

CONSULTATION ON 2020 BENCHMARK

JUNE/JULY 2020

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 eight benchmarks (for 2012-2019¹) with the 2020 Benchmark scheduled for publication in early 2021.

In preparation for the 2020 Benchmark, to be conducted in October and November 2020, BBFAW is inviting comments on the following issues:

- The scope of companies covered by the Benchmark.
- The weighting of the performance reporting and impact questions and introduction of an Impact Rating.
- Revisions to the evaluation criteria.
- The usefulness of the Benchmark and associated report.

KEY CHANGES

We are proposing the following changes to the 2020 Benchmark:

- 1) Replacing one company with its new parent company and assessing another company under a different parent company than previously, following the completion of recent acquisitions, and changing one company's ownership from Public to Private. The total number of companies covered by the Benchmark will remain at 150.
- 2) Keeping the same weightings across all sections but increasing the weighting of the 10 performance impact questions within the Performance Reporting and Impact section.
- 3) Modifying the rationale of two questions (adding permanent housing of dairy cattle to the examples of close confinement) and modifying the scope of two questions (relating to the exclusion or inclusion of finfish).
- 4) Modifying the scoring for one question (relating to welfare outcome measures).
- 5) Providing additional clarification of the scope of several questions (mostly relating to own-brand products).

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

The consultation will run from 26th June to 24th July 2020.

How should stakeholders provide feedback?

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

This year, we are also planning interactive webinars at 9am and 4pm BST on 9th July 2020 as an opportunity for companies to hear more about the proposed changes. The webinars will give companies the option to provide immediate feedback through polling and an opportunity to ask questions about the proposed changes to the 2020 Benchmark.

Please send your comments to, or request a call via the BBFAW Senior Programme Manager, Nathan Rhys Williams, secretariat@bbfaw.com.

Next steps

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

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

The ninth Benchmark Report will be published in early 2021.

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

Structure

This consultation document is structured in five parts as follows:

- Part I: Background
- Part II: Changes to Company Scope
- Part III: Change to Weighting of Performance Questions and Introduction of Impact Rating
- 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 2019 Benchmark

The eighth 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 2019, these companies were assessed on their approach to managing farm animal welfare, based on their publicly available information. The results, presented in the 2019 Benchmark report² published in April 2020, indicate that substantial progress is being made by companies to implement farm animal welfare into their business processes and strategy. With 30 companies having moved up at least one tier in the 2019 Benchmark, there are now 22 companies who are considered to have made farm animal welfare an integral part of their business strategy (corresponding to Tiers 1 and 2), and 70 companies who are implementing their policies and commitments on farm animal welfare (corresponding to Tiers 3 and 4).

The Benchmark data confirm that improved leadership and management practices for farm animal welfare are starting to become institutionalised. Of the 150 companies covered by the Benchmark, 88 (59%) now have explicit board or senior management oversight of farm animal welfare (compared to 43% in 2018), and 112 (75%) now have published formal improvement objectives for farm animal welfare (compared to 71% in 2018). These are significant changes from earlier Benchmarks; in the 2012 Benchmark, only 22% of companies reported on senior management oversight of farm animal welfare and only 26% had published formal improvement objectives for farm animal welfare.

Despite the year-on-year progress, there is still much to be done. Fifty-eight of the 150 companies appear in Tiers 5 and 6, indicating that these companies provide little or no information on their approach to farm animal welfare. In fact, 38 companies (25%) do not even publish a farm animal welfare policy. We clearly have much to do if we are to get to the point where farm animal welfare is being effectively managed by the food industry globally.

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

² Nicky Amos and Rory Sullivan (2020), *The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: 2019 Report* (BBFAW, London). <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

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

³ Elisa Tjärnström, Nicky Amos, Rory Sullivan and Darren Vanstone (2019), *How companies are using the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: BBFAW Company Survey 2019* (BBFAW, London) <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

Robert Black, Dr Rory Sullivan and Nicky Amos (2019), *How investors are using the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare Investor Survey 2019* (BBFAW, London) <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

Part II: Changes to Company Scope

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

For the 2020 Benchmark, we are proposing:

- Replacing one company with its new parent company following the completion of recent acquisition.
- Assessing one company under a different parent company than previously following the completion of recent acquisition.
- Changing one company's ownership from Public to Private.

In total, the 2020 Benchmark will cover 150 companies.

For the 2020 Benchmark, we are proposing to continue to assess 150 companies. There will be some changes to the companies covered by the Benchmark following changes to ownership as follows:

- **Dairy Farmers of America** (a cooperative) will be assessed in place of Dean Foods following its acquisition of the majority of the assets of Dean Foods in the wake of its bankruptcy.
- Tulip Ltd will be assessed as part of its new parent company, **JBS SA**, following its acquisition from Danish Crown AmbA.
- **Chuying Agro-Pastoral Group** has been de-listed and we have therefore changed its ownership category from Public to Private.

