

# Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare 2020 Assessment Criteria



Management Commitment and Policy		
<b>Question 1.</b>	<b>Does the company acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question was looking for an acknowledgement by the parent company that farm animal welfare is a business issue.</li> <li>Companies that published a farm animal welfare policy or statement, even if that did not explain why farm animal welfare was a relevant issue for the business, were awarded the maximum points.</li> <li>Companies that acknowledged farm animal welfare as a business issue and/or set out the reasons why farm animal might be a business issue (e.g. because of public or customer concerns, security and sustainability of supply, cost) were awarded the maximum points.</li> <li>The score did not take account of the importance assigned by companies to farm animal welfare (e.g. relative to other corporate responsibility issues). The importance assigned by individual companies to farm animal welfare depends on factors such as the nature of their business, their existing management practices, the other business risks and priorities they need to manage, and their perceptions of customer and stakeholder pressure for action.</li> <li>The inclusion of farm animal welfare as an explicit subject in a Materiality Matrix, even if considered to be a low priority, was sufficient for points to be awarded for this question.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 2.</b>	<b>Does the company publish an overarching corporate farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment did not differentiate between companies that published stand-alone farm animal welfare policies and companies that</li> </ul>	

	<p>incorporated farm animal welfare into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies that published a clear statement of commitment to farm animal welfare and/or farm animal welfare-related principles that provided a starting point for the company's accountability to its stakeholders were awarded a score of 5 points.</li> <li>• Policies issued by company subsidiaries were not considered as overarching policies, and companies with such policies but no overarching (i.e. at the parent company level) policy were therefore not awarded points for this question. These policies were considered when deciding whether to award points for Questions 1 and 4-11.</li> <li>• Policies focused on specific farm animal welfare issues (e.g. antibiotics where farm animal welfare is mentioned in passing) were not considered as overarching policies. Companies with such policies but no overarching policy on farm animal welfare were therefore not awarded points for this question. These policies were considered when deciding whether to award points for Questions 1 and 4-11.</li> <li>• Companies that supplemented these commitments or principles with details of how these were to be implemented were awarded a score of 10 points. To score maximum points, company farm animal welfare policies needed to include most/all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— A clear statement of the reasons why farm animal welfare was important to the business (including both the business case and the ethical case for action)</li> <li>— A commitment to compliance with relevant legislation</li> <li>— A clear position regarding expected standards of farm animal welfare</li> <li>— A description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy was effectively implemented (e.g. senior management oversight, commitments to continuous improvement, performance monitoring, corrective action if the policy was not being effectively implemented)</li> <li>— A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 3.</b>	<b>Does the policy statement provide a clear explanation of scope?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Understanding the scope of a policy is important to understand the breadth of a company's commitment to action on farm animal welfare.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
<i>3a. Geographic scope</i>		
	Geographic scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified geographies.	2
	Scope is universal across all geographies.	5
<i>3b. Species scope</i>		
	Species scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified species.	2
	Scope is universal across all relevant species.	5
<i>3c. Product scope</i>		
	Product scope is not specified.	0

