

CONSULTATION ON 2019 BENCHMARK

MAY 2019

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 seven benchmarks (for 2012-2018¹) with the 2019 Benchmark scheduled for publication in early 2020.

In preparation for the 2019 Benchmark, to be conducted in August and September 2019, 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.
- Revisions to evaluation criteria (the removal of three and the addition of five new questions).
- The usefulness of the Benchmark and associated report.

KEY CHANGES

We are proposing the following changes to the 2019 Benchmark:

- 1) Replacing four companies with their parent companies following the completion of recent acquisitions. The total number of companies covered by the Benchmark will remain at 150.
- 2) Keeping the same weightings across all sections but modifying the weighting of questions in the performance section to place more emphasis on the performance impact questions.
- 3) Modifying the assessment criteria for one question (relating to routine mutilations).
- 4) Removing one sub-question (relating to reporting on progress against policy) and two questions (relating to animal welfare awards and to non-animal derived protein) from the existing criteria.
- 5) Adding five new questions (covering environmental enrichment, the effectiveness of pre-slaughter stunning, and use of strains of broiler chickens with slower growth potential). The points awarded for these new questions will not be included in companies' overall scores in the 2019 Benchmark, to allow time for companies to adjust to the new criteria.

[The consultation will run from 20 May to 21 June 2019.](#)

¹ These reports can be downloaded from www.bbfaaw.com

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, or request contact via, secretariat@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 BBAW website, of the feedback received and of the changes we have made as a result of this feedback.

The eighth Benchmark Report will be published in early 2020.

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

Structure

This consultation document is structured in five parts as follows:

Part I:	Background
Part II:	Changes to Company Scope
Part III:	Change to Weighting of Performance Questions
Part IV:	Revisions to BBFAW Evaluation Criteria
Part V:	Comments on Improving the BBFAW Benchmark

Part I: Background

BBFAW Overview

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

The 2018 Benchmark

The seventh Benchmark covered 150 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 and September 2018, 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 2018 Benchmark report² published in February 2019, indicated that farm animal welfare is now seen as a strategic opportunity by many food companies, with 64 (43%) of the 150 companies that were assessed now having explicit board or senior management oversight of farm animal welfare, and 106 (71%) having published formal improvement objectives for farm animal welfare.

The number of companies that are considered to have farm animal welfare as an integral part of their business strategy (corresponding to Tiers 1 and 2 in the Benchmark) has grown significantly over the seven Benchmark cycles, from 3 (of 68) in 2012 to 17 (of 150) in 2017 and 2018. Equally encouraging is the fact that 63 (42%) companies have started to introduce improved farm animal welfare management practices, such as policies, management responsibilities, objectives and audits. There is also increased reporting of farm animal welfare performance, with 76 companies (51%) providing at least some data on the proportion of animals that is free from close confinement, 36 (24%) on the proportion of animals that are pre-slaughter stunned, and 30 (20%) on long distance transport times.

² Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2018), *The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: 2018 Report* (BBFAW, London). <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

Despite the progress that we have seen, the 2018 report revealed that with 70 companies appearing in the bottom two tiers of the Benchmark, there continues to be a significant proportion of major food companies that have yet to make farm animal welfare an integral part of their business strategy.

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-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.³

Part II: Changes to Company Scope

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

For the 2019 Benchmark, we are proposing to:

- Replace four companies with their parent companies.
- Amend the name of two companies who have been renamed and branded.

In total, the 2019 Benchmark will cover 150 companies.

For the 2019 Benchmark, we are proposing to assess 150 companies. There will be some changes to the companies covered by the Benchmark following changes to ownership as follows:

- SuperValu will be assessed as part of its parent company, **United Natural Foods Inc (UNFI)**.
- Panera Bread will be assessed as part of its parent company, **JAB Holding Company**.
- Sonic Corporation will be assessed as part of its parent company, **Inspire Brands Inc**.
- **Coles Supermarkets** will be assessed as a separate entity following the demerger of Coles Group from Wesfarmers. Wesfarmers will no longer be assessed.

Additionally, two companies have changed their trading name:

- Marine Harvest SA has been renamed **Mowi ASA**.

³ Further details are available through the BBFAW website, www.bbfaw.com

- Nippon Meat Packers has been renamed **Nippon Ham**.

These changes mean that the 2019 Benchmark will now cover (see Appendix I):

- 91 public companies (92 in 2018)
- 41 private companies (40 in 2018)
- 14 cooperatives
- 4 joint stock/partnership owned companies.

The changes also mean that the 2019 Benchmark will cover one new country - Luxembourg - due to JAB Holding Company being domiciled in this country.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Do you agree with the changes to the companies to be included in the 2019 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 2019?
3. Are there specific companies or regions that you think should be considered for future Benchmark iterations?

Part III: Revisions to Weighting of Performance Questions

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- The weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact section will remain at 35% in 2019. However, within this section, the weighting of the 11 questions relating to performance impacts will be adjusted upwards.

The BBFAW Technical Working Group has identified that the structure of the Performance Reporting and Impact questions (Q.21-35 in the 2018 Benchmark) emphasised performance reporting over performance impact. Overall this section accounted for 35% of the overall score, of which almost two-thirds (64%) of the available points were allocated to performance reporting questions and the balance (36%) were allocated to performance impact questions.

In line with the BBFAW's objective to drive improvements in the welfare of animals managed by companies and their supply chains, it is proposed that the proportion of the scores allocated to performance impact in this section will increase to 60% and the proportion of the scores allocated to performance reporting will be reduced to 40%. Across the Benchmark as a whole, the performance impact questions will now account for 21% of a company's potential maximum score and the performance reporting questions will now account for 14% of a company's potential maximum score.

In practical terms, we will deliver this change through increasing the number of points for Qs 28-31⁴ (Qs 27-30 in 2018) from 5 points in total in 2018 to 20 points in total in 2019, and through increasing the number of points for Qs 32-34⁵ (Qs31-33 in 2018) from 5 points in total in 2018 to 15 points in total in 2019. The new scoring for these questions is presented in Appendix II. The impact of these changes - assuming no change in company practices or reporting - will be to reduce average overall scores across the Benchmark by approximately 5%, assuming no other changes in company practice or performance.

This scale of change is consistent with the rate at which we have evolved the Benchmark, as it means that the change in weighting is approximately one third of a Tier band, and therefore means that – given that many companies receive relatively low scores in this section – approximately 20 companies are at risk of falling a Tier. The companies most impacted by these changes will be those who achieve high scores on performance reporting but low scores on performance impact. This is consistent with the development trajectory we expect companies to follow (from policy, to process, to performance reporting, to performance impact).

