

Summary of Responses to the  
Public Consultation on the 2022  
Business Benchmark on Farm  
Animal Welfare  
March 2023



# Executive Summary

Following feedback to our public consultation in February 2023, the BBFAW Technical Working Group has agreed to make the following changes to the 2022 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare:

1. We will proceed with the proposed changes to the companies assessed in the 2022 Benchmark with the exception of the proposal to assess Sanderson Farms as part of Cargill. Instead, Wayne-Sanderson Farms will be assessed in place of Sanderson Farms. To keep the total number of companies at 150, Associated British Foods will no longer be assessed. In addition, the larger Domino's Pizza, Inc. will replace Domino's Pizza Group PLC.
2. We will proceed with the proposed changes to the assessment pillars and weightings.
3. We will proceed with the proposed changes to the assessment criteria but with the following exceptions and changes:
  - Q10, on commitments on high-performance breeds, will be temporarily removed and a working group process involving industry representatives will be instigated in 2023 to better define the question for key species.
  - Q7, on commitments on antibiotics, has been edited to signal alignment with the EU legislative position on ending use of **routine** metaphylaxis.
  - Q41 and Q44, on the avoidance of disbudding/dehorning for dairy cows and beef cattle, has been amended to enable reporting on polled breeds.
  - The Animal Sourced Foods questions (Q14, 15, 22, 23, 29 and 51) have been amended to enable points to be awarded for evidence on protein diversification.
  - Q50, on reporting on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type, has been moved to the Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact pillar and expanded to also cover reporting on volumes by method of production.
4. The BBFAW 2022 company assessments will be positioned as a pilot of the new criteria. Companies will receive their individual reports providing full feedback on their results and recommendations for how to improve, but we will not publish the usual public BBFAW report. We will publish a briefing paper following the BBFAW 2022 assessments which will provide a commentary on the assessments and confirm the assessment approach for the BBFAW 2023 assessments but this will not include data analysis or a ranking of companies.

# Structure

This report is structured as follows:

Part I: Background

Part II: Public Consultation on the 2022 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare

1. Overview of the Responses

2. Summary of the Responses and Our Planned Actions

2.1 Changes to Company Scope

2.2 Changes to the Weighting of the Assessment Pillars

2.3 Changes to the Assessment Criteria

2.4 Wider Benchmark Revisions

3. Closing Remarks

Appendices:

- Appendix I: Company Scope
- Appendix II: Weighting of the Assessment Pillars
- Appendix III: 2022 Benchmark Assessment Criteria

# Part 1: Background

Following the first decade of BBFAW Benchmarks, the BBFAW Partners decided that it was necessary to pause the annual assessment cycle during 2022 to conduct a thorough revision of the assessment criteria, to ensure they are aligned with evolving expectations of companies on animal welfare. The BBFAW Partners worked with the Secretariat to develop the proposed BBFAW 2022 assessment criteria.

In preparation for the postponed 2022 Benchmark company assessments, to be conducted in April and May 2023, BBFAW invited comments on the following issues:

- The scope of companies covered by the Benchmark.
- Changes to the weighting of the assessment pillars.
- Changes to the assessment criteria.
- Wider benchmark revisions, including how to communicate the 2022 benchmark results.

This document summarises the feedback received and BBFAW's response to this feedback.

# Part 2: Public Consultation on the 2022 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare

## 1. Overview of the Responses

The BBFAW Secretariat received 56 formal written responses to its 2022 public consultation. These were received from 39 food companies, six investors and 11 other organisations. Responses were received from 13 countries, representing all the BBFAW regions: Asia Pacific, Europe, Latin America, North America and UK.

The BBFAW Secretariat held two webinars on 2 February 2022 to outline the proposed changes within the BBFAW 2022 consultation. These offered companies, investors and other stakeholders the opportunity to submit immediate responses to the consultation questions during the webinar and to ask for clarification on the proposed changes. The sessions attracted 111 attendees, of which 71 were from BBFAW companies, 23 were from other organisations, nine were from non-BBFAW companies and eight were from investor organisations.

## 2. Summary of the Responses and Our Planned Actions

### 2.1 Changes to Company Scope

#### 2.1.1 BBFAW's Proposals

##### Summary of proposals:

- Two Retailer and Wholesaler companies and two Producer and Manufacturer companies were proposed to be assessed together under their parent companies. [Net impact: -2 companies]
- One Producer and Manufacturer and two Restaurants and Bars companies were proposed to be removed. [Net impact: -3 companies]
- Two Retailer and Wholesaler companies, two Producer and Manufacturer companies and one Restaurant and Bars company were proposed to be added. [Net impact: +5 companies]

For the 2022 Benchmark, it was proposed to continue to assess 150 companies and to make the following changes to the companies covered by the Benchmark, following changes to ownership, as follows:

## Retailers and Wholesalers

### Proposed changes:

- **Lidl Stiftung & Co KG** and **Kaufland** – currently assessed separately – were proposed to be assessed under the parent company **Schwarz Unternehmens Treuhand KG**

### Proposed new additions:

- **Spar Holding AG** – international group of retailers and wholesalers operating in 45 countries.
- **Metro Inc** – third largest Canadian retailer after Loblaw and Sobey's. Metro Inc is distinct from Metro AG, the retail group domiciled in Germany which is also included in the company scope.

## Producers and Manufacturers

### Proposed changes:

- **Cargill** and Continental Grains acquired **Sanderson Farms** in July 2022. Sanderson Farms was therefore proposed to be assessed as part of **Cargill**.
- **Chuying Agro-Pastoral Group** was proposed to be removed due to relatively small market revenue.