	Scope is limited to own-brand products or ingredients (i.e. the policy does not apply to imported or other brand products).	2
	Scope is universal across own brand, imported and other brand products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 15)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was only scored if marks had been awarded for Question 2, i.e. when the company had a published farm animal welfare policy.</li> <li>• The sub-questions on geography, species and products were scored separately (i.e. companies could score up to 5 points in each of the three sub-questions, and the scores for each sub-question did not influence the scores awarded for the other sub-questions).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market, across species and across product ranges. Companies were given credit if they clearly specified the limits to the application of their farm animal welfare policies.</li> <li>• In some cases, companies used terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we took this to mean that the policy had universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies received 5 points for these sub-questions. We asked companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks.</li> <li>• For companies involved in or using the products from finfish aquaculture, we did not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applied to finfish (i.e. the policy had universal application) unless the company stated otherwise, or had a separate policy that applied to finfish. If it was unclear whether finfish were included, only 3 points were awarded for the species-part of the question.</li> <li>• We defined finfish aquaculture as the breeding, rearing and harvesting of aquatic vertebrates (i.e. cold blooded animals with a bony or cartilaginous skeleton and a segmented spinal column) in all types of water environment enclosures, including ponds, rivers, lakes and the ocean.</li> <li>• We did not consider policies for finfish that focused on conservation or sustainable fishing, unless there was an explicit reference to animal welfare within these.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 4.</b>	<b>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, e.g. turbot)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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 or 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
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was looking for a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation (e.g. with EU Directives referring to egg-laying hens and sow stalls) was not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of close confinement. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all close confinement practices, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that stated that they complied with legislation but did not have a formal policy on close confinement were, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits close confinement was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of close confinement).</li> <li>• Companies that made a commitment to the avoidance of close confinement but were not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species, or products) were awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that made a commitment to the avoidance of close confinement for a specific product or product range (e.g. using only free-range eggs) were awarded a score of 1 point (in contrast to a clear scope such as a cage-free policy for all own-brand products, for which 3 points were awarded).</li> <li>• For the purposes of this question, sow-stall-free referred 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.</li> <li>• Companies that did not permit any confinement or explicitly limited confinement to a maximum of the first four weeks of pregnancy were awarded a score of 3 or 5 points depending on the scope of their commitment.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 5.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the provision of effective species-specific environmental enrichment?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies are expected to provide animals with stimulating and complex environments that enable species-specific behaviours. Effective environmental modifications allow for the performance of strongly motivated species-specific behaviours and lead to the expression of a more complex behavioural repertoire. Examples include (but are not limited to) brushes for cattle; manipulable materials such as straw for pigs; pecking and dustbathing substrates, and perches for chickens; bathing water for ducks; outdoor range enhancement, such as artificial or natural shelter; (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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question was looking for a clear position on the provision of effective species-specific environmental enrichment.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Chains for pigs were not classed as effective enrichment.</li> <li>Simply stating compliance with legislation was 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 stated that they comply with legislation but did not have a formal policy were, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies environmental enrichment was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to provide environmental enrichment was 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).</li> <li>Companies that made a commitment to the provision of species-specific environmental enrichment but were not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) were awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>Companies that simply mentioned they provided enrichment, but without context or a description of the enrichment (or for which species) received a score of 1 point and a comment that in order to keep receiving such points they would need to clarify their statements further.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 6.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of products from farm animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and/or their progeny or descendants throughout its products?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Both cloning and genetic engineering raise serious animal welfare concerns <sup>1</sup> . In farmed fish species this includes heat treatment of eggs to induce triploidy, which renders fish sterile.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has made 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 has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning and the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to avoidance of animals subject to genetic engineering or cloning across all	5

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

<b>Question 7.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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 for the purpose of this question, although they are often used to support gut health (in pigs and poultry) in the absence of antibiotic growth promoters.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0

	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances, but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances, but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was looking for a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances which are typically used to increase the muscle (meat) or milk production of animals farmed for food. Examples include the hormone BST used to increase milk production (in dairy cattle), hormone feed additives in pig production (e.g. ractopamine) and low dose antibiotics.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation was not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues<sup>ii</sup>, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that stated that they complied with legislation but did not have a formal policy were, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits the use of growth hormones was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position unless the commitment to avoidance was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of growth promoting substances).</li> <li>• Companies that stated that they avoided the use of antibiotics as preventative measures but did not explicitly prohibit their use as growth promoters were not awarded points for this question.</li> <li>• Companies with a stated target to reduce the level of growth promoting substances (rather than avoidance) were not awarded points for this question (although they may have scored points for Question 13 if the target/objective had a clear link to farm animal welfare).</li> <li>• Companies that stated compliance with legislation or guidance on eliminating (human) medically important antibiotics used as growth promoters, were not awarded points as we are looking for a clear position on the avoidance of all growth promoting substances.</li> <li>• In the absence of a clear position on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, companies that marketed a particular product line as containing zero growth hormones were not awarded any points. The rationale for this is because a) this question is looking for a clear commitment from the company on the avoidance of growth promoting substances, rather than evidence of selected products that avoid certain substances, b) the question applies to all growth promoting substances (i.e. not just hormones); and c) in certain jurisdictions (e.g. the US), It is illegal to administer steroid growth 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).</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 8.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use?</b>
--------------------	--

