

## **CONSULTATION ON 2017 BENCHMARK**

MAY 2017

# **Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare**

## **Executive Summary**

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare (BBFAW) has been designed to help drive higher farm animal welfare standards across the world's leading food businesses. A key tool for the delivery of these objectives is BBFAW's annual benchmark of global food companies' policies and practices on farm animal welfare. To date, BBFAW has published five benchmarks (for 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016<sup>1</sup>) with the 2017 Benchmark scheduled for publication in early 2018.

In preparation for the 2017 Benchmark, to be conducted in August and September 2017, BBFAW is inviting comments on the following issues:

- The scope of companies covered by the Benchmark.
- The weighting of the performance reporting and performance impact questions.
- The usefulness of the Benchmark and associated report.

### **KEY CHANGES**

**We are proposing two significant changes to the 2017 Benchmark:**

- 1) The addition of 11 new companies. This will increase the total number of companies covered by the Benchmark to 110.**
- 2) An increase in the weighting of questions in the performance section, from 17% of companies' overall scores to 24%.**

**We also welcome any wider comments on the Benchmark and on how the Benchmark might be developed over time.**

**[The consultation will run from 25 May to 23 June 2017.](#)**

### **How should stakeholders provide feedback?**

We welcome written and verbal comments. We are also happy to convene face-to-face meetings or conference calls with investment-related organisations, food companies and other stakeholders during the consultation period. All comments received will be treated in strict confidence.

Please send your comments to [secretariat@bbfaw.com](mailto:secretariat@bbfaw.com).

---

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

### Next steps

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

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

The sixth Benchmark Report will be published in early 2018.

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

## Part I: Background

### BBFAW Overview

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

### The 2016 Benchmark

The fifth Benchmark covered 99 of the world's largest food companies, broadly distributed across (i) food retailers and wholesalers, (ii) restaurants and bars (a category that includes food service providers), and (iii) food producers and manufacturers. In August 2016, these companies were assessed on their approach to managing farm animal welfare, based on their publicly available information. The results, which were presented in the 2016 Benchmark report<sup>2</sup> published in January 2017, indicated that farm animal welfare is rising up the business agenda, with 26 (29%) of the 90 companies that were assessed in the 2015 Benchmark moving up at least one tier in 2016. Some 73% of companies (compared to 46% in 2012) had published farm animal welfare policies, and 65% of companies had published farm animal welfare-related objectives and targets (up from 26% in 2012).

Despite these improvements, the 2016 report revealed that farm animal welfare continues to be a systemic risk that many companies in the food industry are either not effectively managing or not properly reporting. With the average score across the 99 companies being just 34%, the report concluded that farm animal welfare is still not receiving anything like the same management attention as other corporate responsibility topics. Of particular note, 42 of the 99 companies assessed provided limited evidence that they have developed or implemented effective processes for managing farm animal welfare.

### Investor and Stakeholder Engagement

Alongside our annual evaluations of food companies, the BBFAW maintains an active programme of engagement with investors and food companies through direct dialogue, meetings and seminars, as well as through periodic briefings and published articles on issues of relevance and interest.

Over the past year, we have sought feedback, through group and one-to-one meetings and through structured surveys, from a variety of stakeholders (investors, companies, academics, policy makers and civil society organisations) on the usefulness of the Benchmark to them, and on how the scope and criteria might be strengthened. This feedback has been an important influence on the proposals set out in this document.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2017), *The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: 2016 Report* (BBFAW, London). <https://bbfaw.com/media/1450/bbfaw-2016-report.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Further details are available through the BBFAW website, [www.bbfaw.com](http://www.bbfaw.com)  
BBFAW Consultation Paper – May 2017

## Part II: Company Coverage

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

**For the 2017 Benchmark, we are proposing to add 11 new companies – five US companies, two Chinese companies, two Japanese companies, 1 French company and one Italian company – to the 99 companies covered by the Benchmark in 2016.**

**In total, the 2017 Benchmark will cover 110 companies – see Attachment II for a complete listing.**

One of our longer-term objectives is to progressively broaden the coverage of the Benchmark, both in terms of the number of companies and the geographic regions covered. In line with this objective, we are increasing the number of companies from the 99 in the 2016 Benchmark to 110 in the 2017 Benchmark.

For the 2017 Benchmark we considered potential additional companies based on the following factors:

- (a) The company's scale (in terms of revenue and market size).
- (b) The size of the company's footprint (in terms of the number of animals affected).
- (c) The company's significance within the industry sectors covered by the Benchmark (e.g. whether the company is seen as a useful comparator for other companies within the sub-sector, whether it has the potential to influence or drive the sector).
- (d) The company's country of origin or listing. For the 2017 Benchmark, we are particularly keen to extend our coverage of US companies and to extend our coverage of companies in Asia. From 2018, we expect to place an increasing emphasis on companies from emerging markets.
- (e) Companies proposed by the BBFAW Partners, Collier Capital, Compassion in World Farming and World Animal Protection, as well as by investors, existing BBFAW companies and other animal welfare NGOs. One specific recommendation from investors was that we include as many listed companies as possible.