### Proposed new additions:

- **Yili Group** – Chinese dairy company that is one of the largest in Asia.
- **Beijing Dabeinong Technology Group Co., Ltd.** – a leading Chinese pig producer.

## Restaurants and Bars

### Proposed changes:

- **Umoe Gruppen** and **CNHS** were proposed to be removed due to relatively small market revenue.

### Proposed new additions:

- **Yum China Holdings** – one of the largest restaurant groups in China and globally. Yum China Holdings is distinct from Yum! Brands, the restaurant group domiciled in the USA which is also included in the company scope.

### 2.1.2 Stakeholder Responses

Respondents were largely supportive of the proposed company changes and the polls conducted during the webinars also indicated majority support. However, there were a couple of significant points of feedback regarding the company scope.

Feedback clarified that Cargill's joint venture with Continental Grains does not provide Cargill with a controlling stake in the newly formed entity Wayne-Sanderson Farms. Instead, Wayne-Sanderson Farms is independently operated. Further feedback indicated that Associated British Foods has relatively limited involvement in livestock products. In addition, it was questioned whether Domino's Pizza Group PLC was the appropriate entity to assess within

the benchmark. Domino's Pizza Group PLC operates in the UK and Ireland, whereas Domino's Pizza, Inc. operates in the USA, and internationally, and is the significantly larger of the two companies. Feedback from Asda indicated that the correct parent company for them to be listed under is Bellis Topco Ltd.

BBFAW is not currently looking to expand the number of companies assessed in the Benchmark, however, a number of respondents suggested potential companies or regions for inclusion for greater representation. These suggestions will be useful to informing the evolution of the BBFAW company scope in the future.

### 2.1.3 Our Planned Actions

Based on the feedback received, we have decided to proceed with the proposed changes to the companies assessed in the 2022 Benchmark with the exception of the proposal to assess Sanderson Farms as part of Cargill. Instead, Wayne-Sanderson Farms will be assessed in place of Sanderson Farms. Asda will be listed under its parent company, Bellis Topco Ltd.

Given the desire to keep the total number of companies at 150, Associated British Foods will no longer be assessed, due to its relatively limited involvement in livestock products. In addition, the larger Domino's Pizza, Inc. will replace Domino's Pizza Group PLC.

These changes mean that the 2022 Benchmark will now cover:

- 87 public companies (91 in 2021)
- 44 private companies (40 in 2021)
- 15 cooperatives
- 4 joint stock/partnership owned companies.

BBFAW will consider the suggested additional companies and regions for inclusion to allow for greater representation should the BBFAW look to expand its coverage in future years.

## 2.2 Changes to the Weighting of the Assessment Pillars

### 2.2.1 BBFAW's Proposals

#### Summary of proposals:

- The 2022 Benchmark was proposed to be divided into the following five pillars:
  - Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments
  - Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management
  - Farm Animal Welfare Targets
  - Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact
  - Animal-Sourced Foods (Policy Commitments, Governance and Management, Targets and Performance Impact).
- The greatest weighting was proposed to be given to the Performance Impact pillar, representing 55% of the overall score.

In the proposed 2022 assessment criteria, retained questions that previously formed part of the Management Commitment, Governance and Management, and Innovation and Leadership pillars were combined into the new Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments and Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management pillars.

A new pillar focused on Farm Animal Welfare Targets was proposed to be introduced to enable greater emphasis to be placed on time-bound targets for specific animal welfare improvements.

For a number of years, the BBFAW has recognised that performance impact is an increasingly important indicator of company performance on farm animal welfare, as investors, the BBFAW Partners and other stakeholders seek to accurately assess companies on the effectiveness of their policies, commitments and management approach. Accordingly, the proportion of the overall score that the Performance Impact questions represent has been increased each year since 2018. It was proposed to further increase the weighting of the Performance Impact questions and to remove the six Performance Reporting questions (Q20-25 in 2021) as these provided potential for double-scoring against the expanded number of Performance Impact questions. The new Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact pillar was proposed to represent a majority – 55% – of the overall score.

The BBFAW Partners also identified the need to introduce questions to assess how companies are acting to reduce their reliance on animal-sourced foods, as an allied issue to that of farm animal welfare. These questions, focused on companies’ policies and performance on reducing the number of animals farmed for food, mirror the structure of the farm animal welfare questions (Policy Commitments, Governance and Management, Targets and Performance Impact), but were proposed to be grouped into a single new Animal-Sourced Foods pillar.

The 2022 assessment criteria were proposed to be weighted as follows:

Pillar	2022 Weighting
Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments	15%
Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management	14%
Farm Animal Welfare Targets	7%
Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact	55%
Animal-Sourced Foods	9%

## 2.2.2 Stakeholder Responses

There was broad support for the proposal to divide the assessment criteria into the proposed Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments, Farm Animal Welfare Governance and

Management, Farm Animal Welfare Targets and Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact pillars. However, there was a mixed response to the proposed introduction of the Animal-Sourced Foods pillar, with limited support from food companies but greater support from investors and NGO respondents.

Feedback on the proposed weightings for the five pillars was in line with that received on the introduction of the Animal-Sourced Foods pillar. A majority of food company respondents suggested that the weighting given to the Animal-Sourced Foods pillar should be reduced or reallocated to either the Farm Animal Welfare Targets or Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact pillars. Other company respondents suggested the proposed increase in weighting for the Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact pillar should be introduced more gradually.