<b>Rationale</b>	The over-use of antibiotics in humans and in animals is directly linked to the increase in antibiotic resistance. The use of antibiotics on-farm (typically through feed or water) is frequently prophylactic; effectively 'propping up' intensive farming systems where animals are kept in confined and stressful conditions and where their immune systems are compromised and disease outbreaks can spread rapidly <sup>iii</sup> . Companies are expected to commit to reducing the levels of antibiotics they administer routinely and to develop animal production systems that are not reliant on the routine use of antibiotics for disease prevention.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has made a partial commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics, but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to the reduction or avoidance of the routine use of antibiotics, and the scope (in terms of geography, species or 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
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We defined antibiotics as medicines used to control infectious (bacterial) diseases in humans and animals.</li> <li>• There are four broad categories of on-farm use of antibiotics, namely: therapeutic (i.e. giving a treatment when clinical disease is identified), metaphylactic (i.e. giving treatment to a group of animals when some are showing signs of illness), prophylactic (i.e. giving a treatment to an animal or group of animals in anticipation of a disease or when there is a risk of infection), and growth promotion (i.e. giving antibiotics to improve the growth rates of animals). This question was looking for a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation was not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits or restricts antibiotic use was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to reduction or avoidance of antibiotic use was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the reduction or avoidance of antibiotic use).</li> <li>• In the absence of a clear position on the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use, companies were not awarded any points. The rationale for this was because a) this question was looking for a clear commitment from the company to the reduction or avoidance of antibiotics for prophylactic use, b) the question applied to all antibiotics (i.e. not just antibiotics that are critical to human health).</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 9.</b>	<b>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)?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	Many farm animals are subjected to procedures that alter their bodies, often with no anaesthesia, 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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations and the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations across all relevant species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was looking for a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation was not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations. The reasons are (a) legislation does not cover all routine mutilations, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that stated that they complied with legislation but did not have a formal policy on the avoidance of routine mutilations were, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits routine mutilations was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position unless the commitment to avoidance was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations).</li> <li>• Companies that made a commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations but were not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) were awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that specified certain breeds (e.g. genetically polled cattle) in their supplier guidelines but did not have a clear position on the avoidance of routine mutilations were not awarded any points.</li> <li>• Companies that specified immuno-castration as an alternative to surgical castration were awarded points, but only if this was clarified by a commitment to the avoidance of surgical castration with a clear scope for this commitment.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 10.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning, or (in the case of finfish) meat from animals that have not been rendered insensible?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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	3

	the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	
	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
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was 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).</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation was not treated as a proxy for having a clear commitment to pre-slaughter stunning. The reasons are (a) legislation may not be comprehensive, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that stated that they complied with legislation but did not have a formal policy were, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that requires pre-slaughter stunning was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of meat from animals that have not been subjected to pre-slaughter stunning).</li> <li>• Companies that made a commitment to pre-slaughter stunning but were not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) were awarded a score of 1 point.</li> <li>• Companies that described the actions taken (e.g. the installation of CCTV in abattoirs) but did not make a formal policy commitment to pre-slaughter stunning were awarded a score of zero points for this question.</li> <li>• Most developed and many developing countries have legislation that requires pre-slaughter stunning. However, exceptions are made which permit some religious communities to slaughter without pre-stunning, e.g. slaughter by the Jewish method (Shechita) or by the Muslim method (Halal). Companies that made exceptions to requirements for pre-slaughter stunning to account for religious concerns were awarded 3 points, so long as the scope of the exception was clearly defined.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 11.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of long-distance live transportation?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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 or 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
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question was looking for a clear commitment to the avoidance of long-distance live transportation, where long-distance was defined as eight hours or more from loading to unloading.</li> <li>Simply stating compliance with legislation was not treated as a proxy for having a clear commitment to the avoidance of long-distance live transportation. The reasons are (a) legislation may not be comprehensive, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that stated that they complied with legislation but did not have a formal policy were, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that imposes limits on transportation times was not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance was made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard was presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of long-distance transport) and the maximum journey time was specified.</li> <li>Companies that stated that transport distances are low (e.g. because of local sourcing, or the geographic boundaries of the areas where they operate), or those that stated distances in kilometres, were not considered to have made a policy commitment to the avoidance of long-distance live transport.</li> <li>Companies that made a commitment to the avoidance of long-distance live transportation but were not clear about the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) were awarded a score of 1 point.</li> </ul>	

Governance and Management		
<b>Question 12.</b>	<b>Has the company assigned management responsibility for farm animal welfare to an individual or specified committee?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
<i>12a. Management responsibility</i>		
	No clearly defined management responsibility.	0
	The company has published details of the management position with responsibility for farm animal welfare on a day-to-day basis.	5
<i>12b. Board or senior management responsibility</i>		