In anticipation of the proposed changes, all BBFAW companies will be contacted by the Secretariat in May 2019 to advise them of the proposed adjustment to the weighting of the performance Impact questions. In addition, companies identified as being 'at risk' of dropping a tier as a result of this change will be notified in writing. A number of these companies are expected to engage in a dialogue with the BBFAW Secretariat as well as the BBFAW's NGO partners in advance of the 2019 evaluations in August and September 2019.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

4. Do you agree with the proposal to adjust the weighting of the performance impact questions in 2019?
5. Do you have any specific comments you would like to share on how the criteria is weighted in the Benchmark?

⁴ These are:

- Q28. Proportion of laying hens that is cage-free
- Q29. Proportion of pigs free from sow stalls/gestation crates
- Q30. Proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering
- Q31. Proportion of broiler chickens at lower stocking densities
- Q32. Proportion of laying hens free from beak trimming

⁵ These are:

- Q32. Proportion of laying hens free from beak trimming
- Q33. Proportion of pigs free from tail docking
- Q34. Proportion of dairy cattle free from tail docking

Part IV: 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 reflect best practice in the welfare of animals farmed for food and also to maximise the Benchmark's usefulness to investors, companies and other stakeholders.

Between October 2018 and January 2019, the BBFAW Technical Working Group and the BBFAW partners – Compassion in World Farming and World Animal Protection – undertook a comprehensive review of the assessment criteria. The review considered feedback from various stakeholders including investors, academics and companies covered by the Benchmark. It also considered potential overlaps between questions, and the potential for the addition of new questions and subject areas.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- To modify the assessment criteria for one question (relating to routine mutilations).
- To remove one sub-question (relating to reporting on progress against company's farm animal welfare policies) and two questions (one relating to non-animal derived protein and one relating to awards for farm animal welfare).
- To add five new questions (relating to environmental enrichment, broiler breed strains, the effectiveness of pre-slaughter stunning).

Proposed Question Modification

It is proposed that the assessment approach to the question relating to routine mutilations (in the Management Commitment and Policy section) (Q8 in 2018 and Q9 in 2019) be modified to provide exception for companies that specify immuno-castration as an alternative to surgical castration. The wording of the question rationale has been amended to clarify that the question focuses specifically on routine surgical procedures.

Proposed Question Removals

It is proposed that the following sub-question and questions be deleted from the 2019 Benchmark:

Question (2018 Benchmark)	Proposed Change	Rationale
Question 13: Does the company report on its performance against its animal welfare policy and objectives?	Removal of part of question relating to reporting on progress against policy (total 5 points). The revised question (Q14 in the 2019 Benchmark) will focus on reporting on progress against published objectives	Asking companies to report on progress against their farm animal welfare policy was useful in the early years of the Benchmark. However, now that 71% of companies are setting objectives and targets to implement their policy commitments, it makes sense to focus on whether or not they are reporting against these objectives and targets. Furthermore, the Performance Reporting and Impact section (which has

	and targets and the total maximum score will be amended from 10 to 5.	incrementally expanded since its introduction in 2014) follows the logic that companies should monitor and report on the effectiveness of their policy implementation using quantitative performance metrics.
Question 18: Has the company received any notable awards or accreditations for its farm animal welfare performance in the last two years?	Question to be removed from the 2019 Benchmark.	The logic behind this question was that companies often use flagship brands to experiment with new ideas or issues, and that the lessons learned from these processes can then catalyse change within the wider organisation. As farm animal welfare is being mainstreamed within corporate practice, this question is seen as less relevant. We also note that the majority of companies that achieved points on this question did so as a result of receiving awards from Compassion in World Farming (CIWF). Given that the CIWF Good Farm Animal Welfare Awards are geographically limited, and there are relatively few other independent awards in this area, this question may offer unfair advantage to companies in regions where such awards programmes are operating.
<p>Question 20: Does the company have a position on promoting non-animal derived protein alongside animal protein? (Y/N)</p> <p>Does the company have a stated commitment to reducing/substituting (at least in part) a proportion of the animal protein it sells? (Y/N)</p> <p>If yes, does the company's stated rationale for promoting non-animal derived protein include: (Tick all that apply)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • welfare benefits to animals • human health and nutritional benefits • environmental benefits 	Question to be removed from the 2019 Benchmark.	<p>The reason for introducing these questions was to reflect the BBFAW Partners' current strategic focus on promoting the eating of less but better meat, as well as the recognition that many food companies are now paying attention to protein diversification. We wanted to understand the positions that companies are taking on protein diversification, the drivers for companies to make commitments, and the actions that companies are taking.</p> <p>Our analysis of the data from the 2018 Benchmarking process suggests that reporting on this issue is very limited. The consequence is that it is not possible to draw robust conclusions about current practice, to compare companies or to engage effectively with companies to drive improvements in their strategies.</p> <p>The BBFAW's view is that there is a lack of frameworks or tools for assessing corporate performance on non-animal derived protein and there is limited disclosure on the issue. We also see it as an issue that is of similar complexity to farm animal welfare, which warrants a similar level of analytical rigour in its analysis. Additionally, a number</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wildlife benefits • population benefits • cost benefits 		<p>of investors and companies have challenged the inclusion of these questions, seeing it as undermining BBFAW's focus on farm animal welfare.</p>
---	--	--

Introduction Of New Questions

As part of the criteria review process, the BBFAW Technical Working Group considered whether there are new subject areas/issues that needed to be added to the Benchmark. The Group considered feedback from stakeholders via the BBFAW's 2018 consultation process, responses from companies and investors to the BBFAW's 2018 surveys, and the organisational priorities of BBFAW partners, Compassion in World Farming and World Animal Protection. We considered a variety of issues (including enrichment, gene editing, stunning, breed selection, access to pasture) and tested draft questions to test whether there was sufficient clarity around expectations, whether the questions could be assessed objectively, and whether the BBFAW partners were clear about their expectations of companies.

We are proposing the addition of five new questions – one on Management Commitment and Policy and four on Performance Reporting and Impact - as follows (the full questions, rationale and scoring are set out in Appendix III):

[NEW] Q5. Does the company have a clear position on the provision of species-specific environmental enrichment?

Rationale: Companies are expected to provide animals with stimulating and complex environments that enable species-specific behaviours. Environmental enrichment should only be applied to situations where environmental modifications have enhanced the performance of strongly motivated species-specific behaviours or have led to the expression of a more complex behavioural repertoire. Examples can include (but are not limited to) seasonal pasture access for ruminants; brushes for dairy cows; manipulable materials such as straw for pigs; pecking and dustbathing substrates and perches for chickens; nest boxes for laying hens; and bathing water for ducks.