#### **Selected comments:**

“Our suggestion would be a higher percentage on the policy section (In order to be able to achieve farm animal welfare performance impacts, strong policies and requirements need to be in place at first). The performance impact section should be rated less than 55%. Further, we suggest to increase the weighting of the animal welfare targets.” [European food company]

“Whilst we are broadly supportive of the proposed weightings of the Pillars, we would suggest removal of weighing for the “Animal Sourced Foods Pillar”, instead redirecting this weighting towards “Performance Impact Pillar.” [UK food company]

“The Performance Impact pillar should not already have the weight proposed in this new methodology in the first evaluation. We understand the need for evolution in terms of compliance with the indicator, but we believe that as an incentive, the weight of the instrument should be gradual.” [Latin American food company]

“I agree with the shift of weighting so that performance is a greater proportion of a company’s score as this speaks to the actual real-world impact (note that communication on this needs to be very clear as I imagine several companies may drop in the rankings as a result).” [UK investor]

### **2.2.3 Our Planned Actions**

We acknowledge the feedback from respondents, particularly food companies, on the introduction of the Animal Sourced Foods pillar. Further feedback on the proposal to introduce the questions on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods was received across different parts of the consultation and is summarised in section 2.3.2 of this report. BBFAW’s response, including details of how these questions have been revised in line with feedback received, is presented in section 2.3.3. BBFAW will, however, be proceeding with the proposal to divide the assessment criteria into the five pillars described.

BBFAW will also proceed with the proposed weightings for the five pillars of the assessment. Whilst we understand the concerns expressed regarding the weighting of the different pillars of the assessment criteria, specifically the 9% weighting provided to the Animal Sourced Foods pillar, it is important to note that 91% of the total possible score remains allocated to the Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments, Farm Animal Welfare Governance and

Management, Farm Animal Welfare Targets and Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact pillars.

Views on whether to adjust the proposed weightings of the other pillars of the assessment were mixed. The greater focus on Performance Impact within the assessment has been previously stated as the long-term direction of travel for the benchmark, noting that there is increasing interest from stakeholders seeking to accurately assess companies on the effectiveness of their policies, commitments and management approach. At the same time, we have increased the number of species covered by the species-specific Performance Impact questions, meaning that all companies in the benchmark will now have their core species addressed within this section of the assessment.

## 2.3 Changes to the Assessment Criteria

### 2.3.1 BBFAW's Proposals

Following the first decade of BBFAW Benchmarks, the BBFAW Partners decided that it was necessary to conduct a thorough revision of the assessment criteria to adapt to the changing landscape. In particular, to adapt to the increased demand for greater focus on performance impact and to incorporate the allied issue of the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods in human diets. The most significant changes that were proposed are summarised below.

#### Summary of proposals:

- New questions were proposed to be added on whether companies have commitments: to ending the use of high-performance breeds; to not produce or sell foie gras; and to ending the use of other inhumane practices. The question on whether companies have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics was proposed to be expanded to also cover metaphylactic use.
- A new sub-question was proposed to be added on whether companies describe how they use welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in their operations or supply chain.
- New questions were proposed to be added on whether companies have clear, time-bound targets for specific welfare improvements for laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cows.
- New species-specific Performance Impact questions were proposed to be added, covering beef cattle and farmed salmon, in addition to laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cattle (resulting in three questions per species).
- The scoring of the Performance Impact questions was proposed to be adjusted to make the points scale exponential rather than linear (i.e., awarding fewer points than previously for lower levels of performance).

- Eight new questions were proposed to be introduced on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.
- Eleven questions that previously featured as part of the assessment criteria were proposed to be removed.

New questions were proposed to be added within the *Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments* pillar on whether companies have commitments to:

- ending the use of high-performance breeds (Q10 in proposals);
- not produce or sell foie gras (Q11 in proposals, Q10 in final criteria); and
- ending the use of other inhumane practices (Q12 in proposals, Q11 in final criteria), including the culling of day-old male chicks in egg supply chains; cow-calf separation; fully slatted flooring; and live plucking or live harvesting for geese.

Further, the question on whether companies have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics (Q7) was proposed to be expanded to also cover metaphylactic use.

A new sub-question (Q19a in proposals, Q18a in final criteria) was proposed to be added to assess whether companies describe how they use welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in their operations or supply chain. This question was looking for descriptions of how welfare outcome measure data are used to help drive continuous improvement, or as indicators for corrective action.

New questions were proposed to be added within the new *Farm Animal Welfare Targets* pillar on whether companies have clear, time-bound targets for:

- ending the use of cages (battery and enriched/colony) for laying hens (Q24 in proposals, Q23 in final criteria);
- achieving the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment (Q25 in proposals, Q24 in final criteria);
- ending the use of gestation/sow stalls for sows, throughout pregnancy and during the observation period (Q26 in proposals, 25 in final criteria);
- ending the use of farrowing crates for sows (Q27 in proposals, Q26 in final criteria); and
- ending the use of tethering for dairy cows (Q28 in proposals, Q27 in final criteria).

These questions were proposed to introduce a specific focus on time-bound targets for key animal welfare improvements. The setting of time-bound targets is the critical step required for policy commitments to be translated into action and, thereby, performance impact.

The number of species-specific Performance Impact questions was proposed to be expanded to 18, from eight in 2021. These now cover beef cattle and farmed salmon, in addition to laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cattle, with three questions per species. The two Performance Impact questions on maximum transport times and pre-slaughter stunning which apply to all species have been retained from the 2021 assessment criteria.

