p>

Scoring	No clearly defined management responsibility.	0
	Published details of the management position with responsibility for farm animal welfare on a day-to-day basis.	5
	Published details of how the board or senior management oversees the implementation of the company's farm animal welfare policy.	5
	(Max score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two sub-questions were scored separately (i.e. companies could score 5 points for publishing details of who was 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 the question on day-to-day responsibility, the question was not looking for named individuals, but evidence of roles with responsibility for farm animal welfare (e.g. a statement that this was the responsibility of a dedicated technical or sourcing manager, or a statement that responsibility was divided among a number of functions, with information on the various roles and responsibilities). For the oversight question, we recognised 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. For the purposes of scoring, the emphasis was on the management of farm animal welfare. General information on the management or oversight of CSR or sustainability was only credited if it was clear that this included farm animal welfare. 	

Question 12.	Has the company set objectives and targets for the management of farm animal welfare?	
Rationale	Objectives and targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of these objectives and targets.	
Scoring	No published objectives and targets.	0
	Published objectives and targets but with no information on how these are to be achieved.	5
	Published objectives and targets together with information on the actions to be taken to achieve these, the resources allocated and the schedule for the delivery of these objectives	10

	and targets.	
	(Max score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking for evidence of explicit farm animal welfare-related targets, and for evidence that the company had a clear plan for achieving these targets. We did not award points for objectives and targets adopted for other purposes (e.g. quality), unless improving farm animal welfare was an explicit aim of these objectives and targets. For the purposes of scoring, we did not differentiate between process (e.g. to formalise their farm animal welfare management systems, to introduce audits) and performance (e.g. to phase out specific non-humane practices, to ensure that specific standards are met for all species) targets. Companies were awarded maximum points if they provided information on how the targets were to be achieved, e.g. by specifying the main actions to be taken, by indicating the financial and other resources required. 	

Question 13.	Does the company report on its performance against its animal welfare policy and objectives?	
Rationale	Companies should explain how they have performed against their policy commitments, against the objectives and targets, and provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance.	
Scoring		
Policy	The company does not report on how it has performed against the commitments set out in its overarching policy.	0
	The company reports on how it has performed against the commitments set out in its overarching policy.	5
Objectives and targets	The company does not report on how it has performed against its objectives and targets.	0
	The company reports on how it has performed against its objectives and targets.	5
	(Max score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sub-questions (on policy, objectives and targets, and progress) were scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question did not influence the scores on the other sub-questions). The policy question was only assessed if marks had been awarded for Question 2, i.e. the company had published a farm animal welfare policy. Otherwise, zero points were awarded for this part of the question. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objectives and targets question was only assessed if the company had been awarded 5 or 10 points for Question 11, i.e. the company had published objectives and targets. Otherwise, a score of zero was awarded for this part of the question.
--	--

Question 14.	Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its farm animal welfare policy is effectively implemented?	
Rationale	The effective implementation of a farm animal welfare policy relies on employees who are competent to oversee the implementation of the policy, and on controls that allow the company to respond quickly and effectively in the event of non-compliance with the policy.	
Scoring		
<i>Training of Internal Staff</i>	No information provided on employee training in farm animal welfare.	0
	Specific training provided to employees in farm animal welfare.	5
<i>Internal Controls</i>	No information provided 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) were scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question did not influence the scores for the other sub-questions). On training, companies were only awarded 5 points if the training provided was aimed at employees and if it explicitly addressed farm animal welfare-related issues. The training question did not address the quality of the training provided, the manner in which skills or competencies were assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provided. On internal controls, companies were only awarded 5 points if they explicitly discussed the actions that they take in relation to non-compliance with their farm animal welfare policy. A number of the companies reviewed described their internal controls in relation to CSR or product quality-related policies. However, unless it was clear that these policies and processes also covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question. 	

Question 15.	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		
Supplier Contracts	No description of processes for implementing farm animal welfare policy through supply chain.	0
	No information on how farm animal welfare is included in supplier contracts.	0
	Farm animal welfare incorporated into contractual obligations for suppliers but limited by geography and/or certain products or species	3
	Farm animal welfare incorporated into contractual obligations for suppliers across all species, products and geographies.	5
Monitoring and Auditing	No information provided on how supplier compliance with contract conditions is monitored.	0
	Farm animal welfare specified as part of supplier auditing programme.	5
Education and Support	Specific support and/or education provided to suppliers on farm animal welfare policy/issues.	5
	(Max score 15)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sub-questions (on contracts, auditing and supplier education) were scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question did not influence the scores for the other sub-questions). On contracts, companies were awarded 3 points if they indicated that they included farm animal welfare in contracts but did not indicate whether this applied to all relevant contracts or if they indicated that farm animal welfare was not included in all contracts. On auditing, companies were only awarded 5 points if it was clear that their auditing processes explicitly covered farm animal welfare. Many of the companies reviewed reported that they audited their suppliers against safety and/or quality standards, but unless it was clear that these audit processes covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question. On supplier support and/or education, 5 points were awarded to companies that published case studies or examples and/or 	

	provided a more comprehensive description of their approach. The award of 5 points was not dependent on the number or proportion of suppliers receiving this support and/or education. A number of the companies reviewed described their support to suppliers on a range of supply chain issues. However, unless it was clear that this support also covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question.
--	---