	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
	<b>(Max score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two sub-questions were scored separately (i.e. companies could score 5 points for publishing details of who was responsible for farm animal welfare on a day-to-day basis and 5 points for publishing details of senior management responsibility for overseeing the farm animal welfare policy).</li> <li>For the purposes of scoring on day-to-day responsibility, the question was not looking for named individuals, but evidence of roles with responsibility for farm animal welfare (e.g. a statement that this was the responsibility of a dedicated technical or sourcing manager, or a statement that responsibility was divided among a number of functions, with information on the various roles and responsibilities).</li> <li>For the management oversight sub-question, we recognised that companies may assign responsibility to a named senior person or that farm animal welfare may form part of the remit of a wider sustainability, CSR or sourcing committee. Therefore, 5 points were awarded if the company provided a clear account of board or senior management oversight.</li> <li>For the purposes of scoring, the emphasis was on the management of farm animal welfare. General information on the management or oversight of CSR or sustainability was only credited if it was clear that this included farm animal welfare.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 13.</b>	<b>Has the company set objectives and targets for the management of farm animal welfare?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
	<b>(Max score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question was looking for evidence of explicit farm animal welfare-related objectives and targets, and for evidence that the company had a clear plan for achieving these objectives and targets.</li> <li>We did not award points for objectives and targets adopted for other purposes (e.g. quality), unless improving farm animal welfare was an explicit aim of these objectives and targets.</li> <li>For the purposes of scoring, we did 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).</li> <li>Companies with multiple objectives and targets, but without further information on how these were to be achieved, were awarded 5 points.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Companies were awarded maximum points if they provided information on how the objectives and targets were 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.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 14.</b>	<b>Does the company report on its performance against its animal welfare objectives and targets?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should explain how they have performed against their objectives and targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	The company does not report on how it has performed against its objectives and targets.	0
	The company reports on how it has performed against its objectives and targets.	5
	<b>(Max score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question was only assessed if the company had been awarded 5 or 10 points for Question 13, i.e. the company had published objectives and targets. Otherwise, a score of zero was awarded.</li> <li>Companies were awarded points if they provided evidence of having effective systems in place for monitoring of performance against the objectives and targets.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 15.</b>	<b>Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its farm animal welfare policy is effectively implemented?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
<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
	<b>(Max score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sub-questions (on training and on internal controls) were scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question did not influence the scores for the other sub-question).</li> <li>On training, companies were only awarded 5 points if the training provided was aimed at employees and if it explicitly addressed farm animal welfare-related issues.</li> <li>The training question did not address the quality of the training provided, the manner in which skills or competencies were assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provided.</li> <li>On internal controls, companies were only awarded 5 points if they explicitly discussed the actions that they take in relation to</li> </ul>	

	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 was clear that these policies and processes also covered farm animal welfare.	
--	--	--

<b>Question 16.</b>	<b>Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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).	
<b>Scoring</b>		
	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 the specific support and/or education provided to suppliers.	0
	The company provides specific support and/or education provided to suppliers on farm animal welfare policy/issues.	5
	<b>(Max score 15)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sub-questions (on contracts, auditing and supplier education) were scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question did not influence the scores for the other sub-questions).</li> <li>On contracts, companies were awarded 3 points if they indicated that they included farm animal welfare in contracts but did not indicate whether this applied to all relevant contracts or if they indicated that farm animal welfare was not included in all contracts.</li> <li>On auditing, companies were only awarded 5 points if it was clear that their auditing processes explicitly covered farm animal welfare. Many of the companies reviewed reported that they audited their suppliers against safety and/or quality standards but, unless it was clear that these audit processes covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On supplier support and/or education, 5 points were awarded to companies that published case studies or examples and/or provided a more comprehensive description of their approach. The award of 5 points was not dependent on the number or proportion of suppliers receiving this support and/or education. A number of companies described their support to suppliers on a range of supply chain issues. However, unless it was clear that this support also covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 17.</b>	<b>Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No assurance standard specified.	0
	A proportion of products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard, but no information on the balance.	3
	A proportion of products audited to a combination of basic and higher farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard, but no information on the balance.	6
	100% of products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard.	10
	100% of products audited to a combination of a basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard and a higher welfare assurance (or company equivalent standard).	15
	100% of products audited to higher level (or company equivalent) assurance standard.	20
	<b>(Max Score 20)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	

	<p>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").</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
--	--