The scoring of the Performance Impact questions was also proposed to be adjusted, to make the points scale exponential rather than linear (i.e., awarding fewer points for lower levels of performance).

For example, in 2021, a company would have received 5 points for reporting that 50% of the eggs in their global supply chain were cage-free. In 2022, it was proposed they receive 3 points. It was also proposed that this scale could be adjusted further in future assessments, for welfare topics that are regarded as more mature.

Percentage Impact (Progress) Reported	2022 Points Scale	2021 Points Scale
1-20%	1	1
21-40%	2	3
41-60%	3	5
61-80%	5	7
81-98%	7	9
99-100%	10	10

Eight new questions were proposed to be introduced on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. These followed the same structure as the questions on farm animal welfare, with questions under each pillar of the assessment: *Policy Commitments*; *Governance & Management*; *Targets*; and *Performance Impact*. As previously described, for the purposes of weighting within the overall score, these questions were proposed to be grouped within one *Animal-Sourced Foods* pillar.

The proposed questions on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods assess the following:

- a company's acknowledgement of the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue (Q13 in proposals, Q12 in final criteria);
- policies on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (Q14 in proposals, Q13 in final criteria);
- explanations of the policy scope (Q15 in proposals, Q14 in final criteria);
- board/senior management and operational responsibility for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (Q22 in proposals, Q21 in final criteria);
- customer communications and awareness-raising activities (Q23 in proposals, Q22 in final criteria);
- time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (Q29 in proposals, Q28 in final criteria);
- reporting on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) (Q50 in proposals, Q49 in final criteria);
- reporting on progress towards its targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (Q51 in proposals, Q50 in final criteria).

Eleven questions that previously featured as part of the assessment criteria were proposed to be removed. These were the questions that assessed:

- company commitments to genetic engineering and cloning (Q6 in 2021), due to the need to review developments on this topic that may prove beneficial to animal welfare,
- growth promoting substances (Q7 in 2021), due to the challenge of effectively assessing company positions on this issue,
- explanations of progress on objectives and targets and explanations of progress on welfare outcome measures (Q14 and Q27 in 2021), due to the greater focus being placed on Performance Impact questions,
- research and development and industry initiatives (Q18 in 2021), due to the difficulty of assessing whether these initiatives are advancing animal welfare, and
- the six Performance Reporting questions (Q20-25 in 2021), as these provided potential for double-scoring against the expanded number of Performance Impact questions.

### 2.3.2 Stakeholder Responses

Regarding the addition of new questions within the Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments pillar, the majority of respondents supported the introduction of the question on whether companies have a commitment to not produce or sell foie gras. Queries were raised on the question on commitments to ending the use of other inhumane practices as to how some of the issues covered were to be defined and how this question would apply to all companies given the species-specific issues covered within it.

Feedback on the question on commitments to ending the use of high-performance breeds was largely focused on how this question would be defined across all species.

#### Selected comments:

“We wholeheartedly agree with the proposals to include questions on whether companies have commitments around ending use of inhumane practices. However, it is unclear how companies will be graded on specific questions in this section that are not applicable to them, for example questions on species specific criteria, and therefore how this affects the overall rating for the company. Greater clarity is needed to ensure that businesses will not be downgraded because the question is not applicable to their business.” [UK food company]

“We have concerns with the introduction of the high-performance breeds criteria as the definition is not sufficiently clear and cannot be uniformly applied to all species of farm animal.” [Asia Pacific food company]

“We do not fully agree with Q10 (high performance breeds) as it is not clearly defined which breeds per species are counted as “high performance”. (However, we support projects such as the BCC which defines high performance breeds for Broilers). A clear definition would be needed.” [European food company]

“High-performance breeds: this term is ambiguous and it is unclear where “high performance” begins and ends, and companies are unlikely to make a commitment to something that vague. Generally speaking, good performance is a necessity to stay in business as an animal protein producing company.” [North American food company]

Regarding the proposal to expand the question on whether companies have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics to also cover metaphylactic use, feedback expressed concern as to how this supported farm animal welfare.

#### **Selected comments:**

“While routine metaphylaxis should never be a preferred approach, to suggest that metaphylaxis is and of itself poor practice seems to be at odds with received veterinary opinion. If a disease condition is present in an animal group sharing a common environment, then: where isolation of the individual is contrary to good welfare practice or logistically impossible (e.g. poultry and farmed fin fish); and presence of the disease in the individual represents a significant cohort risk; then a failure to treat at group level could compromise animal welfare or ultimately lead to more individual treatment occasions. As a business we would never endorse a complete prohibition on metaphylaxis where clinical presentation clearly evidenced a treatment need.” [European food company]

“We firmly disagree with this proposal. For animals housed in groups where individual animal treatment is not possible (e.g., chickens), metaphylactic treatment is critical for disease control and to prevent further animal welfare issues. To suggest that companies should commit to no metaphylactic use is to suggest that companies should just let animals become sick and suffer, as opposed to intervening to protect their welfare. It is the veterinarian’s responsibility to decide when metaphylaxis is a judicious and appropriate use of antibiotics and should not be a blanket determination made by a company.” [North American food company]

“While [our organisation] is fully supportive of the need to eliminate any routine preventative use of antibiotics, attempting to achieve this outcome through the banning of all prophylactic and (especially) metaphylactic treatments at best, places organisations participating in BFAW in direct conflict with scientific and veterinary best practice, and at worst, poses a material risk to farm animal welfare.” [UK non-governmental organisation]

“Whilst [our organisation] does not support routine prophylactic use of antibiotics it does have concerns with your proposal to end / restrict metaphylactic use. This has a serious risk of negatively affecting animal welfare. [...] To prevent this use of antibiotics in the presence of diseased animals would potentially lead to serious negative welfare outcomes which would appear counter-productive to the objective of the Benchmark concept.” [UK non-governmental organisation]

The consultation responses supported the proposal to add a new sub-question on whether companies describe how they use welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in their operations or supply chain. Similarly, there was majority support for the proposal to add new questions on whether companies have clear, time-bound targets for specific welfare improvements for laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cows.