Question 16.	Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?	
Rationale	Farm assurance schemes provide frameworks for managing farm animals, including their health and welfare, provenance and the legal compliance of the systems used. They can also play an important role in promoting higher welfare standards. Where species-specific legislation exists, schemes should ensure that minimum legislative standards are met and preferably schemes should lift the standards above the minimum. Where there is no species-specific legislation, assurance standards are increasingly important for protecting welfare.	
Scoring	No assurance standard specified.	0
	A proportion of products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard, but no information on the balance.	3
	A proportion of products audited to a combination of basic and higher farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard, but no information on the balance.	6
	100% of products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard.	10
	100% of products audited to a combination of a basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard and a higher welfare assurance (or company equivalent standard).	15
	100% of products audited to higher level (or company equivalent) assurance standard.	20
	(Max Score 20)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic farm assurance standards typically do not go beyond legislative requirements for welfare and so contribute relatively little to enhanced welfare. In general, these involve yearly inspections by an independent body. Examples of standards which provide basic farm assurance (typically within a wider quality context) include the Red Tractor Farm Assurance Schemes, 	

	<p>BEIC Lion Quality, Viande de Porc Française, Certification de Conformité de Produits, and Best Aquaculture Practice (BAP) Standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farming systems that provide for behavioural freedom without compromising health can be described as having higher welfare potential. Whilst it is essential to set high standards to ensure livestock production systems have high welfare potential, it is also important to monitor welfare outcomes (such as mortality, disease, lameness, injuries and the occurrence of normal and abnormal behaviours) to assess the overall performance of the system. In general, schemes with an animal welfare focus require system inputs which offer a higher welfare potential. However, they may also include more detailed welfare outcome measures and more frequent/ detailed inspections than basic farm assurance standards. Examples of higher welfare schemes, which offer many welfare advantages relative to standard industry practice for all species, include the Soil Association organic standards, RSPCA Assured, Beter Leven, KRAV, Label Rouge, Neuland, GLOBALGAP 5-Step for certain species. . Where companies reported on performance by reference to their own internal standards, we needed a clear description of how the company standard compared to the relevant basic or higher assurance standards outlined above in order for points to be awarded. Companies that reported on performance by reference to the proportion of products audited but without specifying whether these were to basic or higher farm assurance standards were awarded 3 points. There are a number of voluntary schemes which claim to incorporate animal welfare components but are, in fact, designed to assure quality or safety standards. In these instances, it is not always clear what standards, if any, of farm animal welfare are expected. Companies that described their performance against these sorts of standards generally did not receive points unless there was a clear description of the farm animal welfare elements of such standards.
--	---

Innovation	
Question 17.	Is the company currently investing in projects dedicated to advancing farm animal welfare practices within the industry?
Rationale	Farm animal welfare is a collective issue for the food industry as well as being an individual issue for each company in the industry. Making progress and raising standards across the industry requires individual companies to support research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare, to share their knowledge and expertise with their suppliers and with their industry peers, to play a supportive

	role in public policy debates around farm animal welfare, and to support industry and stakeholder initiatives directed at improving farm animal welfare.	
Scoring	No evidence of involvement in advancing farm animal welfare beyond company practices.	0
<i>Research and development</i>	Evidence of current involvement in research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare.	5
<i>Lobbying and industry engagement</i>	Evidence of active involvement in industry or other initiatives (e.g. working groups, supporting NGO lobbying, responding to government consultations) directed at improving farm animal welfare.	5
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sub-questions (on research and development and industry initiatives) were scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question did not influence the scores on the other sub-questions). Companies that reported on their involvement in initiatives or programmes to improve farming techniques on environmental, safety or quality grounds, for example, were not awarded a score unless there was a clearly defined farm animal welfare element to these initiatives. Similarly, only those industry initiatives that were explicitly directed at improving farm animal welfare were eligible to be scored. In order to receive a score of 5 points for either sub-question, it was necessary for companies to demonstrate not only that the initiatives had a meaningful farm animal welfare dimension but that the company had played a significant role in the initiative. That is, companies had to demonstrate that they were dedicating significant time, resources or expertise to the initiatives in question. For example, it was not sufficient simply to say that the company had attended roundtables or working groups with industry peers. However, if a company had initiated or become a founding member of an initiative aimed at advancing farm animal welfare, a score of 5 points would have been awarded. 	

Question 18.	Has the company received any notable awards or accreditations for its farm animal welfare performance in the last two years?
Rationale	Awards from credible animal welfare organisations, consumer associations and industry and farming bodies provide tangible evidence that companies are achieving good/best practices in those areas of their operations covered by the awards. Awards can also play an important role within companies through motivating

	employees and signalling to senior management that farm animal welfare is an area where the organisation is achieving good/best practice.	
Scoring	No evidence of notable awards or accreditations in the last two years.	0
	The company has received a notable award or accreditation for a single category or species.	5
	The company has received a significant award relating to its efforts across a number of species, or the company has received awards for its efforts on different species.	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only awards that (a) explicitly focused on farm animal welfare, (b) were offered by credible animal welfare organisations, consumer associations or industry and farming bodies, and (c) involved a focus on farm animal welfare achievements were considered. Awards/commendations from business partners (or other organisations where a commercial relationship exists) were not counted for scoring purposes because of concerns that these commercial links may play a role in the assessment process. Companies were able to score ten points if they received multiple awards from a single awarding organisation (e.g. from the Humane Society, from Compassion in World Farming) provided that these awards related to different species or production systems. Awards made prior to 2013 were not counted for scoring purposes (i.e. only awards received in the 2 years prior to the assessment were considered). To be considered for scoring, awards needed to be publicly acknowledged by the company. In a number of cases, we identified companies that had received farm animal welfare-related awards but did not have any information on these awards on their websites. 	