These changes mean that the 2020 Benchmark will now cover (see Appendix I):

- 89 public companies (91 in 2019)
- 42 private companies (41 in 2019)
- 15 cooperatives (14 in 2019)
- 4 joint stock/partnership owned companies.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Do you agree with the changes to the companies to be included in the 2020 Benchmark?
2. Are there specific companies or regions that you think should be considered for future Benchmark iterations?

Part III: Revisions to Weighting of Performance Questions and Introduction of Impact Rating

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- The weighting of the Performance Reporting and Impact section will remain at 35% in 2020. However, within this section, the weighting of the 10 questions relating to performance impact will again be adjusted upwards.
- To further drive an improvement in scores on the performance impact questions, we propose introducing a new "Impact Rating" in addition to the Tier ranking.

Revisions to the weighting within the Performance Reporting and Impact section

In 2018, the BBFAW Technical Working Group 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 was decided for the 2019 Benchmark to increase the proportion of the scores allocated to the performance impact questions (Q28-37) within the Performance Reporting and Impact section to 60% and to reduce the proportion of the scores allocated to performance reporting questions (Q20-27) to 40%. In practice, this change in score was partially realised and the weighting given to the performance impact questions (Q28-37) in the 2019 Benchmark was 56% and the performance reporting questions (Q20-27) 44%.

In the 2020 Benchmark, it is proposed to complete the increase in the proportion of the scores allocated to the performance impact questions (Q28-37) to 60% and the reduction in the proportion of the scores allocated to the performance reporting questions (Q20-27) to 40%. Appendix II presents the detail of the proposed changes to the scoring and weighting in the 2020 Benchmark.

Impact Rating

To further drive improvement in scores on the 10 performance impact questions, we propose introducing a new "Impact Rating". This will present the scores achieved across Q28-37 in a six-tier rating, labelled A-F, using the same percentage boundaries as the Benchmark Tiers 1-6.

Impact Rating	Percentage score achieved from Q28-37
A	>80%
B	62-80%
C	44-61%
D	27-43%
E	11-26%
F	<11%

It is proposed that individual companies' Impact Ratings will be published in the BBFAW report. Based on the 2019 Benchmark data, the number of companies within each Impact Rating Tier

would be as follows: 1 A-rated company; 5 B-rated companies; 6 C-rated companies; 8 D-rated companies; 11 E-rated companies and 119 F-rated companies.

The further increase in focus on the performance impact question does not reflect a diminution of the importance of the other sections of the Benchmark; conversely, the ability to disclose the data required for the performance impact questions requires companies to have effective management processes in place for farm animal welfare. The changes to the weighting within the Performance Reporting and Impact section will affect those companies which are already reporting on performance (companies within Tiers 1-4).

In line with our proposal to include four new questions in the 2019 Benchmark but to defer the scoring of these new questions for one year, we will be including the scoring for questions 5, 21, 24 and 35⁴ in companies' overall scores for the first time in the 2020 Benchmark. As a consequence, we anticipate that 16 companies are at risk of falling a Tier in the 2020 Benchmark.

We anticipate the proposed changes to the weighting of the questions within the Performance Reporting and Impact section will put a further 1 company at risk of falling a Tier in the 2020 Benchmark. All companies at risk of falling a Tier be contacted by the Secretariat in writing in June 2020. 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 2020 evaluations in October and November 2020.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

3. Do you agree with the proposal to adjust the weighting of the performance impact questions in 2020?
4. Do you have any specific comments you would like to share on how the criteria are weighted in the Benchmark?
5. Do you agree with the proposal to introduce an Impact Rating for companies?
6. Do you agree with the proposal to publish individual companies' Impact Ratings in the BBFAW 2020 Report?

⁴ These are:

- Q5. Policy on effective, species-specific environmental enrichment
- Q21. Reporting on provision of effective, species-specific environmental enrichment
- Q24. Reporting on ineffective pre-slaughter stunning
- Q35. Proportion of chicken from birds with improved welfare outcomes and slower growth potential

Part IV: Revisions to Benchmark Evaluation Criteria

The BBFAW Technical Working Group has reviewed the BBFAW assessment criteria following the 2019 evaluation and has proposed modifying the rationale of two questions, the scope of two questions and the scoring of one question. Beyond these proposals, there are no further substantive changes to the BBFAW assessment criteria this year although additional clarifications of the scope of several questions have been provided. These are detailed in Appendix III.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- Modifying the rationale of two questions (adding permanent housing of dairy cattle to the examples of close confinement).
- Modifying the scope of two questions (relating to exclusion or inclusion of finfish).
- Modifying the scoring for one question (relating to welfare outcome measures).
- Providing additional clarification of the scope of several questions (mostly relating to own-brand products).

Proposed question modifications

It is proposed that permanent housing of dairy cows is listed as an example of close confinement in the rationale for the questions on close confinement in the Management Commitment and Policy section (Q4) and the Performance Reporting and Impact section (Q20). This proposed inclusion reflects the fact that significant farm animal welfare concerns result from the permanent housing of dairy cattle. Tethering is already included in the examples of close confinement and there are leading companies in the benchmark which already have policies prohibiting the permanent housing of dairy cows.