Innovation		
<b>Question 18.</b>	<b>Is the company currently investing in projects dedicated to advancing farm animal welfare practices within the industry?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
	<i>18a. Involvement in research and development</i>	
	No evidence of company involvement in research and development programmes to improve farm animal welfare.	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
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sub-questions (on research and development and industry initiatives) were scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question did not influence the scores on the other sub-question).</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies that reported on their involvement in initiatives or programmes to improve farming techniques on environmental, safety or quality grounds, for example, were not awarded a score unless there was a clearly defined farm animal welfare element to these initiatives.</li> <li>• Similarly, only those industry initiatives that were explicitly directed at improving farm animal welfare were eligible to be scored.</li> <li>• In order to receive a score of 5 points for either sub-question, it was necessary for companies to demonstrate not only that the initiatives had a meaningful farm animal welfare dimension but that the company had played a significant role in the initiative. That is, companies had to demonstrate that they were dedicating significant time, resources or expertise to the initiatives in question. For example, it was not sufficient simply to say that the company had attended roundtables or working groups with industry peers. However, if a company had initiated or become a founding member of an initiative aimed at advancing farm animal welfare, a score of 5 points would have been awarded.</li> <li>• Regarding research, points were only awarded for recent, updated information. If similar information appeared to be repeated year on year, a comment was added to prompt for an update to keep receiving points in future Benchmarks.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 19.</b>	<b>Does the company promote higher farm animal welfare to consumers through education and/or awareness-raising activities?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence of promoting higher farm animal welfare.	0
	At least one example of promoting higher farm animal welfare to consumers.	5
	Multiple examples of promoting higher farm animal welfare to consumers.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The activities that could be considered in this question were defined broadly. Examples included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— 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.</li> <li>— On-pack or on-shelf labelling – provided this was evidenced on the company's website, in its published reports or on social media platforms.</li> <li>— Information leaflets or information packs.</li> <li>— Media promotions.</li> <li>— Supporting third party campaigns or programmes e.g. the RSPCA Farm Animal Week.</li> <li>— Customer farm visits, seminars or roundtables.</li> <li>— Social media campaigns.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In order to receive a score of 5 or 10, the focus of activities had to be on farm animal welfare.</li> <li>• Initiatives aimed at showing how products are sourced or produced but without an explicit focus on the welfare of farm animals, were not scored in the assessment.</li> <li>• Companies that produced multiple consumer-facing videos on farm welfare issues were awarded five points, unless it was clear</li> </ul>	

	<p>that these were linked to separate consumer engagement programmes or themes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies were only awarded maximum points where there was clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to promote higher animal welfare to consumers.</li> <li>• Social media channels were not separately reviewed, so companies had to link to these channels from their webpages in order to receive points (e.g. for YouTube videos).</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

Performance Reporting and Impact		
<b>Question 20.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of animals (or volume of fresh or frozen animal products and its ingredients) in its global supply chain that is free from close confinement (i.e. those in barn, free-range, indoor group housed, indoor free-farrowing, outdoor bred/reared)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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 used for 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, e.g. turbot). For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on the proportion of animals free from close confinement	0
	The company reports on the proportion of animals free from close confinement, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals free from close confinement, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is free from close confinement. Companies that reported using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) were not awarded points unless they explicitly stated that the standard meant that the relevant animals were free from close confinement.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed were not awarded points.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being free from close confinement were not awarded points unless they could demonstrate that these statements were supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 21.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that is provided with effective species-specific enriched environments?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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 cattle; manipulable materials such as straw for pigs; pecking and dustbathing substrates, and perches for chickens; bathing water for ducks;	

	outdoor range enhancement, such as artificial or natural shelter; (artificial) plants, floor substrates and structures for fish. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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 products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportions of animals provided with effective species-specific enriched environments across all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was specifically looking for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is provided with effective species-specific environmental enrichment.</li> <li>• Chains for pigs were not classed as effective enrichment.</li> <li>• Companies that reported using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) were not awarded points unless they explicitly stated that the standard meant that the relevant animals were provided with environmental enrichment.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed were not awarded points.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being provided with environmental enrichment were not awarded points unless they could demonstrate that these statements were supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• Companies that just mentioned that they provided enrichment to a proportion of their animals, but without context or a description of the enrichment (or for which species) received partial points and a comment that in order to keep receiving such points they should clarify their statements further.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 22.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of animals in its global supply chain that is free from routine mutilations (i.e. castration, teeth clipping, tail docking, toe clipping, dehorning, desnooding, de-winging, disbudding, mulesing, beak trimming/tipping, fin clipping)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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 products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals that is free from routine mutilations, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	5

	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is free from routine mutilations. Companies that reported using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) were not awarded points unless they explicitly stated that the standard meant that the relevant animals were free from routine mutilations.</li> <li>Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed were not awarded points.</li> <li>Companies that made general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being free from routine mutilations were not awarded points unless they could demonstrate that these statements were supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>Companies that reported on the use of anaesthesia or analgesics in association with routine mutilations were not awarded points because this question is looking for an explicit commitment to the avoidance of routine mutilations.</li> </ul>