Based on these factors, we are proposing to add the following 11 companies to the 2017 Benchmark:

Proposed Company	Ownership	ICB Classification	Country of Origin/ Incorporation
Aeon Group	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Japan
Seven & i Holdings	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Japan
China Resources Vanguard	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	PRC
Lianhua Supermarket Holdings	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	PRC
Coop Italia	Cooperative	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Italy
LDC Groupe	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
Perdue Farms	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
Wens Foodstuffs Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
Sanderson Farms	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
Bloomin' Brands	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
Sonic Corp	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA

We provide a brief description of each in Attachment III. The main reasons why we have chosen these companies, and the effect of these selections on the Benchmark, are:

#### Global market coverage:

- The addition of Aeon Group and Seven and i Holdings will mean that the Benchmark covers the largest 25 food retailers globally.
- The addition of Aeon Group, Seven and i Holdings, China Resources Vanguard, Lianhua Supermarket Holdings and Coop Italia will mean that the Benchmark covers 39 (60%) of the top 65 food retailers globally; each of the retailers covered by the benchmark has revenues in excess of US\$10 billion.
- The addition of LDC Groupe, Perdue Farms and Wens Foodstuffs Group will mean that the Benchmark covers 34 (68%) of the top 50 food producers globally with revenues in excess of US\$3 billion.
- Along with JBS, Tyson, BRF and New Hope Group, the addition of Wens Foodstuff Group will mean that the Benchmark cover the five largest poultry producers worldwide.
- The addition of Bloomin' Brands and Sonic Corp means that the Benchmark will cover 21 (84%) of the top 25 restaurants and bars globally; each of these 21 companies has revenues in excess of US\$4 billion.

#### Regional and country coverage:

- The addition of LDC Groupe will increase the number of companies in France to 11, making France the largest European market (excluding the UK) in the Benchmark.
- The inclusion of five additional companies in the USA will increase the number of companies in the region from 28 to 33, making the USA the largest country (in terms of number of companies) covered by the Benchmark.

- The addition of Aeon Group, Seven & i Holdings, China Resources Vanguard and Lianhua Supermarket Holdings further increases the Benchmark's coverage of Asian companies, from 5 in 2016 to 9 in 2017.

We acknowledge that the Benchmark does not yet cover many companies from the emerging markets. This has been a conscious decision. In part, it is because we need to consolidate our coverage of existing regions (in North America, in particular). It is also because we have yet to establish a dialogue with stakeholders in the geographic territories not yet covered by the Benchmark (as we have previously done in North America and Australasia), as a prelude to extending the geographic coverage of the Benchmark.

#### **CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

- 1. Do you agree with the proposed universe of companies to be included in the 2017 Benchmark?**
- 2. Are there specific companies that you think should be included or excluded from the universe of companies to be covered by the Benchmark in 2017?**
- 3. Given our plan to increase our coverage in future years, are there specific companies or regions that you think should be included in future Benchmark iterations?**

## Part II: Revisions to Scoring and Weighting of Performance Questions

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- **Companies' scores on the nine Performance Impact questions (introduced in the 2016 Benchmark) will be included in their overall scores for the first time.**
- **The weighting of scores in the Performance Reporting section will increase from 17% in 2016 to 24% in 2017.**

The integration of impact measures into the Benchmark has been a key objective for BBFAW since its inception, and in 2016 we introduced nine performance impact questions (Questions 26 to 34) covering the most prominent welfare impacts (close confinement, routine mutilations, pre-slaughter stunning and long distance live transportation) and the principal farmed species (laying hens, pigs, broiler chickens and dairy cattle).

Having deferred the scoring of the performance impact questions by one year in 2016 – to allow companies time to familiarise themselves with the questions and adapt their reporting accordingly – we are proposing to start scoring these questions in the 2017 Benchmark and to progressively increase the weighting of these questions in subsequent Benchmarks.

### Proposed Changes to Scoring and Weighting of Performance Questions

In the 2017 Benchmark, our intention is to increase the points allocated for the performance-related (performance reporting and performance impact) questions. We summarise these changes in the table below:

	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Total maximum points</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>230</b>	This score will apply to companies that have or use one or more of laying hens, pigs and dairy cows in their operations or in their supply chains, and may or may not have broiler chickens
		<b>225</b>	This score will apply to companies that have or use broiler chickens in their supply chains, but do not have or use any of laying hens, pigs and dairy cows
		<b>220</b>	This score will apply to companies that do not have or use any of laying hens, pigs,

			dairy cows or broiler chickens in their operations or in their supply chains
<b>Points for individual questions</b>			
Q.20 Does the company report on the proportion of animals (or volume of fresh or frozen animal products and ingredients) for own-brand products in its global supply chain that are free from confinement (i.e. those in barn, free range, indoor group housed, outdoor bred/reared)?	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
Q.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, de-winging, disbudding, mulesing, beak trimming, fin clipping)?	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
Q.22 Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that are subject to pre-slaughter stunning?	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
Q.23 Does the company report on the average, typical or maximum permitted live transport times for the animals in its global supply chain?	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
Q.24 Does the company report on welfare outcome measures (i.e. measured linked to physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
Q.25 Does the company provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance (either in terms of input measures or welfare outcome measures)?	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	
Q.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?	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b> (see Note 1)	The total five points for these questions will be equally allocated across relevant questions. For companies with four relevant species, each question will account for 1/4 (i.e. 1.25 points) of the maximum score of 5 points. Similarly for companies with 3 species (1.66 points), 2 species (2.5 points) and 1 specie (5 points). As noted above, none of these questions will be asked of companies that use none of
Q.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?	<b>0</b>		
Q.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	<b>0</b>		