It is proposed that finfish are excluded from the question relating to the reporting of the proportion of animals in a company's global supply chain that is ineffectively stunned (Q24) and that finfish are included in the question relating to the reporting of the proportion of animals in a company's global supply chain that is pre-slaughter stunned (Q36). The exclusion of finfish from Q24 reflects the difficulty in assessing successful stunning due to the high throughput and small size of some fish species and their inclusion in Q36 reflects the increasing availability of effective pre-slaughter stunning equipment for finfish.

It is proposed that the scoring for the question relating to reporting on welfare outcome measures (Q26) be modified to award the greatest points available (5 points) to companies reporting on multiple welfare outcome measures for each relevant species, covering all relevant geographies. Previously, the greatest number of points were awarded to companies reporting fully on at least one welfare outcome measure per species, covering all relevant species and geographies. This proposed change reflects the increasing proportion of companies reporting welfare outcome measures (16% of assessed companies in 2019, up from 3% in 2014).

Additional clarifications of the scope of several questions have been proposed this year, as detailed in Appendix III (Q5, 7, 9, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 36 and 37). These relate mostly to the inclusion or exclusion of own-brand products within the scope of questions, or they consist of additional examples provided within the question rationale. These changes have been proposed purely to aid comprehension of questions and provide clarity; they do not substantively change the assessment of questions.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

7. Do you agree with the proposal to modify the rationale of Q4 and Q20 on close confinement?
8. Do you agree with the proposals to change the scope of Q24 to exclude finfish and Q36 to include finfish?
9. Do you agree with the proposal to modify the scoring of Q26 on welfare outcome measures?
10. Are there any comments you would like to make regarding the additional clarifications provided on Q5, 7, 9, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 36 and 37?
11. 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

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

Appendix I: Proposed scope of companies for 2020 BBFAW Benchmark

Note: Proposed changes are highlighted in red.

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

27.	ICA Gruppen AB	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Sweden
28.	IKEA (Inter IKEA Group)	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Sweden
29.	J Sainsbury PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
30.	Jeronimo Martins	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Portugal
31.	(The) Kroger Company	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
32.	Les Mousquetaires	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
33.	Lianhua Supermarket Holdings Co	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	PRC
34.	Lidl Stiftung & Co KG	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
35.	Loblaw Companies Ltd	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Canada
36.	Marks & Spencer PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
37.	Mercadona SA	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Spain
38.	Metro AG	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
39.	Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland
40.	Publix Super Markets Inc	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
41.	Rewe Group	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
42.	Schwarz Unternehmens Treuhand KG/Kaufland	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
43.	Seven & i Holdings	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Japan
44.	Sysco Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
45.	Target Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
46.	Tesco PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
47.	UNFI	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
48.	Waitrose	Partnership	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
49.	Walmart Inc/Asda	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
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/Ting Hsin International Group	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 Group	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
69.	Gategroup Holding AG	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Switzerland
70.	Greggs PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
71.	Habib's	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	Brazil
72.	Inspire Brands Inc	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
73.	JAB Holding Company	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	Luxembourg
74.	JD Wetherspoon PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
75.	McDonald's Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
76.	Mitchells & Butlers PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
77.	Papa John's Pizza	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
78.	Restaurant Brands International	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Canada
79.	Sodexo	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
80.	SSP Group Limited	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Sweden
81.	Starbucks Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
82.	Subway/Doctor's Associates Inc	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
83.	The Cheesecake Factory	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
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 Limited	Private	3570: Food Producer	China
99.	Chuying Agro-Pastoral Group	Private Public	3570: Food Producer	China
100	ConAgra	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
101	Cooke Seafood Inc	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
102	Cooperativa Central Aurora Alimentos	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
103	Cooperl Arc Atlantique	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
104	Cranswick PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
105	Dairy Farmers of America	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	USA
106	Danish Crown AmbA/ Tulip	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
	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	Groupe Lactalis	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
112	Gruppo Veronesi	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
113	Hershey Co	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
114	Hilton Food Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
115	Hormel Foods Corporation	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
116	Industrias Bachoco	Public	3570: Food Producer	Mexico
117	JBS SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
118	Kerry Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	Ireland
119	KraftHeinz	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
120	LDC Groupe	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
121	Maple Leaf Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	Canada
122	Marfrig Global Foods SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
123	Maruha Nichiro	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
124	Mars Inc	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
125	Meiji Holdings	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
126	Minerva Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
127	Mondelez International	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
128	Mowi ASA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Norway
129	Müller Group AG	Private	3570: Food Producer	Germany
130	Nestlé SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Switzerland
131	New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	PRC
132	Nippon Ham	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
133	Noble Foods	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
134	OSI Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
135	Perdue Farms	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
136	Plukon Food Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
137	Premier Foods PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
138	Royal FrieslandCampina	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
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 2020