Question 19.	Does the company promote higher farm animal welfare to consumers 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 promoting higher farm animal welfare.	0
	At least one example of promoting higher farm animal welfare	5

	to consumers.	
	Multiple examples of promoting higher farm animal welfare to consumers.	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The activities that could be considered in this question were 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 farm animal welfare an integral part of customer communications and engagement. — On-pack or on-shelf labelling – provided this was 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. In order to receive a score of 5 or 10, the focus had to be on farm animal welfare. Initiatives aimed at showing how products are sourced or produced but without an explicit focus on the welfare of farm animals, were not scored in the assessment. Companies that produced multiple videos on various animal species and welfare issues were awarded one point, Companies were only awarded maximum points where there was clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to promote higher animal welfare to consumers. 	

Performance Reporting	
Question 20.	Does the company report on the proportion of animals (or volume of animal products) in its supply chain that are free from confinement (i.e. those in barn, free range, indoor group housed, indoor free-farrowing, outdoor bred/reared)?
Rationale	In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict reporting criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the housing systems and environmental enrichment of animals in their supply chains. This is because many of the most significant farm animal welfare concerns

	result from close confinement practices and barren living conditions (such as barren battery cages, sow stalls, farrowing crates, veal crates, concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), feedlots, tethered systems, close confinement of solitary finfish species).	
Scoring	No reporting on the proportion of animals free from confinement	0
	The company reports on the proportion of animals free from confinement, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals free from confinement, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that are free from close confinement. Companies that reported using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) were not awarded points unless they explicitly stated that the standard meant that the relevant animals were free from confinement. Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed were not awarded points. Companies that made general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being free from close confinement were not awarded points unless there was clear evidence that key performance indicators (ideally by relevant species) were in place to monitor performance against policies and/or related targets or objectives. 	

Question 21.	Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that are free from routine mutilations (i.e. castration, teeth clipping, tail docking, toe clipping, dehorning, desnooding, de-winging, disbudding, mulesing, beak trimming, fin clipping)?
Rationale	In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the routine mutilation of animals in their supply chains.

Scoring	No reporting on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations	0
	The company reports on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that are free from routine mutilations. Companies that reported using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) were not awarded points unless they explicitly stated that the standard meant that the relevant animals were free from routine mutilations. • Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed were not awarded points. • Companies that made general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being free from close confinement were not awarded points unless there was clear evidence that key performance indicators (ideally by relevant species) were in place to monitor performance against policies and/or related targets or objectives. • Companies that reported on the use of anaesthesia or analgesics in association with routine mutilations were not awarded points because this question is looking for an explicit commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations. 	

Question 22.	Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that are subject to pre-slaughter stunning?	
Rationale	In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the slaughter of animals (or the rendering of fish insensible) in their supply chains. It is essential to render an animal unconscious before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs.	
Scoring	No reporting on the proportion of animals that are subject to	0

	pre-slaughter stunning.	
	The company reports on the proportion of animals that are subject to pre-slaughter stunning, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals that are subject to pre-slaughter stunning, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that are subject to pre-slaughter stunning. Companies that reported using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) were not awarded points unless they explicitly stated that the standard meant that the relevant animals were subject to pre-slaughter stunning. • Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed were not awarded points. • Companies that made general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” being subject to pre-slaughter stunning were not awarded points unless there was clear evidence that key performance indicators (ideally by relevant species) were in place to monitor performance against policies and/or related targets or objectives. 	

Question 23.	Does the company report on the average, typical or maximum permitted live transport times for the animals in its global supply chain?	
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 measures linked to the live transportation of animals in their supply chains. When being transported, animals can experience hunger, thirst, discomfort, pain, frustration, fear and distress, as well as physical welfare problems including injury, disease, and, in the worst cases, death. For these reasons, transport of live terrestrial animals should be minimised wherever possible and journeys should be kept as short as possible. Specifically, any transport of a live terrestrial animal that exceeds 8 hours, from loading to unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. In the case of farmed fish, handling practices and water quality conditions (particularly oxygenation) can have a significant impact on welfare. Conditions for transportation of fish must therefore be suitable and a maximum time limit may be required as determined from species-specific welfare risk assessments.</p>	
Scoring	No reporting on live transport times.	0
	The company reports on the live transport times for animals, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
	The company reports fully on the live transport times for animals, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on the average, typical or maximum live transport times for animals. Companies that reported using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) were not awarded points unless they explicitly stated that the standard meant that the transport times were limited to eight hours or less. • Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the average, typical or maximum transport times for animals affected. Companies that reported on the average, typical or maximum distance travelled by animals without specifying transport times were not awarded points. • Companies that made general statements about "Our animals" 	

	<p>or “All animals” being subject to average, typical or maximum journey times were not awarded points unless there was clear evidence that key performance indicators (ideally by relevant species) were in place to monitor performance against policies and/or related targets or objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Companies that reported on measures taken to the comfort of animals during transportation (e.g. stocking levels, access to water, rest breaks, etc) were not awarded points as this question is looking explicitly at journey times for animals.
--	---