free from tethering?			these species (i.e. their potential maximum score will be reduced to 220 points.
Q.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/m <sup>2</sup> or less)?	0		
Q.30 What proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain is free from beak trimming or tipping?	0	5 (see Note 2)	The total five points for these questions will be equally allocated across relevant questions. For companies with three relevant species, each question will account for 1/3 (i.e. 1.66 points) of the maximum score of 5 points. Similarly for companies with 2 species (2.5 points) and 1 specie (5 points).  As noted above, none of these questions will be asked of companies that use none of these species (i.e. their potential maximum score will be reduced to 220 points (if they do not have any of these species and do not have broiler chickens) or 225 points (if they do have broiler chickens).
Q.31 What proportion of pigs in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?	0		
Q.32 What proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?	0		
Q.33 What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?	0	5	
Q.34 What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is transported within specified maximum journey times?	0	5	

Notes:

1. For questions 26-29, we will only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We will assess relevant questions and use the average scores to calculate the overall score for these questions, with the maximum possible score being five (5) points.
2. For questions 30-32, we will only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We will assess relevant questions and use the average scores to calculate the overall score for these questions, with the maximum possible score being five (5) points.

#### Impact of proposed change to weighting

The effect of combining the performance reporting and performance impact questions will increase the weighting of this category from 17% in 2016 to 24% in 2017. This is in line with our intention to increase the weighting of performance reporting and impact questions in the Benchmark to 30% in 2018.

#### Engagement of BBFAW companies

In anticipation of these proposed changes, BBFAW companies were contacted in April 2017 with an explanation of how the new scoring will work and how it may impact their individual scoring and rankings. In addition, companies identified as being 'at risk' of dropping a tier as a result of these changes were notified in writing. A number of these companies have subsequently engaged in a dialogue with the BBFAW Secretariat as well as the BBFAW's NGO partners, Compassion in World Farming and World Animal Protection.

#### **CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

- 4. Do you agree with the proposal to introduce scoring for the nine Performance Impact questions introduced in the 2016 Benchmark?**
- 5. Do you agree with the proposal to increase the weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact Questions from 17% in 2016 to 24% in 2017?**
- 6. Do you broadly agree with the proposal to gradually increase the weighting on performance disclosure year-on-year?**
- 7. Do you have any specific comments you would like to share on performance measure and disclosure within the Benchmark?**

## Part III: Revisions to Benchmark Evaluation Criteria

We are keen to continually evolve our approach to evaluating and reporting on the state of farm animal welfare management and reporting across the food industry. As such, we are keen to understand how we can further develop our methodology and our reporting to maximise the Benchmark's usefulness to investors, companies and other stakeholders.

### CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

- 8. Having reviewed the proposed amendments to scoring for the existing questions, are there any other changes or amendments you would like to propose to the 2017 Benchmark?**
- 9. Do you have any wider reflections on how the Benchmark might be developed over time?**

## Appendix I: Proposed scope of companies for 2017 BBFAW Benchmark

Note: New companies highlighted.

	Company	Ownership	ICB Classification	Country of Origin/ Incorporation
1	Aeon Group	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Japan
2	Ahold BV	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Netherlands
3	Albertsons	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
4	Aldi Nord (Aldi Markt)	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
5	Aldi Sud/Aldi Einkauf GmbH&Co	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
6	Carrefour SA	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
7	Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
8	China Resources Vanguard	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
9	(The) Co-operative Food (UK)	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
10	Coop Group (Switzerland)/Coop Genossenschaft	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland
11	Coop Italia	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Italy
12	Costco Wholesale Corp	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
13	E Leclerc	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
14	Edeka Zentrale	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
15	El Corte Ingles SA	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Spain
16	Groupe Auchan	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
17	ICA Gruppen/ICA Eiendom Norge AS	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Sweden
18	J Sainsbury PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
19	(The) Kroger Company	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
20	Les Mousquetaires	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
21	Lianhua Supermarket Holdings Co	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
22	Lidl Stiftung & Co KG	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
23	Loblaw	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Canada
24	Marks & Spencer PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
25	Mercadona SA	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Spain
26	Metro AG	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
27	Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland
28	Publix Super Markets Inc	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
29	Rewe Group	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
30	Schwarz Unternehmens Treuhand KG/Kaufland	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
31	Seven & i Holdings	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Japan
32	Sysco Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
33	Target Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
34	Tesco PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
35	Waitrose	Partnership	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
36	Walmart Stores/Asda	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
37	Wesfarmers	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
38	Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
39	Woolworths Limited	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
40	Yonghui Superstores	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
41	Aramark Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
42	Autogrill SpA	Joint Stock	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
43	Bloomin' Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
44	Camst – La Ristorazione Italiana Soc. Coop. ARL	Cooperative	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
45	Chick-Fil-A	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
46	Chipotle Mexican Grill	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
47	Compass Group PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
48	Cremonini SpA	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
49	Darden Restaurants PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
50	Domino's Pizza Group PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK

51	Dunkin' Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
52	Elior	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
53	Gategroup Holding AG	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Switzerland
54	Greggs PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
55	JD Wetherspoon PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
56	McDonald's Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
57	Mitchells & Butlers PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
58	Olav Thon Gruppen AS	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Norway
59	Panera Bread	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
60	Restaurant Brands International/Burger King	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Canada
61	Quick Restaurants	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
62	Sodexo	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
63	Sonic Corp	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
64	SSP Group Limited	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Sweden
65	Starbucks Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
66	Subway/Doctor's Associates Inc	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
67	Umoe Gruppen AS	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Norway
68	Wendy's Company (The)	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
69	Whitbread PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
70	Yum! Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
71	2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd)	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
72	Arla Foods Ltd	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
73	Associated British Foods PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
74	Barilla SpA	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
75	BRF SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
76	Cargill	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
77	Charoen Pokphand (CP) Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Thailand
78	ConAgra	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
79	Cranswick PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
80	Danish Crown AmbA/Tulip	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
81	Dean Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
82	Ferrero SpA	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Italy
83	Fonterra	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	New Zealand
84	General Mills Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
85	Groupe Danone SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	France
86	Gruppo Lactalis	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
87	Gruppo Veronesi	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
88	Hormel Foods Corporation	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
89	JBS SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
90	KraftHeinz	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
91	LDC Groupe	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
92	Mondelez International	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
93	Marfrig Alimentos SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
94	Mars Inc	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
95	Muller Group AG	Private	3570: Food Producer	Germany
96	Nestlé SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Switzerland
97	New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC
98	Noble Foods	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
99	OSI Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
100	Perdue Farms	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
101	Premier Foods PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
102	Royal FrieslandCampina	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
103	Sanderson Farms	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
104	Terrena Group	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	France
105	Tyson Foods Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
106	Unilever NV	Public	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
107	VION Food Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
108	Wens Foodstuffs Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
109	WH Group Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC
110	Zhongpin Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC/USA

## Appendix II: Background Information on Additional Companies

Proposed Company	Rationale for Inclusion
Aeon Group	Aeon Group is the largest retailer in Japan, with annual revenues of \$52 billion. It is ranked 14 <sup>th</sup> in the 2017 Deloitte Global Powers of Retailing Index. Aeon operates across 12 markets.
Bloomin' Brands	Bloomin' Brands is one of the world's largest casual dining companies with annual revenues of approximately \$4.2 bn, around 100,000 team members and 1,500 restaurants across the US, Puerto Rico, Guam and 20 countries. Its subsidiaries include Outback Steakhouse, Carrabba's Italian Grill, Bonefish Grill, and Fleming's Prime Steakhouse & Wine Bar.
China Resources Vanguard	China Resources Vanguard is China's largest supermarket and hypermarket operator with annual revenues of \$17.6 bn and with 6.6% market share. The company is also involved in food processing. China Resources Vanguard is ranked 54 <sup>th</sup> in the 2017 Deloitte Global Powers of Retailing Index.
Coop Italia	Coop Italia is Italy's largest retailer with revenue of \$13.88 bn and a 19% market share.
LDC Groupe	LDC Groupe is France's largest poultry producer and has annual revenues of \$3.7 bn.
Lianhua Supermarket Holdings	Lianhua is the fourth largest supermarket operator in China and the second largest Chinese supermarket, operating 4,600 stores. The supermarket is part of the Baillan Group but is listed separately on the HKSE.
Perdue Farms	Perdue Farms is a major chicken, turkey, and pork processing company in the United States. Approximately 654 million chickens are slaughtered annually. It is the largest meat and poultry processor in the US and has revenues of \$6 bn.
Sanderson Farms	Sanderson Farms is the third largest poultry producer in the United States producing 9.4 million chickens per week. It has annual revenues of \$2.7 bn.
Seven & i Holdings	Seven & i Holdings is Japan's second largest retailer and operates in 19 countries. It is ranked as the 20 <sup>th</sup> largest retailer globally in the 2017 Deloitte Global Powers of Retailing Index.
Sonic Corp	Sonic Corp operates 3,561 restaurants in 43 US states, serving approximately 3 million customers per day. Sonic Corp has annual revenues of \$4 bn.
Wens Foodstuffs Group	Wens Foodstuffs Group is the fifth largest poultry producer worldwide (after JBS, Tyson, BRF, New Hope Group). It has 34,581 employees and operates 129 wholly owned or held controlling subsidiaries. It produces 1 billion head of chicken, 8.7 million head of pig, and 20.4 million head of duck, and has an annual slaughter capacity of 100,000 head of pig and 51.1 million head of poultry.