Pillar	BBFAW 2020		BBFAW 2019	
	No. of Points	Weighting	No. of Points	Weighting
Management Commitment and Policy	75	26%	70	26%
- Q5. Commitment to provide species-specific environmental enrichment	5		(Score not included in overall score in year 1)	
Governance and Management	70	28%	70	28%
Leadership and Innovation	20	11%	20	11%
Performance Reporting and Impact	95	35%	80	35%
<i>Q20-27. Performance Reporting questions combined</i>	45	40% of the Performance Reporting and Impact section	45	<i>44% of the Performance Reporting and Impact section</i>
- Q21. Reporting on proportion of animals provided with enriched environments	5		(Score not included in overall score in year 1)	
- Q24. Reporting on proportion of animals ineffectively stunned	5		(Score not included in overall score in year 1)	
- Q26. Reporting on welfare outcome measures	5		5	
<i>Q28-37. Performance Impact questions combined</i>	50	60% of the Performance Reporting and Impact section	50	<i>56% of the Performance Reporting and Impact section</i>
- Q35. Proportion of chickens from strains with slower growth potential	Max Score 5*		(Score not included in overall score in year 1)	
Total Maximum Score/Weighting	240	100%	240	100%

*For Questions 28-35, 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 points per question.

Appendix III: Proposed 2020 Benchmark Evaluation Criteria

Note: Proposed changes are highlighted in red.

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 publish a farm animal welfare policy or statement, even if that does not explain why farm animal welfare is a relevant issue for the business, are awarded the maximum points. • 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 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. • The inclusion of farm animal welfare as an explicit subject in a Materiality Matrix, even if considered to be a low priority, is sufficient for points to be awarded for this question. 	
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)	
Explanatory Notes:	

- 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.
- Policies issued by company subsidiaries are not considered as overarching policies, and companies with such policies but no overarching (i.e. at the parent company level) policy are therefore not awarded points for this question. These policies are considered when deciding whether to award points for Questions 1 and 4-11.
- Policies focused on specific farm animal welfare issues (e.g. antibiotics where farm animal welfare is mentioned in passing) are not considered as overarching policies. Companies with such policies but no overarching policy on farm animal welfare are therefore not awarded points for this question. These policies are considered when deciding whether to award points for Questions 1 and 4-11.
- 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:
 - 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?

Understanding the scope of a policy is important to understand the breadth of a company's commitment to action on farm animal welfare.

3a. Geographic scope

	Geographic scope not specified	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified geographies	2
	Scope is universal across all geographies	5

3b. Species scope

	Species scope not specified	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified species	2
	Scope is universal across all relevant species	5

3c. Product scope

	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)

Explanatory Notes:

- 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. We ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks.
- For companies involved in or using the products from finfish aquaculture, we assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise. If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only 3 points are awarded for the species-part of the question.
- We define finfish aquaculture as the breeding, rearing and harvesting of aquatic vertebrates (i.e. cold blooded animals with a bony or cartilaginous skeleton and a segmented spinal column) in all types of water 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 or feedlots), permanent housing for dairy cows, farrowing crates, single penning, battery cages, tethering, veal crates, force feeding and, for finfish, high stocking densities and close confinement of solitary finfish species)?

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.

No stated position.	0
The company makes a partial commitment to the avoidance of confinement 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 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)	

Explanatory Notes:

- 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.

<p>Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy on close confinement are, therefore, awarded zero points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits close confinement 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 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 or 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. • For the purposes of this question, sow stall free refers to the avoidance of confinement for individual sows during the gestation (pregnancy) period (i.e. it does not cover confinement for insemination and observation, or lactation). Within this definition, and in line with EU legislation, confinement of sows up to the first four weeks of pregnancy is permitted. Companies that do not permit any confinement or explicitly limited confinement to a maximum of the first four weeks of pregnancy are awarded a score of 3 or 5 points depending on the scope of the commitment.
--

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

Companies are expected to provide animals with stimulating and complex environments that enable species-specific behaviours. Effective environmental modifications allow for the performance of strongly motivated species-specific behaviours and lead to the expression of a more complex behavioural repertoire. Examples include (but are not limited to) brushes for 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; outdoor range enhancement, such as artificial or natural shelter; (artificial) plants, floor substrates and structures for fish. Animals with outdoor access should not be excluded from enrichment (provided outdoors or indoors). The BBFAW does not score outdoor access per se as enrichment.

No stated position.	0
The company makes a partial commitment to providing effective, species-specific 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 effective, species-specific enriched environments and the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
The company makes a universal commitment to providing effective, species-specific 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 effective, 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.
- Chains for pigs are not classed as effective enrichment.
- 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 or products) are awarded a score of 1 point.
- Companies that simply mention they provide enrichment, but without context or a description of the enrichment (or for which species) receive minimal points and a comment that in order to keep receiving such points they need to clarify their statements further.

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?

Both cloning and genetic engineering raise serious animal welfare concerns⁵. In farmed fish species this includes heat treatment of eggs to induce triploidy, which renders fish sterile.