The addition of new species-specific Performance Impact questions, covering beef cattle and farmed salmon, in addition to laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cattle (resulting in

three questions per species) was supported. However, some feedback was concerned with the challenge of collecting data for some of the specific issues covered by the new questions.

#### **Selected comments:**

“This [question on disbudding/dehorning for beef cattle] shows a lack of understanding of beef supply chains and how cattle move within them, alongside the issue of practicality of collecting data in a robust way, outside of possibly integrated beef schemes or where standards prohibit. For data collection purposes for beef, which are typically less integrated, it makes sense to collect measures at the slaughter plant for animals coming into supply, how do BBFAW propose that slaughter plant staff differentiate between polled and disbudded cattle or are you expecting assumptions based on breed? In either case we would be concerned over the ability for companies to accurately report. In addition to this disbudding cattle can help prevent harm both to the animals and people working with them. This measure also does not take into account good practice approaches around the use of anaesthetic and long-acting pain relief (i.e. use of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory).” [Asia Pacific food company]

“Whilst I understand and support the principle of reducing the reliance on husbandry procedures / mutilations to help animals fit our production systems, disbudding/dehorning seems to be an odd choice. The practice does not seem to be excluded by law or assurance schemes. There is currently no reliable, transferable record of disbudding. Whilst assessing horns at a slaughterhouse, I am not sure what level of additional procedure would be needed to ascertain whether the lack of horns was due to polled breeding or disbudding.” [UK industry consultant]

Feedback on the proposal to adjust the scoring of the Performance Impact questions to make the points scale exponential rather than linear was mixed.

#### **Selected comments:**

“We believe that the linear scale is fairer at this moment, especially in this moment of [also increasing] the weight of the performance impact pillar.” [Latin American food company]

“We agree with the points distribution regarding the first 60%. However, we consider the remaining 40% (from 60-100%) to be divided too strict. We criticize the division of the last percent as too harsh. If you have already achieved 98%, which we consider to be already very successful, you are still missing 1/3 of the points. This should be looked at more realistically. The last percent often entails an enormous effort. Therefore, we suggest that the last 5% should make up a third of the points. Or alternatively, the points should be awarded a little less strictly in the last percent.” [European food company]

“This does not incentivise those companies that are on a journey of recording and reporting. It can be argued that going from ‘zero visibility’ of compliance to any degree of reporting is the hardest step which should be encouraged. Moving to an exponential scoring system does nothing to incentivise businesses at lower end of reporting/visibility scale or when attempting to establish reporting in a minority species scope.” [UK food company]

The proposal to introduce the eight new questions on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods was not supported by the majority of companies. However, other feedback indicated support for the proposed approach.

#### **Selected comments:**

“We agree with the addition of questions on reducing the reliance on animal-sourced foods but would have preferred to see a lower weighting than the proposed 9% in the first year to enable businesses to develop their monitoring and reporting systems.” [UK food company]

“We are deeply concerned about BBFAW’s new direction. Fundamentally, this move would attempt to reduce protein production overall, which is beyond the scope of BBFAW’s mission to improve animal welfare. Rather than promoting the best possible production systems for welfare, it’s moving to minimize the size of the industry. It seems like a fundamental change in philosophy – that animal agriculture ought to be phased out.” [North American food company]

“The BBFAW assessment is designed to measure a business against their animal welfare practices. Decreasing reliance on animal-sourced ingredients within our supply chain will not necessarily ensure an increased animal welfare for those animals still being farmed for food sources. We have concerns that the introduction of the animal-sourced foods pillar will also penalise companies that have made efforts to develop and expand their plant-based products range. Under the pillar as it stands, there is no recognition for businesses who have made investments into plant-based ranges. The criteria only focuses on reducing animal-sourced foods, which [...] is incredibly challenging for businesses to change consumers’ behaviour.” [UK food company]

“The consultation document indicates that the BBFAW Partners consider reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods to be an ‘allied issue’ to that of farm animal welfare. However, it is unclear how reducing the proportion of foods from animal sources will directly lead to improvements welfare outcomes for the remaining farmed animals.” [Asia Pacific food company]

“One suggestion is that these questions should focus on increased share of alternative proteins, as opposed to reduction of animal protein. In general, companies are expected to keep growing, so even a relative reduction may lead to absolute growth.” [North American food company]

“We agree with the proposal for questions on reducing reliance on animal sourced foods based on the reasoning provided in the consultation paper” [North American investor]

The proposal to remove the eleven questions that previously featured as part of the assessment criteria was largely supported, but there were calls for specific questions to be retained, in particular the question on company involvement in research and development activities.