[NEW] Q21. Does the company report on the proportion of animals for own-brand products in its global supply chain that is provided with an enriched environment?

Rationale: In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict reporting criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the provision of stimulating and complex environments that enable species-specific behaviours for animals in their supply chains. Environmental enrichment should only be applied to situations where environmental modifications have enhanced the performance of strongly motivated species-specific behaviours or have led to the expression of a more complex behavioural repertoire. Examples can include (but are not limited to) seasonal pasture access for ruminants; brushes for dairy cows; manipulable materials such as

straw for pigs; pecking and dustbathing substrates, and perches for chickens, nest boxes for laying hens; and bathing water for ducks.

[NEW] Q24. Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that is ineffectively stunned, i.e. are subject to back-up or repeat stunning?

Rationale: In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. It is essential to render an animal unconscious before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. This question is looking specifically at monitoring the effectiveness of pre-slaughter stunning of animals (or the rendering of fish insensible) in their supply chains as well as the attentiveness of operators to identify when a back-up stun or a repeat stun is required. 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.

[NEW] Q35. What proportion of your supply of chicken meat (fresh/frozen/processed and ingredient) comes from strains of birds with slower growth potential (– defined as <55g/d averaged over the growth cycle) according to the breeding company specification?

Rationale: Breeds of chicken selected for high growth rate, lean meat deposition and high feed conversion efficiency suffer a range of physiological and metabolic health issues, as well as poor immunity and walking ability. Such breeds are lethargic and have increasing meat quality issues. Breeds with slower growth potential tend to have better welfare outcomes.

[NEW] Q37. Of the proportion of animals pre-slaughter stunned in the company's global supply chain, what proportion of animals is effectively stunned, i.e. not subject to back-up or repeat stunning?

Rationale: It is essential to render an animal unconscious before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. 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. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of animals that have been ineffectively stunned but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimum points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.

Following the protocol used in previous years when introducing new questions, we propose allowing a one-year grace period on the scoring of these questions. This means that in 2019, the points awarded to companies for the new questions will be excluded from their overall scoring. This will allow time for companies to adjust to the new criteria, prior to the scores being included in their overall scores from 2020.

We have decided not, at this point, to include questions on gene editing (until this issue has become more established and there is sufficient clarity around expectations of companies) or on pasture access (given the difficulties in developing a globally applicable rule for assessing

this). However, the BBFAW will continue to consider feedback from stakeholders on aspects of farm animal welfare that are important to them.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

6. Do you agree with the proposal to modify Q9 on routine mutilations?
7. Do you agree with the proposals to delete part of Q13 (relating to progress against policy) and to delete Q18 (relating to awards) and Q20 relating to non-animal derived protein?
8. Do you agree with the proposal to add 5 new questions (on environmental enrichment, on pre-slaughter stunning, on chicken breeds)?
9. Do you agree with the proposal to exclude from the overall score the points awarded for each of the five new questions in 2019, to allow companies time to adjust to the new criteria?
10. Are there any other changes or amendments to the Benchmark assessment criteria you would like to propose?

Part V: Wider Benchmark Revisions

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 remain relevant to developments taking place in the marketplace, to reflect best practice in the welfare of animals farmed for food and to maximise the Benchmark's usefulness to investors, companies and other stakeholders.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

11. Do you have any wider reflections on how the Benchmark might be developed over time?

Appendix I: Proposed Scope of Companies for 2019 BBAW Benchmark

Note: New (parent) companies and changes to company names are 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.	Amazon/Whole Foods Market	Public	5337: Food Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
7.	BJ's Wholesale	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
8.	C&S Wholesale	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
9.	Carrefour SA	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
10.	Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
11.	Cencosud	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Chile
12.	China Resources Vanguard	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
13.	Coles Group Limited	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
14.	Colruyt	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Belgium
15.	Conad Consorzio Nazionale	Cooperative	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Italy
16.	(The) Co-operative Food (UK)	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
17.	Coop Group (Switzerland)/Coop Genossenschaft	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland
18.	Coop Italia	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Italy
19.	Costco Wholesale Corp	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
20.	Couche-Tard	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Canada
21.	E Leclerc	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
22.	Edeka Zentrale	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
23.	Empire Company/Sobey's	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Canada
24.	Groupe Auchan	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
25.	H E Butt Company	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
26.	ICA Gruppen/ICA Eiendom Norge AS	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Sweden
27.	IKEA (Inter IKEA Group)	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Sweden

28.	J Sainsbury PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
29.	Jeronimo Martins	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Portugal
30.	(The) Kroger Company	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
31.	Les Mousquetaires	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
32.	Lianhua Supermarket Holdings Co	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
33.	Lidl Stiftung & Co KG	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
34.	Loblaw	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Canada
35.	Marks & Spencer PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
36.	Mercadona SA	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Spain
37.	Metro AG	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
38.	Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland
39.	Publix Super Markets Inc	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
40.	Rewe Group	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
41.	Schwarz Unternehmens Treuhand KG/Kaufland	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
42.	Seven & i Holdings	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Japan
	Super Valu	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
43.	Sysco Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
44.	Systeme U Generale	Cooperative	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	France
45.	Target Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
46.	Tesco PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
47.	United Natural Foods Inc (UNFI)	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
48.	Waitrose	Partnership	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
49.	Walmart Stores/Asda	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
	Wesfarmers	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
50.	Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
51.	Woolworths Limited	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
52.	Yonghui Superstores	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
53.	Aramark Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
54.	Autogrill SpA	Joint Stock	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy

55.	Bloomin' Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
56.	Camst – La Ristorazione Italiana Soc. Coop. ARL	Cooperative	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
57.	Chick-Fil-A	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
58.	Chipotle Mexican Grill	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
59.	CKE Restaurants	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
60.	CNHLS	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	China
61.	Compass Group PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
62.	Cracker Barrel	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
63.	Cremonini SpA	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
64.	Darden Restaurants PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
65.	Dico's	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	China
66.	Domino's Pizza Group PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
67.	Dunkin' Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
68.	Elior	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
69.	Gategroup Holding AG	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Switzerland
70.	Greggs PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
71.	Habib's	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	Brazil
72.	Inspire Brands Inc	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
73.	JAB Holding Company	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	Luxembourg
74.	JD Wetherspoon PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
75.	McDonald's Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
76.	Mitchells & Butlers PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
	Panera Bread	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
77.	Papa John's Pizza	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
78.	Restaurant Brands International/Burger King	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Canada
79.	Sodexo	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
	Sonic Corp	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
80.	SSP Group Limited	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Sweden
81.	Starbucks Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
82.	Subway/Doctor's Associates Inc	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
83.	The Cheesecake Factory	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
84.	Umoe Gruppen AS	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Norway
85.	Wendy's Company (The)	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
86.	Whitbread PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
87.	Yum! Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
88.	2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd)	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
89.	Agro Super	Public	3570: Food Producer	Chile
90.	Arla Foods Ltd	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
91.	Associated British Foods PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
92.	Barilla SpA	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
93.	Bimbo	Public	3570: Food Producer	Mexico
94.	BRF SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
95.	Campbell Soup Company	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
96.	Cargill	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
97.	Charoen Pokphand Foods (CPF)	Private	3570: Food Producer	Thailand
98.	China Yurun Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	China