## Appendix III: Proposed 2017 Benchmark Evaluation Criteria

Management Commitment and Policy	
<b>Q1. Does the company acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
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
<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for an acknowledgement by the parent company that farm animal welfare is a business issue.</li> <li>• Companies that acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue and/or set out the reasons why farm animal might be a business issue (e.g. because of public or customer concerns, security and sustainability of supply, cost) are awarded the maximum points.</li> <li>• The score does not take account of the specific reasons advanced.</li> <li>• The score does not take account of the importance assigned by companies to farm animal welfare (e.g. relative to other corporate responsibility issues). The importance assigned by individual companies to farm animal welfare depends on factors such as the nature of their business, their existing management practices, the other business risks and priorities they need to manage, and their perceptions of customer and stakeholder pressure for action.</li> </ul>	

<b>Q2. Does the company publish an overarching corporate farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent)?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
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

<b>(Max Score 10)</b>
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment does not differentiate between companies that publish stand-alone farm animal welfare policies and companies that incorporate farm animal welfare into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice.</li> <li>• Companies that publish a clear statement of commitment to farm animal welfare and/or farm animal welfare-related principles that provide a starting point for the company's accountability to its stakeholders are awarded a score of 5 points.</li> <li>• Companies that supplement these commitments or principles with details of how these are to be implemented are awarded a score of 10 points. To score maximum points, company farm animal welfare policies need to include most/all of the following:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— A clear statement of the reasons why farm animal welfare is important to the business (including both the business case and the ethical case for action)</li> <li>— A commitment to compliance with relevant legislation</li> <li>— A clear position with regard to expected standards of farm animal welfare</li> <li>— A description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy is effectively implemented (e.g. senior management oversight, commitments to continuous improvement, performance monitoring, corrective action in the event that the policy is not being effectively implemented)</li> <li>— A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Q3. Does the policy statement provide a clear explanation of scope?</b>	
Understanding the scope of a policy is important to understand the breadth of a company's commitment to action on farm animal welfare.	
Scope not specified	0
Not specified	0
Scope is limited to certain specified geographies	2
Scope is universal across all geographies	5
Not specified	0
Scope is limited to certain specified species	2
Scope is universal across all relevant species	5
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
<b>(Max Score 15)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only scored if marks have been awarded for Question 2, i.e.</li> </ul>	



- when the company has a published farm animal welfare policy.
- The sub-questions on geography, species and products are scored separately (i.e. companies can score up to 5 points in each of the three sub-questions, and the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores awarded for the other sub-questions).
  - The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market, across species and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their farm animal welfare policies.
  - In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points for these sub-questions.
  - For companies involved in or using the products from finfish aquaculture, we assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise. Where there is ambiguity, we highlight this in our feedback to companies and we encourage these companies to clarify whether their farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish and/or to product a specific policy for finfish.
  - We define finfish aquaculture as the breeding, rearing and harvesting of aquatic vertebrates (i.e. cold blooded animals with a bony or cartilaginous skeleton and a segmented spinal column) in all types of water environments, including ponds, rivers, lakes and the ocean.
  - We do not consider policies for finfish that focus on conservation or sustainable fishing, unless there is an explicit reference to animal welfare within these.

<b>Q4. 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)?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
No states position.	0
The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of confinement but the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) is not clearly defined.	1
The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of confinement and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.	3
Universal commitment to avoid confinement across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of close</li> </ul>	

<p>confinement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation (e.g. with EU Directives on egg laying hens and sow stalls) is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all close confinement practices, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy on close confinement are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits close confinement is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of close confinement).</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of close confinement but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of close confinement for a specific product or product range (e.g. using only free-range eggs) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> </ul>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Q5. 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?</b></p>	
<p><i>Both cloning and genetic engineering raise serious animal welfare concerns<sup>4</sup>. In farmed fish species this includes heat treatment of eggs to induce triploidy, which renders fish sterile.</i></p>	
No states position.	0
The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of 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
<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having</li> </ul>	

<sup>4</sup> 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.bbfa.com/media/1083/briefing-no6\\_cloning-and-genetic-engineering-of-farm-animals.pdf](http://www.bbfa.com/media/1083/briefing-no6_cloning-and-genetic-engineering-of-farm-animals.pdf)

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 state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.

- Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits genetic modification is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of genetically modified or cloned animals).
- Companies that makes a commitment to the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point.
- Companies that publish general statements on the avoidance of products or ingredients subject to genetic engineering or cloning are not awarded points unless these statements explicitly refer to animals as a part of these products or ingredients. For example, we do not consider statements relating to genetically modified crops used in animal feed.
- We do not award points to companies that state 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 are prohibited by legislation or opposed by consumers. That is, we are looking for unqualified rather than qualified commitments.

<b>Q6. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
No states position.	0
The company makes 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 makes 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
<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of growth</li> </ul>	

promoting substances that 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 is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues<sup>5</sup>, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.
- Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits the use of growth hormones is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances).
- Companies that state that they avoid the use of antibiotics as preventative measures but do not explicitly prohibit their use as growth promoters are not awarded points for this question.
- Companies with a states target to reduce the level of growth promoting substances (rather than avoidance) are not awarded points for this question (although they may score points for Question 11 if the target/objective has a clear link to farm animal welfare).