### Selected comments:

“We object to removing the research and development and industry initiatives question (Q18 in 2021). Scientific research, commercial research and industry initiatives are crucial to improving welfare. Increasingly, customers want to ensure the food they purchase is sustainable for people, the planet and animal care. Multi-stakeholder groups that span the entire supply chain – from farm to fork – can be difference-makers in continuous improvement. BBFAW should want to encourage such work, as well as the focus on research and development. This work requires time and resources, and companies should be recognized for this leadership.” [North American food company]

“We believe that the question on research and development and industry initiatives is valuable to track the direction of travel for industry and demonstrates the value that companies place on driving the sector forward.” [UK non-governmental organisation]

### 2.3.3 Our Planned Actions

It is acknowledged that some of the proposed changes and new additions to the assessment criteria may, at least for now, be challenging to achieve. However, the new criteria reflect the importance of these issues to animal welfare and the BBFAW Partners, and the expected direction of travel over coming years.

BBFAW will proceed with the proposal to add new questions on whether companies have commitments to not produce or sell foie gras (Q11 in proposals, Q10 in final criteria) and to ending the use of other inhumane practices (Q12 in proposals, Q11 in final criteria). In response to queries on how the question on ending the use of other inhumane practices applies to companies with limited species in their supply chain, only the issues relevant to species within a company’s supply chain will be assessed.

It has been decided to pause plans for introducing the proposed new question on whether companies have commitments to ending the use of high-performance breeds (Q10 in proposals). It is acknowledged that further definition is required to be able to adequately assess this question for all species. The BBFAW Secretariat will develop a proposal for consulting relevant stakeholders on this topic in the coming months and will invite stakeholders to participate in a working group process to further define this question before its introduction to the assessment criteria.

Regarding the proposal to expand the question on whether companies have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics to also cover metaphylactic use (Q7), the feedback highlighted the need for an important clarification to the wording of the question. The question has been amended to “Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic and **routine** metaphylactic use of antibiotics for all species?”, to make clear the objective is in line with the new European Union legislation on antibiotic use<sup>1</sup>. The explanatory notes for this question have also been amended to explain that partial points may be awarded for commitments focused on prophylactic use, in the absence of a commitment on routine metaphylactic use.

BBFAW will proceed with the proposal to add a new sub-question on whether companies describe how they use welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement (Q19a

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulation (EU) 2019/6 on veterinary medicinal products and repealing Directive 2001/82/EC

in proposals, Q18a in final criteria), and the proposal to add new questions on whether companies have clear, time-bound targets for specific welfare improvements for laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cows (Q24-28 in proposals, Q23-27 in final criteria).

BBFAW will also proceed with the proposal to add new species-specific Performance Impact questions. However, we acknowledge the feedback on the challenge of collecting data for some of the issues covered by the new questions and anticipate that it will take at least two to three years before we start to see improvements in performance being reported.

In response to specific feedback regarding the questions on disbudding/dehorning for dairy cows and beef cattle (Q41 and Q44 in proposals, Q40 and Q43 in final criteria), we have added a point to the explanatory notes stating: “Reporting related to the proportion of polled breed animals in the company’s global supply chain will also be taken into account.”

BBFAW will proceed with the proposal to adjust the scoring of the Performance Impact questions to make the points scale exponential rather than linear. Whilst the feedback on this proposal was mixed, the focus of much concern was on the impact of the changes on incentivising lower levels of performance improvement. However, as shown in the table in section 2.3.1, the change in points awarded for Performance Impact from 1-20% remains unchanged and, for 21-40%, is reduced by just one point.

We acknowledge the strength of concern expressed by many food companies in the feedback to the proposals to introduce the eight new questions on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. In response to some of the specific points raised, it is important to note that BBFAW does not have an objective to work towards the phase out of livestock in food supply chains. BBFAW remains focused on the issue of farm animal welfare but is aware that it needs to recognise the context within which improvements in animal welfare lie.

The BBFAW recognises that animal welfare is not managed in isolation, and that food companies are constrained by the need to balance the need to improve the welfare of animals against other sustainability priorities. These include the need to reduce absolute carbon emissions as well as other greenhouse gas emissions, to minimise the use of natural resources, and to protect biodiversity. Moreover, with an estimated 80 billion animals being farmed for food every year<sup>2</sup>, the ability to improve the welfare of farm animals is limited by the mainly intensive systems in which they are produced. The BBFAW Partners want to see improvements in the standards of welfare for all animals raised for food and acknowledge the outcome of studies<sup>3</sup> that indicate that the only way this will be possible within a resource-restricted world is if this is coupled with a reduction in the consumption of animal-sourced foods.

Based on the feedback received, we have made a number of significant changes to the Animal Sourced Foods questions to enable points to be awarded for company policies, management processes and reporting focused on protein diversification. Six of these questions (Q14, 15, 22, 23, 29 and 51 in proposals, Q13, 14, 21, 22, 28 and 50 in final criteria) now recognise reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation, changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation). The number of points to be awarded for evidence related to protein

---

<sup>2</sup> UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) statistics. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QA>

<sup>3</sup> Willett W, Rockström J, Loken B et al (2019) Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *Lancet* 393(10170) 447–492; Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K. et al. A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature* 461, 472–475 (2009), et al.

diversification in the 2022 benchmark is set out in Appendix III. The scoring of evidence related to protein diversification may be revised following a review of the BBFAW 2022 data.

Another change in response to feedback on the proposals is that the question “Does the company report on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs)?” (Q50 in proposals, Q49 in final criteria) has been moved to the Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact section and changed to “Does the company report on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production?” This question is now looking for companies to provide greater transparency of the extent to which the company is reliant on animal-sourced foods and/or supporting higher welfare production. Volumes may be reported as numbers of animals and companies can report volumes in the context of overall volumes, i.e., to demonstrate a relative reduction in the case of a growing business.

Finally, BBFAW will proceed with the proposal to remove the eleven questions that previously featured as part of the assessment criteria.