<b>Question 23.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of animals (including finfish) in its global supply chain that is subject to pre-slaughter stunning?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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 products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals subject to pre-slaughter stunning, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is subject to pre-slaughter stunning. Companies that reported using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) were not awarded points unless they explicitly stated that the standard meant that the relevant animals were subject to pre-slaughter stunning.</li> <li>Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed were not awarded points.</li> <li>Companies that made general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being subject to pre-slaughter stunning were not awarded points unless they could demonstrate that these statements were supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 24.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of animals (excluding finfish) in its global supply chain that is ineffectively stunned, i.e. is subject to back-up or repeat stunning?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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 products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of animals subject to back-up or repeat stunning, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that were subjected to back-up or repeat stunning.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected.</li> <li>• Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed were not awarded points.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "None of our animals" or "No animals" required back-up or repeat stunning, were not awarded points unless they could demonstrate that these statements were supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 25.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the average, typical or maximum permitted live transport times for the animals in its global supply chain?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on live transport times.	0
	The company reports on the live transport times for animals, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
	The company reports fully on the live transport times for animals, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on the average, typical or maximum live transport times for animals. Companies that reported using proxy measures (e.g. the proportion of animals managed to certain farm animal welfare standards) were not awarded points unless they explicitly stated that the standard meant that the transport times were limited to eight hours or less.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the average, typical or maximum transport times for animals affected. Companies that reported on the average, typical or maximum distance travelled by animals without specifying transport times were not awarded points.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about “Our animals” or “All animals” being subject to average, typical or maximum journey times were not awarded points unless they could demonstrate that these statements were supported by monitoring data (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our animals...’).</li> <li>• Companies that reported on measures taken to the comfort of animals during transportation (e.g. stocking levels, access to water, rest breaks, etc.) were not awarded points as this question is looking explicitly at journey times for animals.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 26.</b>	<b>Does the company report on welfare outcome measures (i.e. measures linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at welfare outcome measures (WOMs) relating to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals. WOMs may be quantitative, or qualitative. They should focus on the most important species-specific measures, of physical wellbeing, mental wellbeing and behaviour. There is an increasing focus on positive outcome measures (e.g. active and play behaviour). For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.</p> <p>WOMs might include for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For all species: mortality rates.</li> <li>• For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter.</li> <li>• For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate.</li> <li>• For pigs: lameness, tail bites and other lesions.</li> <li>• For broiler chickens: gait score, footpad dermatitis, hockburn, breast blisters.</li> <li>• For beef: body condition, lameness.</li> <li>• For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition.</li> <li>• For fish: fin and body damage.</li> <li>• For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, socialising.</li> <li>• For transportation: injuries, slips and falls, fatigue, road traffic incidents, mortality (dead-on-arrival/DOA).</li> <li>• For slaughter: effectiveness of stunning.</li> </ul>	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on welfare outcome measures.	0
	The company partially reports on welfare outcome measures but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	1
	The company reports fully on one welfare outcome measure for each relevant species, covering all geographies and products.	3
	The company fully reports on multiple welfare outcome measure for each relevant species, covering all geographies and products	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was looking specifically for explicit reporting on welfare outcome measures such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mortality rates (as an indicator of potential pain, suffering and suboptimal performance), for fish: survival rates.</li> <li>○ Bone breakages (as an indicator of pain, suffering, suboptimal performance, and poor house design).</li> <li>○ Lameness (as an indicator of potential pain, behavioural restriction and suboptimal environmental and housing conditions).</li> <li>○ Body marks/injuries (as an indicator of aggressive fight damage, especially during mixing or competition at feeding, or from sexual behaviours).</li> <li>○ Body condition (as an indicator of good feed management, or competition at feeding).</li> <li>○ Cleanliness (as an indicator of good environmental control, thermal comfort).</li> <li>○ Positive flock or herd behaviour (as an indicator of a varied stimulating environment, good management and suitable breed for production system).</li> <li>○ Negative flock or herd behaviour, 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).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Scores were not awarded for reporting on input-based measures (i.e. measures relating to the type of production system, e.g. caged, barn, free-range, as well as to the practices for transport and slaughter).</li> <li>• Scores were 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 were not awarded for production measures (e.g. egg output).</li> <li>• Similarly, scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm animal welfare standards but did not report on the welfare outcomes resulting from the implementation of these standards.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed were not awarded points.</li> </ul>	
<b>Question 27.</b>	<b>Does the company provide an explanation of progress and trends in performance (either in terms of input measures or welfare outcome measures)?</b>	