<b>Q7. Does the company have a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use?</b>	
<i>The over-use of antibiotics in humans and in animals is directly linked to the increase in antibiotic resistance. The use of antibiotics on-farm (typically through feed or water) is frequently prophylactic; effectively 'propping up' intensive farming systems where animals are kept in confined and stressful conditions and where their immune systems are compromised and disease outbreaks can spread rapidly<sup>6</sup>. Companies are expected to commit to reducing the levels of antibiotics they administer routinely and to develop animal production systems that are not reliant on the routine use of antibiotics for disease prevention.</i>	
No states position.	0
The company makes 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 makes 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

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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.bbfaaw.com/media/1070/briefing-17-impacts-of-antibiotic-use-in-animals-on-human-health-and-animal-welfare.pdf>

Universal commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics across all geographies, species and products.	5
<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We define 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).</li> <li>This question is looking for a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use.</li> <li>Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use.</li> <li>Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits or restricts antibiotic use is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to reduction or avoidance of antibiotic use is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the reduction or avoidance of antibiotic use).</li> </ul>	

<b>Q8. 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)?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
No states position.	0
The company makes 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 makes 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
<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations.</li> <li>Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations. The reasons are (a)</li> </ul>	

<p>legislation does not cover all routine mutilations, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits routine mutilations is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations).</li> <li>• Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point.</li> </ul>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Q9. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning, or (in the case of finfish) meat from animals that have not been rendered insensible?</b></p>	
<p><i>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.</i></p>	
No states position.	0
The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning or from finfish that have not been rendered insensible but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning or from finfish that have not been rendered insensible and the scope (in terms of geography, species 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
<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is 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)</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear commitment to pre-slaughter stunning. The reasons are (a) legislation may not be comprehensive, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that requires pre-slaughter stunning is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of meat from animals that have not been</li> </ul>	

- subjected to pre-slaughter stunning).
- Companies that make a commitment to pre-slaughter stunning but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point.
  - Companies that describe the actions taken (e.g. the installation of CCTV in abattoirs) but do not makes a formal policy commitment to pre-slaughter stunning are awarded a score of zero points for this question.
  - Some companies make 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 is clear, companies are awarded 3 points for this question.

<b>Q10. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of long distance live transportation?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
No states position.	0
The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of long distance transport but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of long distance transport and the scope (in terms of geography, species 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
<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for a clear commitment to the avoidance of long distance live transportation, where long distance is defined as eight hours or more from loading to unloading.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear commitment to the avoidance of long distance live transportation. The reasons are (a) legislation may not be comprehensive, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that imposes limits on transportation times is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its</li> </ul>	

- commitment to the avoidance of long-distance transport) and the maximum journey time is specified.
- Companies that state that transport distances are low (e.g. because of local sourcing, or the geographic boundaries of the areas where they operate) are not considered to have made a policy commitment to the avoidance of long distance live transport.
  - Companies that make a commitment to the avoidance of long distance live transportation but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point.

**Governance and Management**

**Q11. Has the company assigned management responsibility for farm animal welfare to an individual or specified committee?**

*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.*

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
<b>(Max score 10)</b>	

**Explanatory Notes:**

- The two sub-questions are scored separately (i.e. companies can score 5 points for publishing details of who is responsible for farm animal welfare on a day-to-day basis and 5 points for publishing details of senior management responsibility for overseeing the farm animal welfare policy).
- For the purposes of scoring the question on day-to-day responsibility, the question is not looking for named individuals, but evidence of roles with responsibility for farm animal welfare (e.g. a statement that this is the responsibility of a dedicated technical or sourcing manager, or a statement that responsibility is divided among a number of functions, with information on the various roles and responsibilities).
- For the oversight question, we recognise that companies may assign responsibility to a named senior person or that farm animal welfare may form part of the remit of a wider sustainability, CSR or sourcing committee.
- For the purposes of scoring, the emphasis is on the management of farm animal welfare. General information on the management or oversight of CSR or sustainability is only credited if it is clear that this includes farm animal welfare.



<b>Q12. Has the company set objectives and targets for the management of farm animal welfare?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
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 and targets.	10
<b>(Max score 10)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for evidence of explicit farm animal welfare-related targets, and for evidence that the company has a clear plan for achieving these targets.</li> <li>• We do not award points for objectives and targets adopted for other purposes (e.g. quality), unless improving farm animal welfare is an explicit aim of these objectives and targets.</li> <li>• For the purposes of scoring, we do not differentiate between 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.</li> <li>• Companies are awarded maximum points if they provide information on how the targets are to be achieved, e.g. by specifying the main actions to be taken, by indicating the financial and other resources required.</li> </ul>	

<b>Q13. Does the company report on its performance against its animal welfare policy and objectives?</b>	
<i>Companies should explain how they have performed against their policy commitments, and against their objectives and targets.</i>	
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
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
<b>(Max score 10)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sub-questions (on policy, and on objectives and targets) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores on the other sub-questions).</li> <li>• The policy question is only assessed if marks have been awarded for Question 2, i.e. the company has published a farm animal welfare policy. Otherwise, zero points are awarded for this part of the question.</li> <li>• The objectives and targets question is only assessed if the company has been</li> </ul>	

awarded 5 or 10 points for Question 11, i.e. the company has published objectives and targets. Otherwise, a score of zero is awarded for this part of the question.