	Limited			
99.	Chuying Agro-Pastoral Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	China
100	Cooke Seafood Inc	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
101	ConAgra	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
102	Cooperativa Centrale Aurora Alimentos	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
103	Cooperl Arc Atlantique	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
104	Cranswick PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
105	Danish Crown AmbA/Tulip	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
106	Dean Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
107	Ferrero SpA	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Italy
108	Fonterra	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	New Zealand
109	General Mills Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
110	Groupe Danone SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	France
111	Gruppo Veronesi	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
112	Hershey Co	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
113	Hilton Food Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
114	Hormel Foods Corporation	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
115	Industrias Bachoco	Public	3570: Food Producer	Mexico
116	JBS SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
117	Kerry Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	Ireland
118	KraftHeinz	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
119	Lactalis	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
120	LDC Groupe	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
121	Maple Leaf Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	Canada
122	Marfrig Alimentos SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
123	Mowi ASA (formerly Marine Harvest ASA)	Public	3570: Food Producer	Norway
124	Maruha Nichiro	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
125	Mars Inc	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
126	Meiji Holdings	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
127	Minerva Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
128	Mondelez International	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
129	Muller Group AG	Private	3570: Food Producer	Germany
130	Nestlé SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Switzerland
131	New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC
132	Nippon Ham (formerly Nippon Meat Packers)	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
133	Noble Foods	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
134	OSI Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
135	Plukon Food Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
136	Perdue Farms	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
137	Premier Foods PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
138	Royal FrieslandCampina	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
139	Sanderson Farms	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
140	Saputo Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	Canada
141	Seaboard Corp	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
142	Terrena Group	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	France
143	Tönnies Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Germany
144	Tyson Foods Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
145	Unilever NV	Public	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands

146	US Foods	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
147	VION Food Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
148	Wens Foodstuffs Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
149	WH Group Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC
150	Zhongpin Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC/USA

Appendix II: Proposed Changes To Question Scoring And Weighting In 2019

Pillar	BBFAW 2019		BBFAW 2018	
	No. of Points	Weighting	No. of Points	Weighting
Management Commitment and Policy	70	26%	70	26%
- Q5. Commitment to provide species-specific environmental enrichment	(Score not included in overall score in year 1)	0%	(Not asked in 2018)	-
Governance and Management	70	28%	75	28%
Leadership and Innovation	20	11%	30	11%
Performance Reporting and Impact	80*	35%	55**	35%
- Q21. Reporting on proportion of animals provided with enriched environments	(Score not included in overall score in year 1)	0%	(Not asked in 2018)	-
- Q24. Reporting on proportion of animals ineffectively stunned	(Score not included in overall score in year 1)	0%	(Not asked in 2018)	-
- Q28. Proportion of laying hens that is cage-free	1.25 - 5	2.2%	1.25 - 5	0.8%
- Q29. Proportion of pigs free from sow stalls/gestation crates	1.25 - 5	2.2%	1.25 - 5	0.8%
- Q30. Proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering	1.25 - 5	2.2%	1.25 - 5	0.8%
- Q31. Proportion of broiler chickens at lower stocking densities	1.25 - 5	2.2%	1.25 - 5	0.8%
- Q32. Proportion of laying hens free from beak trimming	1.66 - 5	2.2%	1.66 - 5	1.1%
- Q33. Proportion of pigs free from tail docking	1.66 - 5	2.2%	1.66 - 5	1.1%
- Q34. Proportion of dairy cattle free from tail docking	1.66 - 5	2.2%	1.66 - 5	1.1%
- Q35. Proportion of chickens from strains with slower growth potential	(Score not included in overall score in year 1)	0%	(Not asked in 2018)	-
- Q36. Proportion of animals that is pre-slaughter stunned	5	2.2%	5	3.2%
- Q37. Proportion of animals that is effectively stunned	(Score not included in overall score in year 1)	0%	(Not asked in 2018)	-
- Q38. Proportion of animals transported in 8 hours or less	5	2.2%	5	3.2%
Total Maximum Score/Weighting	240***	100%	230****	100%

Appendix III: Proposed 2019 Benchmark Evaluation Criteria

Management Commitment and Policy	
Q1. Does the company acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue?	
<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
The company identifies farm animal welfare as a relevant business issue.	10
(Max Score 10)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking for an acknowledgement by the parent company that farm animal welfare is a business issue. • 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. • The score does not take account of the specific reasons advanced. • 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. 	
Q2. Does the company publish an overarching corporate farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent)?	
<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 firmly on the business agenda.</i>	
No evidence of a formal policy statement (or equivalent) on farm animal welfare.	0
The company has a broad commitment to farm animal welfare in a policy statement (or equivalent) but no description of how the policy is to be implemented.	5
The company has a broad commitment to farm animal welfare within a policy statement (or equivalent) and a description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy is effectively implemented.	10
(Max Score 10)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment does not differentiate between companies that publish stand-alone farm animal welfare policies and companies that incorporate farm animal welfare into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice. • Companies that publish a clear statement of commitment to farm animal welfare 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. • 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"> — A clear statement of the reasons why farm animal welfare is important to the business 	

- (including both the business case and the ethical case for action)
- A commitment to compliance with relevant legislation
 - A clear position with regard to expected standards of farm animal welfare
 - A description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy 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)
 - A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance.

Q3. Does the policy statement provide a clear explanation of scope?	
<i>Understanding the scope of a policy is important to understand the breadth of a company's commitment to action on farm animal welfare.</i>	
3a. Geographic scope not specified	0
Scope is limited to certain specified geographies	2
Scope is universal across all geographies	5
3b. Species scope not specified	0
Scope is limited to certain specified species	2
Scope is universal across all relevant species	5
3c. Product scope not specified	0
Scope is limited to own-brand products or ingredients (i.e. the policy does not apply to imported or other brand products)	2
Scope is universal across own brand, imported and other brand products	5
(Max Score 15)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if marks have been awarded for Question 2, i.e. when the company has a published farm animal welfare policy. • 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. 	