Question 24.	Does the company report on 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.</p> <p>WOMs might include for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For all species: mortality rates For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate For pigs: lameness, tail bites and other lesions For broiler chickens: gait score, footpad dermatitis, hockburn, breast blisters For beef: body condition, lameness For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition For fish: fin and body damage For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, socialising For transportation: injuries, fatigue, road traffic incidents, mortality

	(dead-on-arrival/DOA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For slaughter: effectiveness of stunning. 	
Scoring	No reporting on welfare outcome measures.	0
	Partial reporting on welfare outcome measure but reporting is limited to certain species or geographies.	3
	Company fully reports on at least one welfare outcome measure per relevant species and/ or per relevant geography.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on welfare outcome measures such as: Mortality rates (as an indicator of potential pain, suffering and suboptimal performance) Disease incidence (as an indicator of health status, robustness) 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) 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 to production system). Negative flock or herd behaviour, such as injurious feather pecking or tail biting in pigs (as an indicator of a barren non-stimulating environment, poor environmental control, low space allowance, feed and health problems) Scores were not awarded for reporting on input-based measures (i.e. measures relating to the type of production system, e.g. caged, barn, free-range, used as well as the practices for transport and slaughter). Similarly, scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm animal welfare standards, but did not report on the welfare outcomes resulting from the implementation of these standards. Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed were not awarded points. 	

Question 25.	Does the company provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance (either in terms of input measures or welfare outcome measures)?	
Rationale	Companies should provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance and clearly define the scope of reporting (i.e. by geography, by species, by production system, by welfare outcome).	
Scoring	The company does not report on progress on animal welfare performance (either in terms of input measures or welfare outcome measures).	0
	The company reports on progress on at least one animal welfare performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure), but this is limited to certain species, products or geographies and there is no explanation of trends in performance.	4
	The company reports on progress on at least one animal welfare performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure) in its supply chain, but this is limited to certain species, products or geographies, although it does provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance.	6
	The company reports on at least one performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure) per relevant species across all geographies, but there is no explanation of progress or trend in performance.	8
	The company reports on at least one performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure) per relevant species across all geographies, and it provides an explanation of progress or trend in performance.	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because performance reporting is relatively underdeveloped, we did not prescribe the performance indicators to be used. We awarded scores for input-based measures (i.e. measures relating to the type of production system, e.g. caged, barn, free-range, used as well as the practices for transport and slaughter) and outcome-based measures (which are indicators that relate to the physical and mental wellbeing of the animals themselves, e.g. lameness and mastitis in dairy cows, gait score and footpad dermatitis in broilers, tail-biting and lameness in pigs, bone breakage and feather coverage in laying hens). 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We did not prescribe the form in which performance data were reported. We awarded scores for reporting in absolute (e.g. number of animals) and relative (e.g. as a percentage of the total number of animals, as a proportion of the species in question) terms.
--	---

Performance Impact		
Question 26.	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 making public commitments to source cage-free eggs should report on the proportion of own brand shell eggs and eggs used as ingredients that are from cage-free hens. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of eggs that are cage-free but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	0% of laying hens are cage-free, or no reported information	0
	1 – 25% of laying hens are cage-free	1
	26 – 50% of laying hens are cage-free	3
	51 – 75% of laying hens are cage-free	5
	76 – 99% of laying hens are cage-free	7
	100% of laying hens are cage-free	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain that are cage-free. Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded 1 point. Companies that reported on the proportion of laying hens that are cage-free but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded 1 point. Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards, but did not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that are cage-free in line with these standards. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Companies that made general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” being free from close confinement were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that are cage-free.
--	--

Question 27.	What proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company’s global supply chain is sourced from pigs that are free from sow stalls?	
Rationale	What proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company’s global supply chain is sourced from pigs that are free from sow stalls?	
Scoring	0% of laying hens are cage-free, or no reported information	0
	1 – 25% of sows are free from sow stalls	1
	26 – 50% of sows are free from sow stalls	3
	51 – 75% of sows are free from sow stalls	5
	76 – 99% of sows are free from sow stalls	7
	100% of sows are free from sow stalls	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of sows in the company’s global supply chain that are free from sow stalls. Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded 1 point. Companies that reported on the proportion of sows that are free from sow stalls but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded 1 point. Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards, but did not explicitly report on the proportion of sows that are free from sow stalls in line with these standards. Companies that made general statements about “Our sows” or “All sows” being free from sow stalls were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of sows that are free from sow stalls. 	

Question 28.	What proportion of fresh/frozen milk or milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is sourced from cows that are free from tethering?	
Rationale	<p>Companies making public commitments to source milk from dairy cows that are not tethered should report on the proportion of own brand milk and milk products (including ingredients) that are from dairy cows that are not tethered.</p> <p>NB. Companies that report on the proportion of milk or milk products and ingredients that are sourced from cows that are free from tethering but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.</p>	
Scoring	0% of dairy cows are free from tethering, or no reported information	0
	1 – 25% of dairy cows are free from tethering	1
	26 – 50% of dairy cows are free from tethering	3
	51 – 75% of dairy cows are free from tethering	5
	76 – 99% of dairy cows are free from tethering	7
	100% of dairy cows are free from tethering	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that are free from tethering. • Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded 1 point. • Companies that reported on the proportion of cows that are free from tethering but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded 1 point. • Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but did not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that are free from tethering in line with these standards. • Companies that made general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All cows" being free from tethering were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that are free from tethering. 	