We note the feedback received on the eleven questions to be removed and, in particular, agree that company involvement in research and development activities is important. However, it remains that it is often difficult in the course of an assessment on publicly available information to assess adequately the degree to which animal welfare features in specific research and development activities.

## 2.4 Wider Benchmark Revisions

### 2.4.1 BBFAW’s Proposals

The proposed BBFAW 2022 assessment criteria contained 51 questions with a maximum of 435 points available, compared to 37 questions and a maximum of 305 points in 2021. The scale of the proposed changes to the assessment criteria and the weighting of the assessment pillars is sufficiently large that it would not be possible to draw meaningful comparisons between company scores under the 2021 and 2022 assessment criteria.

#### Summary of proposals:

- BBFAW sought feedback on how to communicate the benchmark results. One option proposed was to not publish a named ranking of companies following the 2022 company assessments, in order to provide time for companies to understand how they perform under the new assessment criteria.

Given the scale of the proposed changes to the criteria, we sought feedback on how to communicate the benchmark results whilst avoiding drawing comparison between company scores under the 2021 and 2022 assessment criteria.

One option proposed was to not publish a named ranking of companies following the 2022 company assessments, in order to provide time for companies to fully understand how they perform under the new assessment criteria and respond accordingly. Under this proposal,

companies would still receive a confidential report on their assessment, including their overall score and how they rank within the full scope of companies and by sub-sector.

We are keen to continually evolve our approach to evaluating and reporting on the state of farm animal welfare management and reporting across the global food industry. As such, we invited suggestions as to how we could further develop our methodology and our reporting to remain relevant to developments taking place in the marketplace, to reflect best practice in the welfare of animals farmed for food and to maximise the Benchmark's usefulness to investors, to companies and to other stakeholders.

### 2.4.2 Stakeholder Responses

Feedback received from food companies was strongly in favour of not publishing a named ranking of companies following the 2022 company assessments, noting, in particular, the short timeframe between the consultation and assessments limiting companies' ability to respond accordingly. Investor and NGO responses were more mixed, but still a majority of respondents were in favour of not producing a named ranking in 2022.

#### Selected comments:

"As supply chains are complex, and collaboration with suppliers is crucial to drive performance and impact, we will need to understand the status of the new measures and reports requested under the new benchmark before we can make any commitments. We therefore strongly support that the April benchmark is not published and results shared with [benchmarked companies] only." [UK food company]

"Given the substantial revisions to the Benchmark methodology, we support the option of not publishing a named ranking of companies based on the 2022 company assessments. This determination is based, in part, on our assumption that the revised methodology and pillar weightings will result in a concentration of companies in the lowest tiers of the Benchmark. Such an outcome would be of only modest use to investors who utilize the benchmark to assess the relative animal welfare policies, targets, and performance of portfolio holdings. Although we question how significantly the companies in scope will be able to amend disclosures to meaningfully improve in the 2023 company assessments, we believe that providing this grace period may serve to enhance company buy-in with BFAW and the methodology changes." [North American investor]

"We would strongly encourage that you provide a named ranking to investor signatories to enable us to engage ahead of the April 2024 report. That would prevent worries from the companies about being 'named and shamed' but also provide some accountability and encourage improvement, particularly among laggards." [UK investor]

"It makes sense as a strategy [to not publish a named ranking] if ultimately you want to work with industry and not directly against it." [North American NGO]

We received various suggestions for how to communicate the 2022 benchmark results whilst avoiding drawing comparison between company scores under the 2021 and 2022 assessment criteria.

### **Selected comments:**

“It is unavoidable that comparisons between the 2021 and 2022 assessments will occur. We would ask BBFAW to provide clear public guidance that such comparisons are inappropriate.” [UK food company]

“Ideally, the 2022 result should not be released, as companies will not have enough time to adapt communication, nor to align new possible commitments suggested by the instrument.” [Latin American food company]

“We suggest BBFAW archive references to the previous methodology outcomes, and when results for 2023 benchmark are made public, have these on a separate page but with no indication of whether a company score has dropped or improved.” [Asia Pacific food company]

“Although we believe it may be impossible to prevent all stakeholders from attempting to draw comparisons, highlighting any methodological changes at the beginning of the Benchmark report – and explicitly stating that comparisons are not possible – is likely the most effective approach.” [North American investor]

We received further comments on how the Benchmark and the criteria review process could be improved. Common themes, beyond those already summarised, included concerns about the scale and pace of the changes proposed.

### **Selected comments:**

“Despite recognising the need for evaluation methodologies to improve over time, it is also important to ensure that direction and overall targets are consistent through time, allowing companies to evolve and be evaluated in that progress. Extensive and regular methodology changes can hinder this comparison.” [Latin American food company]

“We welcome the “relaunch” of BBFAW, as it does need to keep moving forwards. However, we feel there needs to be minimal change over the next 10 years. Constantly moving the goalposts can be many things – frustrating, demotivating, disengaging – because as you know driving change for farm animal welfare takes a long time to build momentum. You have set some extremely challenging targets, and these will help companies focus their efforts on priority issues, but these take a long time to see fruition. Therefore while we accept there will be some tweaks along the way, we suggest you use this review to make most of the major changes in one go, reset baselines, then not mess with it too much to allow companies time to improve and get the recognition for putting in the work.” [UK food company]

### **2.4.3 Our Planned Actions**

The final BBFAW 2022 assessment criteria, detailed in Appendix III, contain 50 questions with a maximum of 430 points available.