<b>Q14. Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its farm animal welfare policy is effectively implemented?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
No information provide on employee training in farm animal welfare.	0
Specific training provide to employees in farm animal welfare.	5
No information provide on the actions to be taken in the event of non-compliance with the farm animal welfare policy.	0
The company describes the actions it takes in the event of non-compliance with its farm animal welfare policy.	5
<b>(Max score 10)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sub-questions (on training and on internal controls) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores for the other sub-questions).</li> <li>• On training, companies are only awarded 5 points if the training provided is aimed at employees and if it explicitly addressed farm animal welfare-related issues.</li> <li>• The training question does not address the quality of the training provide, the manner in which skills or competencies are assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provide.</li> <li>• On internal controls, companies are 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 is clear that these policies and processes also covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question.</li> </ul>	

<b>Q15. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain?</b>	
<i>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).</i>	
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

No information provide on how supplier compliance with contract conditions is monitored.	0
Farm animal welfare specified as part of supplier auditing programme.	5
Specific support and/or education provide to suppliers on farm animal welfare policy/issues.	5
<b>(Max score 15)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sub-questions (on contracts, auditing and supplier education) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores for the other sub-questions).</li> <li>On contracts, companies are awarded 3 points if they indicate that they include farm animal welfare in contracts but do not indicate whether this applies to all relevant contracts or if they indicate that farm animal welfare is not included in all contracts.</li> <li>On auditing, companies are only awarded 5 points if it is clear that their auditing processes explicitly cover farm animal welfare. Many of the companies report that they audit their suppliers against safety and/or quality standards, but unless it is clear that these audit processes cover farm animal welfare, companies score zero for this sub-question.</li> <li>On supplier support and/or education, 5 points are awarded to companies that publish case studies or examples and/or provide a more comprehensive description of their approach. The award of 5 points is not dependent on the number or proportion of suppliers receiving this support and/or education. A number of companies describe their support to suppliers on a range of supply chain issues. However, unless it is clear that this support also covers farm animal welfare, companies score zero for this sub-question.</li> </ul>	

<b>Q16. Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
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
<b>(Max Score 20)</b>	
Explanatory Notes:	

- 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, BEIC Lion Quality, Viande de Porc Française, Certification de Conformité de Produits, and Best Aquaculture Practice (BAP) Standards.
- Farming systems that provide for behavioural freedom without compromising health can be described as having higher welfare potential. Whilst it is essential to set high standards to ensure livestock production systems have high welfare potential, it is also important to monitor welfare outcomes (such as mortality, disease, lameness, injuries and the occurrence of normal and abnormal behaviours) to assess the overall performance of the system. In general, schemes with an animal welfare focus require system inputs that offer a higher welfare potential. However, they may also include more detailed welfare outcome measures and more frequent/ detailed inspections than basic farm assurance standards. Examples of higher welfare schemes, which offer many welfare advantages relative to standard industry practice for all species include the Soil Association organic standards, RSPCA Assured, Beter Leven, KRAV, Label Rouge, Neuland, GLOBALGAP 5-Step for certain species. .
- Where companies report on performance by reference to their own internal standards, we need a clear description of how the company standard compares to the relevant basic or higher assurance standards outlined above in order for points to be awarded.
- Companies that report on performance by reference to the proportion of products audited but without specifying whether these are to basic or higher farm assurance standards are awarded 3 points.
- There are a number of voluntary schemes that claim to incorporate animal welfare components but are, in fact, designed to assure quality or safety standards. In these instances, it is not always clear what standards, if any, of farm animal welfare are expected. Companies that describe their performance against these sorts of standards generally do not receive points unless there is a clear description of the farm animal welfare elements of such standards.

<b>Innovation and Leadership</b>	
<b>Q17. Is the company currently investing in projects dedicated to advancing farm animal welfare practices within the industry?</b>	
<i>Farm animal welfare is a collective issue for the food industry as well as being an individual issue for each company in the industry. Making progress and raising standards across the industry requires individual companies to support research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare, to share their knowledge and expertise with their suppliers and with their industry peers, to play a supportive role in public policy debates around farm animal welfare, and to support industry and stakeholder initiatives directed at improving farm animal welfare.</i>	
No evidence of involvement in advancing farm animal welfare beyond company practices.	0
Evidence of current involvement in research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare.	5
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

<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sub-questions (on research and development and industry initiatives) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores on the other sub-questions).</li> <li>• Companies that report on their involvement in initiatives or programmes to improve farming techniques on environmental, safety or quality grounds, for example, are not awarded a score unless there is a clearly defined farm animal welfare element to these initiatives.</li> <li>• Similarly, only those industry initiatives that are explicitly directed at improving farm animal welfare are eligible to be scored.</li> <li>• In order to receive a score of 5 points for either sub-question, it is necessary for companies to demonstrate not only that the initiative has a meaningful farm animal welfare dimension but that the company has played a significant role in the initiative. That is, companies have to demonstrate that they are dedicating significant time, resources or expertise to the initiatives in question. For example, it is not sufficient simply to say that the company has attended roundtables or working groups with industry peers. However, if a company has initiated or become a founding member of an initiative aimed at advancing farm animal welfare, a score of 5 points will be awarded.</li> </ul>	

<b>Q18. Has the company received any notable awards or accreditations for its farm animal welfare performance in the last two years?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
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
<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only awards that (a) explicitly focus on farm animal welfare, (b) are offered by credible animal welfare organisations, consumer associations or industry and farming bodies, and (c) involve a focus on farm animal welfare achievements are considered.</li> <li>• Awards/commendations from business partners (or other organisations where a commercial relationship exists) are not counted for scoring purposes because of concerns that these commercial links may play a role in the assessment process.</li> <li>• Companies are able to score 10 points if they receive multiple awards from a single awarding organisation (e.g. from Compassion in World Farming) provided that these awards relate to different species or production systems.</li> <li>• Awards made prior to 2014 are not counted for scoring purposes (i.e. only awards received in the 2 years prior to the assessment are considered).</li> </ul>	

- To be considered for scoring, awards need to be publicly acknowledged by the company. In a number of cases, companies receive farm animal welfare-related awards but do not have any information on these awards on their websites.