<b>Rationale</b>	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). For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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 geographies, species, or 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 geographies, species, or 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) for each relevant species across all geographies and 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) for each relevant species across all geographies and products, and it provides an explanation of progress or trend in performance.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because performance reporting is relatively underdeveloped, we did not prescribe the performance indicators to be used. We awarded scores for input-based measures (i.e. measures relating to the type of production system, e.g. caged, barn, free-range, 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).</li> <li>• The purpose of this question was 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.</li> <li>• We did not prescribe the form in which performance data were reported. We awarded scores for reporting in absolute (e.g. number of animals) and relative (e.g. as a percentage of the total number of animals, as a proportion of the species in question) terms.</li> <li>• 'Relevant' means all species that are in the company's supply chain.</li> <li>• We did not award points if the company used terms such as 'improved' or 'decreased' but did not provide a precise definition (e.g. a number, a rate) for these terms.</li> <li>• We expected companies to continue reporting when specific targets or objectives have been reached (e.g. are at 100%) to ensure that their performance was maintained at 100% and that this performance was continually monitored (e.g. a company could report that they only used 100% cage free eggs, but we still expected year-on-year reporting, and an explanation that the performance remained at 100%).</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 28.</b>	<b>What proportion of laying hens (for shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is cage-free?</b>
---------------------	---

<b>Rationale</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of laying hens is 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
	<b>(Max Score 5)<sup>i</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products.</li> <li>• This question was 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.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that reported on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards but did not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that are cage-free in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being free from close confinement were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• In situations where companies reported performance data for different regions, countries or products but did not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported was applied (e.g. if a company, with operations in three countries, reported that 14% its laying hens in Country A, 47% in Country B and 100% in Country C were cage free but did not provide any information on the proportion of its laying hens that was in each of these countries, 14% would be used as the basis for calculating its score for this question).</li> <li>• We expected companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain that this data represented (i.e., it should not be necessary for the assessor to have to calculate the data in order to arrive at a percentage of the global supply chain).</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 29.</b>	<b>What proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is sourced from pigs that are free from sow stalls?</b>
---------------------	---

<b>Rationale</b>	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 fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients that is sourced from pigs that are free from sow stalls but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
	<b>(Max Score 5)<sup>i</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> <li>• This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that was sourced from sows that are free from sow stalls.</li> <li>• For the purposes of this question, sow-stall-free referred 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.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that reported on the proportion of sows that is free from sow stalls but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards but did not explicitly report on the proportion of sows that is free from sow stalls in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "Our sows" or "All sows" being free from sow stalls were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of sows that is free from sow stalls (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• In situations where companies reported performance data for different regions, countries or products but did not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported was 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).</li> <li>• We expected companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without having to do any calculations.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 30.</b>	<b>What proportion of fresh/frozen milk or milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is sourced from cows that are free from tethering?</b>															
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>Companies making public commitments to source milk from dairy cows that are not tethered should report on the proportion of own brand milk and milk products (including ingredients) that are from dairy cows that are not tethered.</p> <p>NB. Companies that report on the proportion of milk or milk products and ingredients that is sourced from cows that are 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.</p>															
<b>Scoring</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>0% of dairy cows is free from tethering, or no reported information.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 – 25% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26 – 50% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>51 – 75% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>2.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>76 – 99% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>3.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>100% of dairy cows is free from tethering.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;"><b>(Max Score 5)<sup>i</sup></b></td> </tr> </table>	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	<b>(Max Score 5)<sup>i</sup></b>		
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															
<b>(Max Score 5)<sup>i</sup></b>																
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy-based products.</li> <li>• This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of milk or milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that was sourced from dairy cows that are free from tethering.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that reported on the proportion of cows that are free from tethering but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but did not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All cows" being free from tethering were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• In situations where companies reported performance data for different regions, countries or products but did not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported was 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).</li> <li>• We expected companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without having to do any calculations.</li> </ul>															