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)?	
<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 stated 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
The company makes a universal commitment to avoid confinement across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
(Max Score 5)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement. • Simply stating compliance with legislation (e.g. with EU Directives on egg laying hens and sow stalls) 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. 	

[New] Q5. Does the company have a clear position on the provision of species-specific environmental enrichment?	
<i>Companies are expected to provide animals with stimulating and complex environments that enable species-specific behaviours. Environmental enrichment should only be applied to situations where environmental modifications have enhanced the performance of strongly motivated species-specific behaviours or have led to the expression of a more complex behavioural repertoire. Examples can include (but are not limited to) seasonal pasture access for ruminants; brushes for dairy cows; manipulable materials such as straw for pigs; pecking and dustbathing substrates, and perches for chickens, nest boxes for laying hens; bathing water for ducks.</i>	
No stated position.	0
The company makes a partial commitment to providing enriched environments but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
The company makes a partial commitment to providing enriched environments and the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3

The company makes a universal commitment to providing enriched environments across all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
(Max Score 5)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question is looking for a clear position on the provision of species-specific environmental enrichment. The term environmental enrichment is often used to describe modifications to a captive environment to enhance the performance of strongly motivated species-specific behaviours or encourage the expression of natural behaviours. Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the provision of species-specific enrichment. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points. Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies environmental enrichment is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to provide environmental enrichment is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the provision of species-specific enrichment). Companies that make a commitment to the provision of species-specific environmental enrichment but are not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, products) are awarded a score of 1 point. 	

Q6. 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?	
<i>Both cloning and genetic engineering raise serious animal welfare concerns⁶. In farmed fish species this includes heat treatment of eggs to induce triploidy, which renders fish sterile.</i>	
No stated 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
The company makes a universal commitment to avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
(Max Score 5)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their 	

⁶ 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*. BFFAW Investor Briefing No. 6 (September 2012) (BFFAW, London), http://www.bbfaw.com/media/1083/briefing-no6_cloning-and-genetic-engineering-of-farm-animals.pdf

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 stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of genetically modified or cloned animals).
- Companies that make 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.

Q7. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances?

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.

No stated 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
The company makes a universal commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances.	5
(Max Score 5)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of growth 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 issues⁷, (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.

⁷ 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.

- Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits the use of growth hormones is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances).
- 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 stated 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).
- In the absence of a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, companies that market a particular product line as containing zero growth hormones are not awarded any points. The rationale for this is because a) this question is looking for a clear commitment from the company on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, rather than evidence of selected products that avoid certain substances, b) the question applies to all growth promoting substances (i.e. not just hormones); and c) in certain jurisdictions (e.g. the US), it is illegal to administer hormones to poultry and pigs (so, if a poultry or pig product states that the animals are not fed hormones, the product is simply complying with legislation).

Q8. Does the company have a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use?	
<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 rapidly⁸. 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 stated 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
The company makes a universal commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics across all geographies, species and products.	5
(Max Score 5)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • This question is looking for a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use. 	

⁸ 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>

- 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.
- 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).
- In the absence of a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, companies that market a particular product line as containing zero growth hormones are not awarded any points. The rationale for this is because a) this question is looking for a clear commitment from the company on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, rather than evidence of selected products that avoid certain substances, b) the question applies to all growth promoting substances (i.e. not just hormones); and c) in certain jurisdictions (e.g. the US), It is illegal to administer hormones to poultry and pigs (so, if a poultry or pig product states that the animals are not fed hormones, the product is simply complying with legislation).

Q9. 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)?	
<i>Many farm animals are subjected to procedures that alter their bodies, often with no anesthesia, 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, surgical castration and tail docking of pigs, and fin clipping in finfish aquaculture.</i>	
No stated 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
The company makes a universal commitment to avoidance of routine mutilations across all relevant species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.	5
(Max Score 5)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking for a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations. • Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations. The reasons are (a) legislation does not cover all routine mutilations, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they 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 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). • 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. • Companies that specify certain breeds (e.g. genetically polled cattle) in their supplier guidelines but do not have a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations are not awarded any points. • Companies that specify immuno-castration as an alternative to surgical castration will not be scored on this procedure as it is outside of the scope of this question, which focuses specifically 	

on routine surgical procedures.

Q10. 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?	
<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>	
No stated position.	0
The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter 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
The company makes a universal commitment to avoid the use of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning or from finfish that have not been rendered insensible across all species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.	5
(Max Score 5)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) • 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. • 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 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. 	

Q11. Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of long distance live transportation?	
<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</i>	

<i>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 stated position.	0
The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of long distance transport but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
The company makes a partial commitment to avoid the use of long distance transport and the scope (in terms of geography, species and products) is clearly defined.	3
The company makes a universal commitment to avoidance of long distance live transportation across all species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.	5
(Max Score 5)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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 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	
Q12. Has the company assigned management responsibility for farm animal welfare to an individual or specified committee?	
<i>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.</i>	
No clearly defined management responsibility.	0
The company has published details of the management position with responsibility for farm animal welfare on a day-to-day basis.	5
The company has published details of how the board or senior management oversees the implementation of the company's farm animal welfare policy.	5

(Max score 10)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	

Q13. Has the company set objectives and targets for the management of farm animal welfare?	
<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
The company has published objectives and targets but with no information on how these are to be achieved.	5
The company has published objectives and targets together with information on the actions to be taken to achieve these, the resources allocated and the schedule for the delivery of these objectives and targets.	10
(Max score 10)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 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. 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. 	

Q14. Does the company report on its performance against its animal welfare policy and objectives?	
<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

(Max score 10 5)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sub-questions (on objectives and targets) are scored independently (i.e. the score for one sub-question does not influence the score on the other sub-question). The objectives and targets question is only assessed if the company has been awarded 5 or 10 points for Question 13, i.e. the company has published objectives and targets. Otherwise, a score of zero is awarded for this part of the question. 	

Q15. Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its farm animal welfare policy is effectively implemented?	
<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 provided on employee training in farm animal welfare.	0
The company provides specific training to employees in farm animal welfare.	5
The company provides no information on the actions to be taken in the event of non-compliance with the farm animal welfare policy.	0
The company describes the actions it takes in the event of non-compliance with its farm animal welfare policy.	5
(Max score 10)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sub-questions (on training and on internal controls) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores for the other sub-questions). On training, companies are only awarded 5 points if the training provided is aimed at employees and if it explicitly addressed farm animal welfare-related issues. The training question does not address the quality of the training provide, the manner in which skills or competencies are assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provide. 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. 	