**Q19. Does the company promote higher farm animal welfare to consumers through education and/or awareness-raising activities?**

*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.*

No evidence of promoting higher farm animal welfare.	0
At least one example of promoting higher farm animal welfare to consumers.	5
Multiple examples of promoting higher farm animal welfare to consumers.	10
<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	

**Explanatory Notes:**

- The activities that could be considered in this question are defined broadly. Examples include:
  - 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 – provide this is evidenced on the company’s website, in its published reports or on social media platforms.
  - Information leaflets or information packs.
  - Media promotions.
  - Supporting third party campaigns or programmes e.g. the RSPCA Farm Animal Week.
  - Customer farm visits, seminars or roundtables.
  - Social media campaigns.
- In order to receive a score of 5 or 10, the focus has 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, are not scored in the assessment.

### Performance Reporting and Impact

**Q20. Does the company report on the proportion of animals (or volume of fresh or frozen animal products and ingredients) for own-brand products in its global supply chain that are free from confinement (i.e. those in barn, free range, indoor group housed, outdoor bred/reared)?**

*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).*

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,	5

covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>

<b>Q21. 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)?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
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
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>

<b>Q22. Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that are subject to pre-slaughter stunning?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
No reporting on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning.	0
The company reports on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
The company reports fully on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>

<b>Q23. Does the company report on the average, typical or maximum permitted live transport times for the animals in its global supply chain?</b>	
<i>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-</i>	

<i>specific welfare risk assessments.</i>	
No reporting on live transport times.	0
The company partially reports on the live transport times for animals, but reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
The company reports fully on the live transport times for animals, covering all relevant species and geographies.	5
<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	

<b>Q24. Does the company report on welfare outcome measures (i.e. measures linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?</b>	
<p><i>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. WOMs might include for example:</i></p> <p><i>For all species: mortality rates</i></p> <p><i>For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter</i></p> <p><i>For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate</i></p> <p><i>For pigs: lameness, tail bite and other lesions</i></p> <p><i>For broiler chickens: gait score, footpad dermatitis, hockburn, breast blisters</i></p> <p><i>For beef: body condition, lameness</i></p> <p><i>For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition</i></p> <p><i>For fish: fin and body damage</i></p> <p><i>For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort</i></p> <p><i>For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, socialising</i></p> <p><i>For transportation: injuries, fatigue, road traffic incidents, mortality (dead-on-arrival/DOA)</i></p> <p><i>For slaughter: effectiveness of stunning</i></p>	
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
<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	

<b>Q25. Does the company provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance (either in terms of input measures or welfare outcome measures)?</b>	
<p><i>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).</i></p>	
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	6



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.	
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
<b>(Max Weighted Score 1.25 – 5*)</b>	

<b>Q26. What proportion of laying hens (for shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients) in the company’s global supply chain is cage-free?</b>	
<i>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.</i>	
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
<b>(Max Weighted Score 1.25 – 5*)</b>	

<b>Q27. What proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company’s global supply chain is sourced from pigs that are free from sow stalls?</b>	
<i>Companies making public commitments to source sow-stall-free pork should report on the proportion sows that are free from sow stalls. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of pork that is sow stall-free but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.</i>	
0% of sows are free from sow stalls, 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
<b>(Max Weighted Score 1.25 – 5*)</b>	

<b>Q28. What proportion of fresh/frozen milk or milk products and ingredients in the company’s global supply chain is sourced from cows that are free from tethering?</b>	
<i>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. NB. Companies that report of 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.</i>	
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
<b>(Max Weighted Score 1.25 – 5*)</b>	

**Q29. 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/m<sup>2</sup> or less)?**

*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.*

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
<b>(Max Weighted Score 1.25 – 5*)</b>	

**Q30. What proportion of laying hens in the company’s global supply chain is free from beak trimming or tipping?**

*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. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.*

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
<b>(Max Weighted Score 1.66 – 5*)</b>	

**Q31. What proportion of pigs in the company’s global supply chain is free from tail docking?**

*Companies should report on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report of 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.*

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
<b>(Max Weighted Score 1.66 – 5*)</b>	

<b>Q32. What proportion of dairy cows in the company’s global supply chain is free from tail docking?</b>	
<i>Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that are free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report of 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.</i>	
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
<b>(Max Weighted Score 1.66 – 5*)</b>	

<b>Q33. What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company’s global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?</b>	
<i>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 of 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.)</i>	
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
<b>(Max Weighted Score 5)</b>	

<b>Q34. What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company’s global supply chain is transported within specified maximum journey times?</b>	
<i>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 of the proportion of animals that have been transported in 8 hours or less but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point.</i>	

<i>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.</i>	
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
<b>(Max Weighted Score 5)</b>	

**\*Notes**

1. For questions 26-29, we will only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We will assess relevant questions and use the average scores to calculate the overall score for these questions, with the maximum possible score being five (5) points per question.
2. For questions 30-32, we will only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We will assess relevant questions and use the average scores to calculate the overall score for these questions, with the maximum possible score being five (5) points per question.