<b>Question 31.</b>	<b>What proportion of broiler chickens for fresh/frozen products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> or less)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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 meat that is sourced from 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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<b>(Max Score 5)<sup>i</sup></b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products.</li> <li>• This question was 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.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that reported on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but did not explicitly report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "Our broiler chickens" or "All meat chickens" being reared at lower stocking densities were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that are reared at lower stocking densities (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• In situations where companies reported performance data for different regions, countries or products but did not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported was 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).</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We expected companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 32.</b>	<b>What proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain is free from beak trimming or tipping?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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 is sourced from laying hens that are 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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping, or no reported information.	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
	<b>(Max Score 5)<sup>ii</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question was only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products.</li> <li>This question was 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 were free from beak trimming or tipping.</li> <li>Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that reported on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but did not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that made general statements about "Our laying hens" or "All chickens" being free from beak trimming or tipping were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>In situations where companies reported performance data for different regions, countries or products but did not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported was 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 or tipping 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).</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We expected companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 33.</b>	<b>What proportion of pigs in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of pigs that is free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients that is sourced from pigs that are 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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
	<b>(Max Score 5)<sup>ii</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question was only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> <li>This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that was sourced from pigs that are free from tail docking.</li> <li>Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that reported on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but did not explicitly report on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that made general statements about "Our pigs" or "All pigs" being free from tail docking were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>In situations where companies reported performance data for different regions, countries or products but did not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported was 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).</li> <li>We expected companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain this data represented, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 34.</b>	<b>What proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from tail docking. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of fresh/frozen milk products and ingredients that is sourced from cows that are 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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
<b>(Max Score 5)<sup>ii</sup></b>		
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products.</li> <li>• This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of fresh/frozen milk products and ingredients in the company's global supply chain that was sourced from dairy cows that are free from tail docking.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that reported on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tail docking but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but did not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tail docking in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being free from tail docking were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of cows that is free from tail docking (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• In situations where companies reported performance data for different regions, countries or products but did not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported was 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).</li> <li>• We expected companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>	
<b>Question 35.</b>	<b>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</b>	

	<b>&lt;55g/d averaged over the growth cycle according to the breeding company specification)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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.	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
	<b>(Max Score 5)<sup>iii</sup></b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products.</li> <li>• This question was 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.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that reported on the proportion of chicken meat that is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of chicken meat from birds managed according to particular farm assurance standards but did not explicitly report on the strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with slower growth potential in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "Our chicken meat" or "All chicken " being from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of chicken meat that is from strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and slower growth potential (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where companies reported on their own breeds with improved welfare outcomes and slower growth potential, they needed to provide a clear description of how the company's breed standard(s) compare to other breeds with improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential.</li> <li>In situations where companies reported performance data for different regions, countries or products but did not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported was 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 breeds with improved welfare outcomes and a slower growth potential 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).</li> <li>We expected companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by this data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 36.</b>	<b>What proportion of animals (including fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	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) before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. For all companies, this question applies to all products (own-brand and other).	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the company's global supply chain that had been pre-slaughter stunned.</li> <li>Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that reported on the proportion of animals that was pre-slaughter stunned but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded minimal points.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but did not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that was pre-slaughter stunned in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being pre-slaughter stunned were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• In situations where companies reported performance data for different regions, countries or products but did not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported was 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).</li> <li>• We expected companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 37.</b>	<b>What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is transported within specified maximum journey times?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the live transportation of animals in their supply chains. When being transported, animals can experience hunger, thirst, discomfort, pain, frustration, fear and distress, as well as physical welfare problems including injury, disease, and, in the worst cases, death. For these reasons, transport of live terrestrial animals should be minimised wherever possible and journeys should be kept as short as possible. Specifically, any transport of a live terrestrial animal that exceeds 8 hours, from loading to unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. NB. Companies that report on the proportion of animals that have been transported in 8 hours or less but do not specify the scope will be awarded minimal points. This question currently excludes finfish because the key welfare issues concern the pumping, crowding and poor handling of finfish, as well as the deterioration of water quality, especially the depletion of oxygen or accumulation of carbon dioxide and ammonia. For all companies, this question applies to all products (own-brand and other).	
<b>Scoring</b>	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
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question was looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the company's global supply chain that are transported in 8 hours or less.</li> <li>• Points were only awarded if the company was explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total</li> </ul>	

	<p>number of animals affected but did not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally were awarded minimal points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies that reported on the proportion of animals that was transported in 8 hours or less but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Similarly, if the scope of reported figures was unclear, companies were awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Scores were not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but did not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that was transported in 8 hours or less in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that made general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" were not awarded points unless there was explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that was transported in 8 hours or less (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• In situations where companies reported performance data for different regions, countries or products but did not specify the relative proportion of global supply represented by these regions, countries or products, the lowest number reported was 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 of 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).</li> <li>• We expected companies to report impact figures in an easy to understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations.</li> </ul>
--	--

\*Notes

<sup>i</sup> For questions 28-31 (on close confinement), we only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We assess relevant questions, with the maximum possible score being five (5) points per question and we use the scores to calculate the overall average for these relevant questions.

<sup>ii</sup> For questions 32-34 (on mutilations), we only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We assess relevant questions, with the maximum possible score being five (5) points per question and we use the scores to calculate the overall average for these relevant questions.

<sup>iii</sup> For question 35 (on strains of birds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential), we only assess this question if it is relevant to the company. The maximum possible score for this question is five (5) points.

---