Q16. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain?	
<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
16a. No information on how farm animal welfare is included in supplier contracts.	0
The company incorporates farm animal welfare into contractual obligations for suppliers but this is limited by geography and/or certain products or species	3
The company incorporates farm animal welfare into contractual obligations for suppliers across all species, products and geographies.	5
16b. No information provided on how supplier compliance with contract	0

conditions is monitored.	
The company specifies farm animal welfare as part of supplier auditing programme.	5
16c. No information provided on specific support and/or education provided to suppliers.	
The company provides specific support and/or education to suppliers on farm animal welfare policy/issues.	5
(Max score 15)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sub-questions (on contracts, auditing and supplier education) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores for the other sub-questions). • On contracts, companies are awarded 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. • 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. • 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. 	

Q17. Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?	
<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
(Max Score 20)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic farm assurance standards typically do not go beyond legislative requirements for welfare and so contribute relatively little to enhanced welfare. In general, these involve yearly inspections by an independent body. Examples of standards which provide basic farm assurance (typically within a wider quality context) include the Red Tractor Farm Assurance Schemes, 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.

Innovation and Leadership

Q18. Is the company currently investing in projects dedicated to advancing farm animal welfare practices within the industry?

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.

No evidence of company involvement in advancing farm animal welfare beyond company practices.	0
Evidence of current company involvement in research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare.	5
Evidence of active company involvement in industry or other initiatives (e.g. working groups, supporting NGO lobbying, responding to government consultations) directed at improving farm animal welfare.	5
(Max Score 10)	

Explanatory Notes:

- 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).
- 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.
- Similarly, only those industry initiatives that are explicitly directed at improving farm animal welfare are eligible to be scored.
- Examples of research and industry initiatives aimed at improving farm animal welfare could e.g.

be innovations linked to using genetics and breeds specifically bred for welfare improvement, innovative housing systems and environment providing better welfare as well as innovations linked to the avoidance of unnecessary culling.

- 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.

Q18. Has the company received any notable awards or accreditations for its farm animal welfare performance in the last two years?

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.

No evidence of notable awards or accreditations in the last two years.

0

The company has received a notable award or accreditation for a single category or species.

5

The company has received a significant award relating to its efforts across a number of species, or the company has received awards for its efforts on different species.

10

(Max Score 10)

Explanatory Notes:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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).
- 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
(Max Score 10)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The activities that could be considered in this question are defined broadly. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of farm animal welfare information on the company's website. Note: This is not just about providing information in the corporate responsibility section of the website but making farm animal welfare an integral part of customer communications and engagement. On-pack or on-shelf labelling – 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. Companies that produce multiple videos on various animal species and welfare issues are awarded 1 point, Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to promote higher animal welfare to consumers 	

Q20a. Does the company have a position on promoting non-animal derived protein alongside animal protein?	
There are several drivers for companies offering lifestyle choices for customers through the food they sell, from health and nutritional benefits, to environmental benefits (e.g. reduced greenhouse gases, restoration of biodiversity, soil and water quality), wildlife benefits (e.g. reversing habitat destruction), population benefits (e.g. diverting crops used for animal feed to directly feeding the world's growing population), welfare benefits to animals (e.g. eating less but high welfare animal protein, and cost benefits (e.g. supplementing a proportion of animal protein with plant-based alternatives).	
Company has a position on promoting non-animal derived protein alongside animal protein	Yes
Company does not have a position on promoting non-animal derived protein alongside animal protein	No
Q20b. Does the company have a stated commitment to reducing/substituting (at least in part) a proportion of the animal protein it sells?	
Company has a stated commitment to reducing/substituting (at least in part) a proportion of the animal protein it sells	Yes
Company does not have a stated commitment to reducing/substituting (at least in part) a proportion of the animal protein it sells	No
Q20c. If yes: Does the company's stated rationale for promoting non-animal derived protein include: (Tick all that apply)	
Welfare benefits to animals	
Human health and nutritional benefits	
Environmental benefits	
Wildlife benefits	

Population benefits	
Cost benefits	
(Max Score 0)	-

Performance Reporting and Impact	
<p>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 is free from confinement (i.e. those in barn, free range, indoor group housed, outdoor bred/reared)?</p>	
<p><i>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 of animals in their supply chains. This is because many of the most significant farm animal welfare concerns result from close confinement practices (such as barren battery cages, sow stalls, farrowing crates, veal crates, concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), feedlots, tethered systems, close confinement of solitary finfish species).</i></p>	
No reporting on the proportion of animals free from confinement	0
The company reports on the proportion of animals free from confinement, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
The company reports fully on the proportion of animals free from confinement, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
(Max Score 5)	
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is free from close confinement. Companies that report using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) are not awarded points unless they explicitly state that the standard means that the relevant animals is free from confinement. Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points. Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being free from close confinement are not awarded points unless there is clear evidence that key performance indicators (ideally by relevant species) are in place to monitor performance against policies and/or related targets or objectives. 	

[New] Q21. Does the company report on the proportion of animals for own-brand products in its global supply chain that are provided with an enriched environment?	
<i>In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict reporting criteria for animals in their supply chain. Examples can include (but are not limited to) seasonal pasture access for ruminants; brushes for dairy cows; manipulable materials such as straw for pigs; pecking and dustbathing substrates, and perches for chickens, as well nest boxes for laying hens; bathing water for ducks.</i>	
No reporting on the proportion of animals provided with enriched environments.	0
The company reports on the proportion of animals provided with enriched environments but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
The company reports fully on the proportions of animals provided enriched environments across all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that are provided with environmental enrichment. • Companies that report using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) are not awarded points unless they explicitly state that the standard means that the relevant animals are provided with environmental enrichment. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points. <p>Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being provided with environmental enrichment are not awarded points unless there is clear evidence that key performance indicators (ideally by relevant species) are in place to monitor performance against policies and/or related targets or objectives.</p>	

Q22. Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that is free from routine mutilations (i.e. castration, teeth clipping, tail docking, toe clipping, dehorning, desnooding, de-winging, disbudding, mulesing, beak trimming, fin clipping)?	
<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 is free from routine mutilations	0
The company reports on the proportion of animals that is free from routine mutilations, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
The company reports fully on the proportion of animals that is free from routine mutilations, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is free from routine mutilations. Companies that report using proxy measures (e.g. the 	

proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) are not awarded points unless they explicitly state that the standard means that the relevant animals is free from routine mutilations.

- Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.
- Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being free from close confinement are not awarded points unless there is clear evidence that key performance indicators (ideally by relevant species) are in place to monitor performance against policies and/or related targets or objectives.