Question 29.	What proportion of broiler chickens for own-brand fresh/frozen products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 33 kg/m² or less)?	
Rationale	Companies making public commitments to source broiler chickens to higher welfare standards should report on the stocking densities of own brand fresh and frozen chicken meat and ingredients. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens reared at lower stocking densities but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. Companies will not be scored for reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that are cage-free. (That is, the actual stocking density or higher welfare/free range systems must be specified). For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	0% of broiler chickens reared at lower stocking densities, or no reported information	0
	1 – 25% of broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities	1
	26 – 50% of broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities	3
	51 – 75% of broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities	5
	76 – 99% of broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities	7
	100% of broiler chickens are reared at lower stocking densities	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens in the company's global supply chain that are reared at lower stocking densities. • Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded 1 point. • Companies that reported on the proportion of broiler chickens that are reared at lower stocking densities but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded 1 point. • Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but did not explicitly report on the 	

	<p>proportion of broiler chickens that are reared at lower stocking densities in line with these standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Companies that made general statements about "Our broiler chickens" or "All meat chickens" being reared at lower stocking densities were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that are reared at lower stocking densities.
--	--

Question 30.	What proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain is free from beak trimming or tipping?	
Rationale	<p>Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that are free from beak trimming or tipping. NB. Companies that report of the proportion of shell eggs or eggs as ingredients that are sourced from laying hens that are free from beak trimming or tipping but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point.</p> <p>For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.</p>	
Scoring	0% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping	0
	1 – 25% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping	1
	26 – 50% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping	3
	51 – 75% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping	5
	76 – 99% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping	7
	100% of laying hens are free from beak trimming or tipping	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain that are free from beak trimming or tipping. Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded 1 point. Companies that reported on the proportion of laying hens that are free from beak trimming or tipping but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded 1 point. Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but did not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that are free from beak trimming or 	

	<p>tipping in line with these standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Companies that made general statements about “Our laying hens” or “All chickens” being free from beak trimming or tipping were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that are free from beak trimming or tipping.
--	--

Question 31.	What proportion of pigs in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients that are sourced from pigs that are free from tail docking but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	0% of pigs are free from tail docking, or no reported information	0
	1 – 25% of pigs are free from tail docking	1
	26 – 50% of pigs are free from tail docking	3
	51 – 75% of pigs are free from tail docking	5
	76 – 99% of pigs are free from tail docking	7
	100% of pigs are free from tail docking	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of pigs in the company's global supply chain that are free from tail docking. Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded 1 point. Companies that reported on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded 1 point. Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but did not explicitly report on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking in line with these standards. Companies that made general statements about “Our pigs” or “All pigs” being free from tail docking were not awarded points 	

	unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking.
--	--

Question 32.	What proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that are free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of fresh/frozen milk products and ingredients that are sourced from cows that are free from tail docking but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	0% of dairy cows are free from tail docking, or no reported information	0
	1 – 25% of dairy cows are free from tail docking	1
	26 – 50% of dairy cows are free from tail docking	3
	51 – 75% of dairy cows are free from tail docking	5
	76 – 99% of dairy cows are free from tail docking	7
	100% of dairy cows are free from tail docking	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that are free from tail docking. Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded 1 point. Companies that reported on the proportion of dairy cows that are free from tail docking but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded 1 point. Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but did not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that are free from tail docking in line with these standards. Companies that made general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being free from tail docking were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of cows that are free from tail docking. 	

Question 33.	What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?	
Rationale	This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the slaughter of animals in their supply chains. It is essential to render an animal unconscious (through for example captive bolt and stun to kill methods including electrical stunning, gas stunning, gas stun to kill) before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. This question currently excludes finfish because finfish are slaughtered in commercial aquaculture systems using a variety of methods, which, depending on the species and husbandry system, may or may not involve pre-slaughter stunning.	
Scoring	0% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned, or no reported information	0
	1 – 25% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned	1
	26 – 50% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned	3
	51 – 75% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned	5
	76 – 99% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned	7
	100% of products are from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the company's global supply chain that have been pre-slaughter stunned. • Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded 1 point. • Companies that reported on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded 1 point. • Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the 	

	<p>proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but did not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned in line with these standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Companies that made general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” being pre-slaughter stunned were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.
--	---

Question 34.	What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is transported within specified maximum journey times?	
Rationale	<p>This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the live transportation of animals in their supply chains. When being transported, animals can experience hunger, thirst, discomfort, pain, frustration, fear and distress, as well as physical welfare problems including injury, disease, and, in the worst cases, death. For these reasons, transport of live terrestrial animals should be minimised wherever possible and journeys should be kept as short as possible. Specifically, any transport of a live terrestrial animal that exceeds 8 hours, from loading to unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of animals that have been transported in 8 hours or less but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. This question currently excludes finfish because the key welfare issues concern the pumping, crowing and poor handling of finfish, as well the deterioration of water quality, especially the depletion of oxygen or accumulation of carbon dioxide and ammonia.</p>	
Scoring	0% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less, or no reported information	0
	1 – 25% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less	1
	26 – 50% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less	3
	51 – 75% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less	5
	76 – 99% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less	7
	100% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less	10
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the company's global supply chain that are transported in 8 hours or less. Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the 	

	<p>proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded 1 point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Companies that reported on the proportion of animals that are transported in 8 hours or less but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded 1 point.• Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but did not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that are transported in 8 hours or less in line with these standards.• Companies that made general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that are transported in 8 hours or less.
--	---

CHAPTER 6: COMPANY COVERAGE

In total, 99 of the world's largest food companies were included in the 2016 Benchmark. A full list is presented in Table 2. These companies were broadly spread across the three food industry subsectors (see Table 3). The universe of companies is global although it is weighted towards North American and European companies. In total, the 2016 Benchmark covered 18 UK, 40 European companies, 28 American companies, four Chinese companies, three Brazilian companies, three Australasian companies, two Canadian companies and one Thai company.