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)	

Explanatory Notes:

- 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 progeny or descendants. The reasons are (a)

⁵ 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.bbfa.com/media/1083/briefing-no6_cloning-and-genetic-engineering-of-farm-animals.pdf

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 or products) are awarded a score of 1 point.
- Companies that only refer to a specific genetic engineering technique (e.g. somatic cell nuclear transfer cloning), only receive 1 or 3 points depending on the scope of their commitment.
- 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. Essential oils and organic acids are not classed as growth promoters, although they are often used to support gut health (in pigs and poultry) in the absence of antibiotic growth promoters.

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 issues⁶, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they complied with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.
- Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits the use of growth hormones is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly states position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances).
- Companies that state that they avoid the use of antibiotics as preventative measures but do not explicitly prohibit their use as growth promoters are not awarded points for this question.
- Companies with a 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 13 if the target/objective has a clear link to farm animal welfare).
- Companies that state compliance with legislation or guidance on eliminating (human) medically important antibiotics used as growth promoters, are not awarded points as we are looking for a clear position on the avoidance of all growth promoting substances.
- 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?

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 rapidly⁷. Companies are expected to commit to reducing the levels of antibiotics they administer routinely and to develop

⁶ 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.

⁷ See, further, Vicky Bond and Jemima Jewell (2014), The Impacts of Antibiotic Use in Animals on Human Health and Animal Welfare. BBFAW Investor Briefing No. 17 (BBFAW, London).

<http://www.bbfa.com/media/1070/briefing-17-impacts-of-antibiotic-use-in-animals-on-human-health-and-animal-welfare.pdf>

<i>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. • 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 reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use, companies are not awarded any points. The rationale for this is because a) this question is looking for a clear commitment from the company to the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use, b) the question applies to all antibiotics (i.e. not just antibiotics that are critical to human health). 	

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 or tipping, 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/tipping, castration of beef cattle with knives, branding with hot irons, dehorning of dairy cattle with hot irons, castration and tail docking of pigs, sheep and calves (surgical, rubber rings or clamping), 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 or 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 be awarded points, but only if this is clarified by a clear commitment to the avoidance of surgical castration with a clear scope for this commitment. 	

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 controlled atmosphere stunning 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 or 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?

When being transported, animals can experience hunger, thirst, discomfort, pain, frustration, fear and distress, as well as physical welfare problems including injury, disease, and, in the worst cases, death. For these reasons, transport of live animals should be minimised wherever possible and journeys should be kept as short as possible. Specifically, any transport of a live animal that exceeds 8 hours, from loading to unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. In the case of farmed fish, handling practices and water quality conditions, particularly oxygenation, can have a significant impact on welfare.

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)	

Explanatory Notes:

- 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 or 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?

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.

12a. Management responsibility

No clearly defined management responsibility.	0
The company has published details of the management position with responsibility for farm animal welfare on a day-to-day basis.	5

12b. Board or senior management responsibility

No clearly defined board or senior management responsibility	0
The company has published details of how the board or senior management oversees the implementation of the company's farm animal welfare policy.	5

(Max score 10)

Explanatory Notes:

- 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 sub-question, we recognise that companies may assign responsibility to a named senior person or that farm animal welfare may form part of the remit of a

wider sustainability, CSR or sourcing committee. Therefore, 5 points are awarded if the company provided a clear account of board or senior management oversight.

- For the purposes of scoring, the emphasis is on the management of farm animal welfare. General information on the management or oversight of CSR or sustainability is only credited if it is clear that this includes farm animal welfare.

Q13. Has the company set objectives and targets for the management of farm animal welfare?

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.

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)	

Explanatory Notes:

- 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 objectives and 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 objectives and targets relating to 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).
- Companies with multiple objectives and targets, but without further information on how these are to be achieved, are awarded 5 points.
- 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 time frame, by indicating the financial and other resources required.

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

Companies should explain how they have performed against their policy commitments, and against their objectives and targets.

The company does not report on how it has performed against its objectives and targets.	0
The company reports on how it has performed against its objectives and targets.	5
(Max score 5)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This 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.
- Companies are awarded points if they provide evidence of having effective systems in place for monitoring of performance against the objectives and targets.

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>		
<i>15a. Employee training</i>		
	No information provided on employee training in farm animal welfare.	0
	The company provides specific training to employees in farm animal welfare.	5
<i>15b. Actions taken in the event of non-compliance</i>		
	The company provides no information on the actions to be taken in the event of non-compliance with the farm animal welfare policy.	0
	The company describes the actions it takes in the event of non-compliance with its farm animal welfare policy.	5
(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 addresses farm animal welfare-related issues. • The training question does not address the quality of the training provided, the manner in which skills or competencies are assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provided. • On internal controls, companies are only awarded 5 points if they explicitly discuss the actions that they take in relation to employee and/or supplier non-compliance with their farm animal welfare policy, e.g. when audit failures are identified. Descriptions of internal controls in relation to CSR or product quality-related policies are scored zero for this sub-question unless it is clear that these policies and processes also cover farm animal welfare. 		

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

<i>16b. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain via monitoring and auditing?</i>		
	No information provided on how supplier compliance with contract conditions is monitored.	0
	The company specifies farm animal welfare as part of supplier auditing programme.	5
<i>16c. Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain via education and support?</i>		
	No information provided on 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)		

Explanatory Notes:

- 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?