Companies that report on the use of anesthesia or analgesics in association with routine mutilations are not awarded points because this question is looking for an explicit commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations.

Q23. Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that are subject to pre-slaughter stunning?

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.

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
(Max Score 5)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that are subject to pre-slaughter stunning. Companies that report using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) are not awarded points unless they explicitly state that the standard means that the relevant animals are subject to pre-slaughter stunning.
- Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.

Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being subject to pre-slaughter stunning are not awarded points unless there is clear evidence that key performance indicators (ideally by relevant species) are in place to monitor performance against policies and/or related targets or objectives.

[New] Q24. Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that are ineffectively stunned, i.e. are subject to back-up or repeat stunning?

In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. It is essential to

<i>render an animal unconscious before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. This question is looking specifically at monitoring the effectiveness of pre-slaughter stunning of animals (or the rendering of fish insensible) in their supply chains as well as the attentiveness of operators to identify when a back-up stun or a repeat stun is required.</i>	
No reporting on the proportion of animals subject to back-up or repeat stunning.	0
The company reports on the proportion of animals subject to back-up or repeat stunning, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
The company reports fully on the proportion of animals subject to back-up or repeat stunning, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that are subject to back-up or repeat stunning. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. • Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points. • Companies that make general statements about "None of our animals" or "No animals" required back-up or repeat stunning are not awarded points unless there is clear evidence that key performance indicators (ideally by relevant species) are in place to monitor the effectiveness of stunning. 	

Q25. Does the company report on the average, typical or maximum permitted live transport times for the animals in its global supply chain?	
<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-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
(Max Score 5)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on the average, typical or maximum live transport times for animals. Companies that report using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) are not awarded points unless they explicitly state that the standard means that the transport times are limited to eight hours or less.
- Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the average, typical or maximum transport times for animals affected. Companies that report on the average, typical or maximum distance travelled by animals without specifying transport times are not awarded points.
- Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being subject to average, typical or maximum journey times are not awarded points unless there is clear evidence that key performance indicators (ideally by relevant species) are in place to monitor performance against policies and/or related targets or objectives.

Companies that report on measures taken to the comfort of animals during transportation (e.g. stocking levels, access to water, rest breaks, etc) are not awarded points as this question is looking explicitly at journey times for animals.

Q26. Does the company report on welfare outcome measures (i.e. measures linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?

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:

For all species: mortality rates

For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter

For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate

For pigs: lameness, tail bite and other lesions

For broiler chickens: gait score, footpad dermatitis, hockburn, breast blisters

For beef: body condition, cleanliness, lameness, hoof health status

For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition

For fish: injuries, fin and body damage, prevalence of lice and other diseases, starvation

For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort)

For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, socialising

For transportation: injuries, fatigue, road traffic incidents, mortality (dead-on-arrival/DOA)

For slaughter: effectiveness of stunning

No reporting on welfare outcome measures.	0
The company partially reports on welfare outcome measure but reporting is limited to certain species or geographies.	3
The company fully reports on at least one welfare outcome measure per relevant species and/or per relevant geography.	5
(Max Score 5)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is looking specifically for explicit reporting on welfare outcome measures such as:
 - Mortality rates (as an indicator of potential pain, suffering and suboptimal performance)
 - Disease incidence (as an indicator of health status, robustness)
 - Bone breakages (as an indicator of pain, suffering, suboptimal performance, and poor house design)
 - Lameness (as an indicator of potential pain, behavioural restriction and suboptimal environmental and housing conditions)
 - Body marks/injuries (as an indicator of aggressive fight damage, especially during mixing or competition at feeding)
 - Body condition (as an indicator of good feed management, or competition at feeding)
 - Cleanliness (as an indicator of good environmental control, thermal comfort)
 - Positive flock or herd behaviour (as an indicator of a varied stimulating environment, good management and suitable breed to production system).
 - Negative flock or herd behavior, such as injurious feather pecking or tail biting in pigs (as an indicator of a barren non-stimulating environment, poor environmental control, low space allowance, feed and health problems)
 - Scores are not awarded for reporting on input-based measures (i.e. measures relating to the type of production system, e.g. caged, barn, free-range, used as well as the practices for transport and slaughter).
 - Similarly, scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm animal welfare standards, but do not report on the welfare outcomes resulting from the implementation of these standards.
 - Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.

Q27. Does the company provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance (either in terms of input measures or welfare outcome measures)?

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).

The company does not report on progress on animal welfare performance (either in terms of input measures or welfare outcome measures).	0
The company reports on progress on at least one animal welfare performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure), but this is limited to certain species, products or geographies and there is no explanation of trends in performance.	4
The company reports on progress on at least one animal welfare performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure) in its supply chain, but this is limited to certain species, products or geographies, although it does provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance.	6
The company reports on at least one performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure) per relevant species across all geographies but there is no explanation of progress or trend in performance.	8

The company reports on at least one performance measure (either an input measure or a welfare outcome measure) per relevant species across all geographies, and it provides an explanation of progress or trend in performance.	10
(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because performance reporting is relatively underdeveloped, we do not prescribe the performance indicators to be used. We award scores for input-based measures (i.e. measures relating to the type of production system, e.g. caged, barn, free-range, used as well as the practices for transport and slaughter) and outcome-based measures (which are indicators that relate to the physical and mental wellbeing of the animals themselves, e.g. lameness and mastitis in dairy cows, gait score and footpad dermatitis in broilers, tail-biting and lameness in pigs, bone breakage and feather coverage in laying hens). We do not prescribe the form in which performance data are reported. We award scores for reporting in absolute (e.g. number of animals) and relative (e.g. as a percentage of the total number of animals, as a proportion of the species in question) terms. 	

Q28. What proportion of laying hens (for shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is cage-free?	
<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
(Max Weighted Score 1.25 – 5*)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain that is cage-free. Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point. Companies that report on the proportion of laying hens that are cage-free but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point. Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards, but do not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that are cage-free in line with these standards. 	
Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being free from close confinement are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free.	

Q29. What proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is sourced from pigs that is free from sow stalls?	
<i>Companies making public commitments to source sow-stall-free pork should report on the proportion sows that is 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 is free from sow stalls, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of sows is free from sow stalls	1
26 – 50% of sows is free from sow stalls	3
51 – 75% of sows is free from sow stalls	5
76 – 99% of sows is free from sow stalls	7
100% of sows is free from sow stalls	10
(Max Weighted Score 1.25 – 5*)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of sows in the company's global supply chain that is free from sow stalls. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point. • Companies that report on the proportion of sows that is free from sow stalls but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point. • Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards, but do not explicitly report on the proportion of sows that is free from sow stalls in line with these standards. • Companies that make general statements about "Our sows" or "All sows" being free from sow stalls are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of sows that is free from sow stalls. 	