Relative to the 2015 Benchmark, 12 new companies were added. These were Chick-fil-A (USA), Charoen Pokphand (CP) Group (Thailand), Dunkin' Brands Inc (USA), E Leclerc (France), Zhongpin Inc (PRC), Hormel Foods Corporation (USA), Les Mousquetaires (France), New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd (PRC), OSI Group (USA), Panera Bread (USA), Publix Super Markets Inc (USA) and Yonghui Superstores (PRC/USA).

In addition to the new companies, some minor changes were made to the existing universe of companies covered by the Benchmark, in particular:

- Burger King was evaluated as part of its Canadian parent company, Restaurant Brands International.
- Kraft Heinz was evaluated for the first time, following the merger of Kraft and Heinz in 2015.
- Ahold Delhaize was evaluated for the first time, following the merger of Ahold and Delhaize in 2016.
- UK company Dairy Crest, was removed from the company scope following the sale of a significant proportion of its dairy business in 2015.

Table 2: 2016 Benchmark Company Scope

	Company	Ownership	ICB Classification	Country of Origin/ Incorporation
1	Ahold Delhaize	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Netherlands
2	Albertsons	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
3	Aldi Nord (Aldi Markt)	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
4	Aldi Süd/Aldi Einkauf GmbH&Co	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
5	Carrefour SA	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
6	Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
7	Co-op (UK)	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
8	Coop Group (Switzerland)/Coop Genossenschaft	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland

9	Costco Wholesale Corp	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
10	E Leclerc	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
11	Edeka Zentrale	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
12	El Corte Ingles SA	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Spain
13	Groupe Auchan	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
14	ICA Gruppen/ICA Eiendom Norge AS	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Sweden
15	J Sainsbury PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
16	(The) Kroger Company	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
17	Les Mousquetaires	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
18	Lidl Stiftung & Co KG	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
19	Loblaw	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Canada
20	Marks & Spencer PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
21	Mercadona SA	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Spain
22	Metro AG	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
23	Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland
24	Publix Super Markets Inc	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
25	Rewe Group	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
26	Schwarz Unternehmens Treuhand KG/Kaufland	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
27	Sysco Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
28	Target Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
29	Tesco PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
30	Waitrose	Partnership	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
31	Walmart Stores/Asda	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
32	Wesfarmers	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
33	Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK

34	Woolworths Limited	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
35	Yonghui Superstores	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
36	Aramark Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
37	Autogrill SpA	Joint Stock	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
38	Camst – La Ristorazione Italiana Soc. Coop. ARL	Cooperative	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
39	Chick-Fil-A	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
40	Chipotle Mexican Grill	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
41	Compass Group PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
42	Cremonini SpA	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
43	Darden Restaurants PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
44	Domino's Pizza Group PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
45	Dunkin' Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
46	Elior	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
47	Gategroup Holding AG	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Switzerland
48	Greggs PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
49	JD Wetherspoon PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
50	McDonald's Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
51	Mitchells & Butlers PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
52	Olav Thon Gruppen AS	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Norway
53	Panera Bread	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
54	Restaurant Brands International/Burger King	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Canada
55	Quick Restaurants	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
56	Sodexo	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
57	SSP Group Limited	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Sweden
58	Starbucks Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
59	Subway/Doctor's Associates Inc	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
60	Umoe Gruppen AS	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Norway
61	Wendy's Company (The)	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
62	Whitbread PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
63	Yum! Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
64	2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd)	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
65	Arla Foods Ltd	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
66	Associated British Foods PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
67	Barilla SpA	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
68	BRF SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
69	Cargill	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
70	Charoen Pokphand (CP) Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Thailand

71	ConAgra	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
72	Cranswick PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
73	Danish Crown AmbA/Tulip	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
74	Dean Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
75	Ferrero SpA	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Italy
76	Fonterra	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	New Zealand
77	General Mills Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
78	Groupe Danone SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	France
79	Gruppo Lactalis	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
80	Gruppo Veronesi	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
81	Henan Zhongpin Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC/USA
82	Hormel Foods Corporation	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
83	JBS SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
84	Kraft Heinz	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
85	Mondeléz International	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
86	Marfrig Alimentos SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
87	Mars Inc	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
88	Muller Group AG	Private	3570: Food Producer	Germany
89	Nestlé SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Switzerland
90	New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC
91	Noble Foods	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
92	OSI Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
93	Premier Foods PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
94	Royal FrieslandCampina	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
95	Terrena Group	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	France
96	Tyson Foods Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
97	Unilever NV	Public	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
98	VION Food Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
99	WH Group Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC

Table 3: Companies by Sub-sector

Sub-sector (and ICB Classification)	Number of Companies
Food Retailers and Wholesalers (5337)	35
Restaurants and Bars (5757)	28
Food Producers (3570)	36
Total	99