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.

This question applies to all own-brand products.

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: Assured British Meat Scheme; Aquaculture Standards Council (ASC); BEIC Lion Quality; Best Aquaculture Practice (BAP); BFC Certification de Conformité de Produits; Global Standards; FMI Animal Welfare Standards; GLOBALG.A.P.; North American Meat Institute; Red Tractor Farm Assurance Schemes; Viande de Porc Française. • Farming systems that provide for behavioural freedom without compromising health can be described as having higher welfare potential. Whilst it is essential to set high standards 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: Animal Welfare Approved; Better Animal Welfare (Denmark); Beter Leven; Certified Humane; European Organic Certification; Global Animal Partnership (GAP 5-Step); KRAV; Neuland; Soil Association Organic; RSPCA Assured; Label Rouge (for certain species, also note that Label Rouge pork is not systematically higher welfare, except if "fermier"). • 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?	
<i>Farm animal welfare is a collective issue for the food industry as well as being an individual issue for each company in the industry. Making progress and raising standards across the industry requires individual companies to support research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare, to share their knowledge and expertise with their suppliers and with their industry peers, to play a supportive role in public policy debates around farm animal welfare, and to support industry and stakeholder initiatives directed at improving farm animal welfare.</i>	
<i>18a. Involvement in research and development</i>	
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
<i>18b. Involvement in industry or other initiatives</i>		
	No evidence of active company involvement in industry or other initiatives directed at improving farm animal welfare.	0
	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)		
<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • Regarding research, points are only awarded for recent, updated information. If similar information appears to be repeated year on year, companies receive a comment prompting for an update in order to keep receiving points in future Benchmarks. 		

Q19. Does the company promote higher farm animal welfare to consumers through education and/or awareness-raising activities?	
<i>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.</i>	
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 consumer-facing videos on farm welfare issues are awarded five points, unless it was clear that these are linked to separate consumer engagement programmes or themes.
- Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to promote higher animal welfare to consumers.
- Social media channels are not separately reviewed, so companies have to link to these channels from their webpages in order to receive points (e.g. for YouTube videos).
-

Performance Reporting and Impact	
Q20. Does the company report on the proportion of animals (or volume of fresh or frozen animal products and ingredients) for own-brand products in its global supply chain that is free from close confinement (i.e. those in barn, free range, indoor group housed, outdoor bred/reared)?	
<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 or feedlots), permanent housing for dairy cows, tethered systems, close confinement of solitary finfish species). This question applies to all own-brand products.</i>	
No reporting on the proportion of animals free from confinement	0
The company reports on the proportion of animals free from confinement, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
The company reports fully on the proportion of animals free from confinement, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This question 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 	

<p>affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being free from close confinement are not awarded points unless they demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...'). 	
---	--

Q21. Does the company report on the proportion of animals for own-brand products in its global supply chain that is provided with effective species-specific enriched environments?

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) brushes for dairy cows; manipulable materials such as straw for pigs; pecking and dustbathing substrates, and perches for chickens; bathing water for ducks. This question applies to all own-brand products.

No reporting on the proportion of animals provided with effective, species-specific enriched environments.	0
The company reports on the proportion of animals provided with effective, species-specific 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 with effective, species-specific enriched environments across 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 provided with effective, species-specific environmental enrichment.
- Chains for pigs are not classed as effective 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. Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being provided with environmental enrichment are not awarded points unless they demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').
- Companies that just mention that they provide enrichment to a proportion of their animals, but without context or a description of the enrichment (or for which species) receive partial points and a comment that in order to keep receiving such points they should clarify their statements further.

Q22. Does the company report on the proportion of animals for own-brand products 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/tipping, 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. This question applies to all own-brand products.</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 they demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...'). 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 (including finfish) for own-brand products in its global supply chain that is subject to pre-slaughter stunning?	
<i>In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the slaughter of animals (or the rendering of fish insensible) in their supply chains. It is essential to render an animal unconscious before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. This question applies to all own-brand products.</i>	
No reporting on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning.	0
The company reports on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or own-brand products.	3
The company reports fully on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
(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 they demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').

Q24. Does the company report on the proportion of animals (excluding finfish) for own-brand products 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 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 (excluding finfish) in their supply chains as well as the attentiveness of operators to identify when a back-up stun or a repeat stun is required. This question applies to all own-brand products.

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:

- 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 they demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').

Q25. Does the company report on the average, typical or maximum permitted live transport times for the animals in its global supply chain?

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. This question applies to all own-brand products.

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 own-brand products.	3
The company reports fully on the live transport times for animals, covering all relevant geographies, species and own-brand products.	5
(Max Score 5)	

Explanatory Notes:

- 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 they demonstrate that these statements are supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...'). Companies that report on measures taken to improve 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. There is an increasing focus on positive outcome measures (e.g. active and play behaviour). This question applies to all own-brand products.