Q30. What proportion of fresh/frozen milk or milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is sourced from cows that is free from tethering?	
<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 is 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 is free from tethering, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of dairy cows is free from tethering	1
26 – 50% of dairy cows is free from tethering	3
51 – 75% of dairy cows is free from tethering	5
76 – 99% of dairy cows is free from tethering	7
100% of dairy cows is free from tethering	10
(Max Weighted Score 1.25 – 5*)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that is free from tethering. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put 	

this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point.

- Companies that report on the proportion of cows that is free from tethering but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point.
- Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but do not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering in line with these standards.

Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All cows" being free from tethering are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering.

Q31. 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, 30 kg/m² 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
(Max Weighted Score 1.25 – 5*)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens in the company's global supply chain that is reared at lower stocking densities.
- Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point.
- Companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point.
- Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but do not explicitly report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities in line with these standards.
- Companies that make general statements about "Our broiler chickens" or "All meat chickens" being reared at lower stocking densities are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities.

Q32. 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 is 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 is 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 is free from beak trimming or tipping	0
1 – 25% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping	1
26 – 50% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping	3
51 – 75% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping	5
76 – 99% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping	7
100% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping	10
(Max Weighted Score 1.66 – 5*)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain that is free from beak trimming or tipping. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point. • Companies that report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point. • Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but do not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping in line with these standards. 	
Companies that make general statements about "Our laying hens" or "All chickens" being free from beak trimming or tipping are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping.	

Q33. 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 is free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report of the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients that are sourced from pigs that is 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 is free from tail docking, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of pigs is free from tail docking	1
26 – 50% of pigs is free from tail docking	3
51 – 75% of pigs is free from tail docking	5
76 – 99% of pigs is free from tail docking	7
100% of pigs is free from tail docking	10
(Max Weighted Score 1.66 – 5*)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of pigs in the company's global supply chain that is free from tail docking. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point. • Companies that report on the proportion of pigs that is free from tail docking but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point. 	

- Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but do not explicitly report on the proportion of pigs that is free from tail docking in line with these standards.

Companies that make general statements about "Our pigs" or "All pigs" being free from tail docking are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of pigs that is free from tail docking.

Q34. What proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?

Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report of the proportion of fresh/frozen milk products and ingredients that are sourced from cows that is 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 dairy cows is free from tail docking, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of dairy cows is free from tail docking	1
26 – 50% of dairy cows is free from tail docking	3
51 – 75% of dairy cows is free from tail docking	5
76 – 99% of dairy cows is free from tail docking	7
100% of dairy cows is free from tail docking	10

(Max Weighted Score 1.66 – 5*)

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that is free from tail docking.
- Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point.
- Companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tail docking but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point.
- Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but do not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tail docking in line with these standards.
- Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being free from tail docking are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of cows that is free from tail docking.

[New] Q35. What proportion of your supply of chicken meat (fresh/frozen/processed and ingredient) comes from strains of birds with slower growth potential (defined as <55g/d averaged over the growth cycle) according to the breeding company specification?

Breeds of chicken selected for high growth rate, lean meat deposition and high feed conversion efficiency suffer a range of physiological and metabolic health issues, as well as poor immunity and walking ability. Such breeds are lethargic and have increasing meat quality issues. Breeds with slower growth potential tend to have better welfare outcomes.

0% of products are from slower growth potential strains, or no reported information.	0
1 – 25% of products are from slower growth potential strains (or scope of reporting is not clear).	1

26 – 50% of products are from slower growth potential strains	3
51 – 75% of products are from slower growth potential strains	5
76 – 99% of products are from slower growth potential strains	7
100% of products are from slower growth potential strains.	10
(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of chicken meat in the company's global supply chain that is from strains of birds with slower growth potential. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point. • Companies that report on the proportion of chicken meat that is from strains of birds with slower growth potential but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point. • Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of chicken meat from birds managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but do not explicitly report on the strains of birds with slower growth potential in line with these standards. • Companies that make general statements about "Our chicken meat" or "All chicken " being from strains of birds with slower growth potential are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of chicken meat that is from strains of birds with slower growth potential. 	

Q36. What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?	
<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
(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the 	

company's global supply chain that have been pre-slaughter stunned.

- Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point.
- Companies that report on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point.
- Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but do not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned in line with these standards.
- Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being pre-slaughter stunned are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.

[New] Q37. Of the proportion of animals pre-slaughter stunned in the company's global supply chain, what proportion of animals are effectively stunned, i.e. not subject to back-up or repeat stunning?

It is essential to render an animal unconscious before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. This question 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. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of animals that have been ineffectively stunned but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimum points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.

0-95% of products are from animals that have been effectively stunned, or no reported information.	0
96% of products are from animals that have been effectively stunned (or scope of reporting is not clear)	1
97% of products are from animals that have been effectively stunned.	3
98% of products are from animals that have been effectively stunned.	5
99% of products are from animals that have been effectively stunned.	7
100% of products are from animals that have been effectively stunned	10
(Max Score 10)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the company's global supply chain that have been effectively stunned.
- Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point.

- Companies that report on the proportion of animals that have been effectively pre-slaughter stunned but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point.
- Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but do not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that have been effectively stunned in line with these standards.
- Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being effectively stunned are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that have been effectively stunned.

Q38. What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is transported within specified maximum journey times?

This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the live transportation of animals in their supply chains. When being transported, animals can experience hunger, thirst, discomfort, pain, frustration, fear and distress, as well as physical welfare problems including injury, disease, and, in the worst cases, death. For these reasons, transport of live terrestrial animals should be minimised wherever possible and journeys should be kept as short as possible. Specifically, any transport of a live terrestrial animal that exceeds 8 hours, from loading to unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of animals that have been transported in 8 hours or less but do not specify the scope will be awarded 1 point.

This question currently excludes finfish because the key welfare issues concern the pumping, crowding and poor handling of finfish, as well the deterioration of water quality, especially the depletion of oxygen or accumulation of carbon dioxide and ammonia.

0% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less	1
26 – 50% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less	3
51 – 75% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less	5
76 – 99% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less	7
100% of animals are transported in 8 hours or less	10
(Max Score 10)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the company's global supply chain that are transported in 8 hours or less.
- Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally are awarded 1 point.
- Companies that report on the proportion of animals that are transported in 8 hours or less but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded 1 point.
- Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards, but do not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that are transported in 8 hours or less in line with these standards.

Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that are transported in 8 hours or less.

*Notes

1. For Questions 28-31, 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 32-34, 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.