CHAPTER 7: FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BENCHMARK

In the course of the investor consultation and the process of developing and conducting the 2016 Benchmark, we received a series of suggestions about how the Benchmark might evolve in future years. Among the suggestions that we received were to:

- Broaden the number and geographic scope of the companies covered by the Benchmark.
 - **BBFAW Response:** *We have increased the number of companies covered by the Benchmark from 68 in 2012 to 99 in 2016. Our expectation is that we will benchmark 110 companies in 2017.*
 - **BBFAW Response:** *In relation to geographic coverage, we have progressively extended our coverage of US-based companies. In 2016 we added companies from China, France, Thailand and the US. We intend to add more emerging market companies in 2017, and will, as we have done since the inception of the Benchmark, consult with investors on the universe of companies to ensure that we are focusing on companies and geographies that are relevant to them.*
- Consider the balance of listed and non-listed companies in the Benchmark to ensure that the universe of companies assessed by the BBFAW remains relevant to investors.
 - **BBFAW Response:** *While we continue to expand the Benchmark, we aim to cover the most significant food companies by industry sub-sector (e.g. food retailers, food producers and restaurants and bars) and by geography. The food industry is characterised by listed companies and by privately owned companies and co-operatives. Investors have indicated that the inclusion of major food companies, irrespective of their ownership status, is helpful in providing a rounded view of the food industry. Furthermore, while it could be argued that the drivers for listed companies to account for their business approach and performance is greater, in our experience, a significant number of privately owned companies and co-operatives place importance on being transparent about their business activities and impacts. Notwithstanding these points, we remain mindful of the need to ensure that the Benchmark remains relevant and useful to investors.*

- Provide more information on the business case for farm animal welfare.
 - **BBFAW Comment:** *This is a priority for us. We have received an increasing number of questions about the business case for companies to focus on farm animal welfare. The BBFAW has produced several briefings on elements of the business case (e.g. on the scale of consumer demand for higher welfare products). We plan to conduct further analysis of the economic impact of farm animal welfare and will involve existing Benchmark companies in sharing their approaches to financing farm animal welfare measures.*
- Provide more information on the investment case for farm animal welfare.
 - **BBFAW Comment:** *We have encouraged investment analysts to produce research on the investment case for farm animal welfare, and have seen some progress with Aviva Investors, Robeco and BNP Paribas identifying animal welfare as a major issue for 2017. In 2016, Robeco identified animal welfare as one of the key material topics for meat and fish supply chain, and engaged with 11 companies on this issue (as part of their wider discussions about sustainability-related issues).*
 - **BBFAW Comment:** *There is a need to raise the profile of farm animal welfare and the investment-related risks and opportunities in the investment community. Companies can help by strengthening their reporting on farm animal welfare, and on the business case for higher standards of animal welfare. BBFAW will support these efforts by working with investors to strengthen the investment case for action, both on how animal welfare affects share prices and other financial metrics, and on how higher standards of farm animal welfare can enhance company financial performance.*

In early 2017, we will – as we have done for the 2016 Benchmark - review all of the feedback that we have received (including the issues raised above), and we will also conduct a structured consultation to gather feedback from companies, investors and other stakeholders. We will use this feedback to inform any changes that we make to the scope and assessment framework for the 2017 Benchmark.

APPENDIX 1: GLOSSARY

Animal welfare – the physical and mental wellbeing of animals and the freedom to express behaviours that are important to them; the Farm Animal Welfare Council adopted the Five Freedoms (see below) to demonstrate the attributes of good animal welfare.

Androsterone – an endogenous steroid hormone and pheromone formed in testes from the breakdown of progesterone excreted in the urine and plasma of entire (non-castrated) males, and responsible for boar taint and unpleasant odour/taste to meat.

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

Barren battery 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 – removal of part of the beak (laying hens, parent broilers and turkeys) using a hot blade, secateurs or an infra-red beam. Infra-red is the only method permitted in England; in the EU no more than a third of the beak may be removed.

Broiler chickens – chickens reared for meat production.

Cephalosporins – antibiotics used in preventative medicine and the treatment of gram positive bacteria (first generation) and increasingly gram negative and broad spectrum (fourth generation) bacteria. Some strains of bacteria have developed resistance to Cephalosporins and fourth generation Cephalosporins are considered among medicine's last defences against several serious human infections.

Cloning – the process of producing genetically identical individuals using donor DNA and a surrogate mother. In farm animals, cloning may be used to create copies of high-yielding animals for breeding whose progeny may then be used in food production. The majority of cloning is performed with cattle, but pigs, goats and sheep have also been subject to the procedure. Animal welfare concerns associated with cloning include risks associated with the surgical procedures undergone by the donor and surrogate animals, high rates of pregnancy loss and juvenile deaths, birth complications, and potential loss of genetic diversity.

Close confinement – provision of very limited space, representing inadequate space to allow an animal to move around or express normal patterns of behaviour.

Coccidiostat – a pharmaceutical agent that acts upon Coccidia parasites commonly found in animal intestines.

Concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) - also known as a factory farm, a CAFO is a production process for meat that squeezes many animals into a small and confined space (for at least 45 days in a 12 month period under the US Environmental Protection Agency's definition). 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.

Dehorning – removal of the horns of adult animals by cutting or sawing.

Desnooding – removal of the snood of a turkey, the fleshy part hanging from the forehead and over the beak.