WOMs might include for example:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all species: mortality rates • For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter • For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate • For pigs: lameness, tail bites and other lesions • For broiler chickens: gait score, footpad dermatitis, hockburn, breast blisters • For beef cattle: body condition, lameness • For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition • For fish: fin and body damage • For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort • For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, socialising • For transportation: injuries, fatigue, road traffic incidents, mortality (dead-on-arrival/DOA) • 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 geographies, species or own-brand products.	1
The company fully reports on one welfare outcome measure per relevant species, covering all relevant geographies and own-brand products.	3
The company fully reports on multiple welfare outcome measure for each relevant species, covering all relevant geographies 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 welfare outcome measures such as: • Mortality rates (as an indicator of potential pain, suffering and suboptimal performance), for fish: survival rates • Bone breakages (as an indicator of pain, suffering, suboptimal performance, and poor house design) • Lameness (as an indicator of potential pain, behavioural restriction and suboptimal environmental and housing conditions) • Body marks/injuries (as an indicator of aggressive fight damage, especially during mixing or competition at feeding, or from sexual behaviours) • Body condition (as an indicator of good feed management, or competition at feeding) • Cleanliness (as an indicator of good environmental control, thermal comfort) • Positive flock or herd behaviour (as an indicator of a varied stimulating environment, good management and suitable breed to production system). • Negative flock or herd behavior, such as injurious feather pecking or tail biting in pigs (as a signpost of a barren non-stimulating environment, poor environmental control, low space allowance, feed and health problems) • 'Relevant' means all species that are in the company's supply chain. • 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). • Scores are awarded for some health indicators (e.g. somatic cell count and mastitis for dairy cows), although strictly speaking these are not regarded as WOMs. However, points are not awarded for production measures (e.g. egg output). • Similarly, scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm animal welfare standards, 	

but do not report on the welfare outcomes resulting from the implementation of these standards.

- Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.

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). This question applies to all own-brand products.

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, geographies or own-brand products, 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) but this is limited to certain species, geographies or own-brand products, 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 and own-brand products, 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 own-brand products, and it provides an explanation of progress or trend in performance.	10
(Max Score 10)	

Explanatory Notes:

- 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, and environmental enrichment, 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).
- The purpose of this question is to further encourage companies to continuously report on progress against their objectives and targets, and to provide a narrative on current challenges and opportunities that aid or hinder achievement of these objectives and targets.
- 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.
- 'Relevant' means all species that are in the company's supply chain.

- We do not award points if the company uses terms such as 'improved' or 'decreased' but does not provide a precise definition (e.g. a number, a rate) for these terms.
- We expect companies to continue reporting when specific targets or objectives have been reached (e.g. are at 100%) to ensure that their performance is maintained at 100% and that this performance is continually monitored (e.g. a company could report that they only use 100% cage free eggs, but we still expect year-on-year reporting, and an explanation that the performance remains at 100%).

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?

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 is from cage-free hens. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of shell eggs or eggs as ingredients that is sourced from laying hens that are cage-free but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.

0% of laying hens are cage-free, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of laying hens is cage-free	0.5
26 – 50% of laying hens is cage-free	1.5
51 – 75% of laying hens is cage-free	2.5
76 – 99% of laying hens is cage-free	3.5
100% of laying hens is cage-free	5
(Max Score 5*)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products.
- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of shell eggs or eggs as ingredients in the company's global supply chain that was sourced from laying hens that are 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 minimal points.
- 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 minimal points.
- Similarly, if the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.
- 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 (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').
- In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company, with operations in three countries, reports that 14% its laying hens in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C were cage

free but does not provide any information on the proportion of its laying hens that is in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).

- We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain that this data represents (i.e., it should not be necessary for the assessor to have to calculate the data in order to arrive at a percentage of the global supply chain).

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?

Companies making public commitments to source sow-stall-free or gestation-crate-free pork should report on the proportion of sows that are free from stalls. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of pork that is sow stall-free but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.

0% of sows is free from sow stalls, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of sows is free from sow stalls	0.5
26 – 50% of sows is free from sow stalls	1.5
51 – 75% of sows is free from sow stalls	2.5
76 – 99% of sows is free from sow stalls	3.5
100% of sows is free from sow stalls	5
(Max Score 5*)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.
- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of sows in the company's global supply chain that is free from sow stalls.
- For the purposes of this question, sow-stall-free refers to the avoidance of confinement for individual sows during the gestation (pregnancy) period (i.e. it does not cover confinement for insemination and observation, or lactation). Within this definition, and in line with EU legislation, confinement of sows up to the first four weeks of pregnancy is permitted.
- 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 minimal points.
- 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 minimal points.
- Similarly, if the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.
- 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 (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').
- In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported

is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of sows in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C were free from sow stalls but did not provide any information on the proportion of its sows that was in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).

- We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without having to do any calculations.

Q30. What proportion of fresh/frozen milk or milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is sourced from cows that are free from tethering?