Dry sows – pregnant female pigs.

Farm animal welfare – the physical and mental wellbeing of animals reared for food, fibres and other commodities. In 2012, the BBFAW defined farm animal welfare as it relates to egg laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs, dairy cows and calves, ducks, guinea fowl, rabbits, turkeys, geese, beef cattle, sheep and game.

Farrowing crate – a metal cage used to confine a single sow during farrowing (birth) and lactation; the crate is designed to obstruct transition between lying and standing and does not allow the sow to turn around or engage properly with her piglets.

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.

Five Freedoms – a framework for analysis of animal welfare within any system which includes the following requirements for good welfare:

1. Freedom from thirst, hunger and malnutrition
2. Freedom from discomfort
3. Freedom pain and disease
4. Freedom to express normal behaviour
5. Freedom from fear and distress

Fluoroquinolones – antimicrobials, used typically to treat bone, joint and skin infections caused by microorganisms.

Food companies – food businesses including producers, processors, manufacturers, food retail and service companies.

Free-farrowing – these systems house pregnant sows, and those with new litters, in larger pens than the sow stall, enabling the sow to move more freely, nest build (if provided with manipulable material), exhibit maternal behaviour better, and other natural behaviours.

Free range – free range livestock have access to the outdoors for at least part of the day, allowing greater freedom of movement.

Gait score – a method for assessing lameness in poultry using indicators such as balance, stride length, and the position of the feet.

Gilts – young female pigs that have yet to be mated to become pregnant.

Growth promoting substances – used to increase the muscle (meat) or milk production of animals farmed for food. Examples include the hormone BST used to increase milk production, hormone feed additives in pig production (ractopamine) and low dose antibiotics. Antibiotic and hormonal growth promoters are not permitted by EU legislation.

In-Ovo Gender Identification (Sexing) – a method for identifying the sex of laying hens via analysis of the allantoic fluid, aimed at avoiding the routine culling of day-old male chicks.

Lairage – holding pens for livestock following transport to a slaughter house.

Long distance live transportation – any transport of a live animal that exceeds 8 hours, from loading to unloading; welfare has been shown to decrease significantly in journeys lasting more than 8 hours.

Mulesing – removal of skin from the hind-quarters of sheep breeds with excess folds of skin on their rumps, often without adequate pain relief.

Mutilation – A procedure that interferes with the bone structure or sensitive tissues of an animal, usually to prevent an abnormal behaviour such as tail biting (pigs) or injurious pecking (laying hens).

Ractopamine - a feed additive used to promote growth promotion and leanness in animals raised for their meat. Ractopamine use has been banned in many countries, including European Union countries, mainland China and Russia.

Neospora caninum – a microscopic protozoan parasite that causes the disease neosporosis, a major cause of abortion in cattle.

Phytotherapy - the study of the use of extracts of natural origin as medicines or health-promoting agents.

Pithing - a technique used to immobilise or kill an animal by inserting a needle or metal rod into its brain. Current USA and European Union regulations prohibit importation of beef from cows pithed due to risk of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE, or "mad cow") disease.

Polled breeds - typically refers to breeds or strains of ruminants that are naturally polled (without horns) through selective breeding (as opposed to being dehorned).

Routine Mutilations – The mutilation of all animals at a certain stage within a certain system to help prevent problems associated with abnormal behaviours. Usually occurs instead of addressing the underlying issues with the system that may lead to the abnormal behaviours.

Sow stall – a narrow metal crate used to confine individual sows for their 16 week pregnancy, without sufficient room for sows to turn around; also called gestation crates.

Stockmanship – the knowledgeable and skillful handling of livestock in a safe, efficient, effective, 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.

Teeth clipping – reduction (cutting) of a piglet's 8 sharp needle teeth shortly after birth using sharp clippers or pliers; routine teeth clipping is not permitted by EU legislation.

Tethering – tying of an animal (usually grazing animals such as cattle and goats, but also 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, from poultry.

Triploidy – triploid fish have one extra set of chromosomes than the natural diploid state, rendering them sterile. Aquaculture using artificially induced triploidy avoids problems such as early sexual maturation and interbreeding between wild and cultured fish. However, triploids may be more susceptible to eye cataracts, temperature stress, deformities, and suffer slower growth and lower survival rates.

Veal crate – a 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; the use of veal crates is prohibited in the EU and some US states.

Welfare outcome measures – performance measures directly linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals.

Authors' Details

Dr Rory Sullivan is Expert Adviser to the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare. He is an internationally recognised expert on responsible investment. He is Strategic Advisor, Ethix SRI Advisers and a Senior Research Fellow at the University of Leeds. He has written/edited seven books on finance, environmental and development issues, including *Valuing Corporate Responsibility* (2011) and *Responsible Investment* (2006).

Nicky Amos is the Executive Director of the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare. She is a corporate responsibility professional with 20 years' experience in managing and directing corporate responsibility in global companies, including The Body Shop International. She is recognised for her pioneering work around supply chain development, responsible sourcing and sustainability reporting, and for her work in developing global sustainability strategies, campaigns and communications for leading international businesses.

The **Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare** is designed to help drive higher farm animal welfare standards in the world's leading food businesses. It is the first global measure of animal welfare standards in food companies and is designed for use by investors, companies, NGOs and other interested stakeholders.

For more information, go to www.bbfaw.com or contact the Programme Director, Nicky Amos: nicky@nicky-amos.co.uk.