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

0% of dairy cows is free from tethering, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of dairy cows is free from tethering	0.5
26 – 50% of dairy cows is free from tethering	1.5
51 – 75% of dairy cows is free from tethering	2.5
76 – 99% of dairy cows is free from tethering	3.5
100% of dairy cows is free from tethering	5
(Max Score 5*)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy-based products.
- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of milk or milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from dairy cows that are 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 minimal points.
- 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 minimal points.
- Similarly, if the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.
- 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 (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').
- In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its dairy cows in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C were free

from tethering but did not provide any information on the proportion of its dairy cows that was in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).

- We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without having to do any calculations.

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 minimal points. 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 is reared at lower stocking densities, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities	0.5
26 – 50% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities	1.5
51 – 75% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities	2.5
76 – 99% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities	3.5
100% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities	5
(Max Score 5*)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products.
- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler meat in the company's global supply chain that was sourced from broiler chickens that are 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 minimal points.
- Companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded minimal points.
- Similarly, if the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.
- 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 (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').
- In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported

is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in 3 countries reported that 14% of its broiler chickens in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C were reared at lower stocking densities but did not provide any information on the proportion of its broiler chickens that was in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).

- We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.

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 minimal points. 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	0.5
26 – 50% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping	1.5
51 – 75% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping	2.5
76 – 99% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping	3.5
100% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping	5
(Max Score 5*)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products.
- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of shell eggs or eggs as ingredients in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from laying hens that are 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 minimal points.
- 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 minimal points.
- Similarly, if the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.
- 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 (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').
- In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its laying hens in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C was free

from beak trimming but did not provide any information on the proportion of its laying hens that were in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).

- We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations

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 minimal points. 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	0.5
26 – 50% of pigs is free from tail docking	1.5
51 – 75% of pigs is free from tail docking	2.5
76 – 99% of pigs is free from tail docking	3.5
100% of pigs is free from tail docking	5
(Max Score 5*)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.
- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from pigs that are 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 minimal points.
- 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 minimal points.
- 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. Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.
- 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 (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').
- In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its pigs in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C was free from tail docking but did not provide any information on the proportion of its pigs that were in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).

- We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain this data represented, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations

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 minimal points. 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	0.5
26 – 50% of dairy cows is free from tail docking	1.5
51 – 75% of dairy cows is free from tail docking	2.5
76 – 99% of dairy cows is free from tail docking	3.5
100% of dairy cows is free from tail docking	5

(Max Score 5*)

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products.
- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of fresh/frozen milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that is sourced from dairy cows that are 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 minimal points.
- 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 minimal points.
- Similarly, if the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.
- 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 (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').
- In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in 3 countries reported that 14% of its cows in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C were free from tail docking but did not provide any information on the proportion of its cows that was in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).

- We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations

Q35. What proportion of the company's supply of chicken meat (fresh/frozen/processed and ingredient) comes from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a 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. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of chicken meat that is sourced from slower growing strains but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.

0% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential, or no reported information.	0
1 – 25% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	0.5
26 – 50% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	1.5
51 – 75% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	2.5
76 – 99% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	3.5
100% of products is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	5
(Max Score 5*)	

Explanatory Notes:

- This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products.
- This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of chicken meat in the company's global supply chain that is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a 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 minimal points.
- Companies that report on the proportion of chicken meat that is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are awarded minimal points.
- Similarly, if the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.
- 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 improved welfare outcomes and a 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 improved welfare outcomes and a 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 improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').

- Where companies report on their own slower growing breeds, they needed to provide a clear description of how the company's breed standard(s) compare to other slower growing breeds.
- In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its bird strains in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C were from slower growing strains but did not provide any information on the proportion of strains that was in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).
- We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by this data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.

Q36. What proportion of animals (including finfish) for own-brand and other products in the company's global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?

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 minimal points. This question applies to all products (own-brand and other).

0% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned	0.5
26 – 50% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned	1.5
51 – 75% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned	2.5
76 – 99% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned	3.5
100% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned	5
(Max Score 5*)	

Explanatory Notes:

- 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 minimal points.
- 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 minimal points.
- Similarly, if the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.
- 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 (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').
- In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its animals in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C were pre-slaughter stunned but did not provide any information on the proportion of the animals that was in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).
- We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.

Q37. What proportion of animals (excluding finfish) for own-brand and other products 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 of the proportion of animals that have been transported in 8 hours or less but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. 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. This question applies to all products (own-brand and other).

0% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less, or no reported information	0
1 – 25% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less	0.5
26 – 50% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less	1.5
51 – 75% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less	2.5
76 – 99% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less	3.5
100% of animals is transported in 8 hours or less	5
(Max Score 5*)	

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 minimal points.

- 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 minimal points.
- Similarly, if the scope of reported figures is unclear, companies are awarded minimal points.
- 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 (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').
- In situations where companies report performance data for different regions, countries or products but do not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported is applied (e.g. if a company with operations in three countries reported that 14% of its animals in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C were transported for 8 hours or less, but did not provide any information on the proportion of the animals that was in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).
- We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.

*Notes

1. For Questions 28-35, 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 points per question.

2. For Questions 36-37, 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 points per question.