The BBFAW Partners acknowledge the short timeframe between the BBFAW 2022 consultation and the subsequent company assessments, due to start on the 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2023. They also recognise the scale of change between the BBFAW 2021 and 2022 assessment

criteria. Both factors present challenges for companies looking to respond to the new criteria through changes to their policies and reporting.

For this reason, it has been decided that the BBFAW 2022 company assessments will be positioned as a pilot of the new criteria. This will provide opportunity for any issues with the new assessment criteria to be identified and rectified in advance of the 2023 benchmark later this year. The pilot will also provide an opportunity for companies to receive feedback on their score under the new criteria, with time for them to prepare for the BBFAW 2023 assessments starting in October 2023. Individual company summary and question-by-question reports will be produced and shared with companies as usual, detailing company scores under the new criteria and highlighting individual strengths, weaknesses and recommendations.

Importantly, following the BBFAW 2022 company assessments we will not be publishing the usual public Benchmark report. A briefing paper will be produced which will include a commentary on the assessments and confirm the evaluation approach for the BBFAW 2023 assessments but this will not include an analysis of the data or a ranking of companies. The briefing paper will set out, for example, any revision to the number of points to be awarded for evidence related to protein diversification on the Animal Sourced Foods questions. The results of the BBFAW 2023 company assessments will be published in full, including a ranking of companies, in April 2024.

We appreciate the many further suggestions provided, not all of which have been possible to summarise within this report. We will reflect on these, and the other suggestions provided in individual discussion with stakeholders and during the webinars, as we evolve the Benchmark in future years.

### 3. Closing Remarks

We are extremely grateful for the feedback received in response to the 2022 consultation. We would also like to thank the companies, investors and other stakeholders that have engaged with the BBFAW programme over the last year. The annual public consultation forms an integral part of our Benchmark cycle and the feedback received to this consultation has played an important role in helping to refine the 2022 Benchmark to ensure that it remains relevant and credible and continues its role as a key driver of change in investment and corporate practice on farm animal welfare.

The BBFAW partners, Compassion in World Farming and FOUR PAWS, and the Secretariat would like to thank the organisations that took the time to respond to our 2022 public consultation, and we look forward to continued engagement with all stakeholders as we further develop the Benchmark.

# Appendix I: Proposed company scope

N.B. Changes from 2021 are shown in red.

	Company	Ownership	ICB classification	Country of origin / incorporation
1.	Aeon Group	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Japan
2.	Ahold Delhaize	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Netherlands
3.	Albertsons	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
4.	Aldi Nord (Aldi Markt)	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
5.	Aldi Sud/Aldi Einkauf SE & Co. oHG	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
6.	Amazon/Whole Foods Market	Public	5337: Food Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
7.	Auchan Holdings	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
8.	Bellis Topco Ltd./Asda	Private	5337: Food Retailers & Wholesalers	UK
9.	BJ's Wholesale Club Holdings	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
10.	C&S Wholesale	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
11.	Carrefour SA	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
12.	Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
13.	Cencosud	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Chile
14.	China Resources Vanguard	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	China
15.	Coles Group	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
16.	Colruyt	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Belgium
17.	Conad Consorzio Nazionale	Cooperative	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Italy
18.	(The) Co-op (UK)	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
19.	Coopérative U Enseigne	Cooperative	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	France
20.	Coop Group (Switzerland)/Coop Genossenschaft	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland

21.	Coop Italia	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Italy
22.	Costco Wholesale Corp	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
23.	Couche-Tard	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Canada
24.	E Leclerc	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
25.	Edeka Group	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
26.	Empire Company/Sobey's	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Canada
27.	H E Butt Company	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	USA
28.	ICA Gruppen AB	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Sweden
29.	IKEA (Inter IKEA Group)	Private	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Sweden
30.	J Sainsbury PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
31.	Jeronimo Martins	Public	5337: Retailers & Wholesalers	Portugal
32.	(The) Kroger Company	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
33.	Les Mousquetaires	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	France
34.	Lianhua Supermarket Holdings Co	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	China
	<del>Lidl Stiftung &amp; Co KG</del>	<del>Private</del>	<del>5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers</del>	<del>Germany</del>
35.	Loblaw Companies Ltd	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Canada
36.	Marks & Spencer PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
37.	Mercadona SA	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Spain
38.	Metro AG	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
39.	<del>Metro Inc</del>	<del>Public</del>	<del>5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers</del>	<del>Canada</del>
40.	Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Switzerland
41.	Publix Super Markets Inc	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
42.	Rewe Group	Cooperative	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany
43.	Schwarz Unternehmens Treuhand KG	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Germany

44.	Seven & i Holdings	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Japan
45.	SPAR Holding AG	Private	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Netherlands
46.	Sysco Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
47.	Target Corporation	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
48.	Tesco PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
49.	UNFI	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
50.	Waitrose	Partnership	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
51.	Walmart Inc	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	USA
52.	Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	UK
53.	Woolworths Limited	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Australia
54.	Yonghui Superstores	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	China
55.	Aramark Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
56.	Autogrill SpA	Joint Stock	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
57.	Bloomin' Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
58.	Camst – La Ristorazione Italiana Soc. Coop. ARL	Cooperative	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
59.	Chick-Fil-A	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
60.	Chipotle Mexican Grill	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
61.	CKE Restaurants	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
	CNHLS	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	China
62.	Compass Group PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
63.	Cracker Barrel	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
64.	Cremonini SpA	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Italy
65.	Darden Restaurants PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
66.	Dico's/Ting Hsin International Group	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	China
67.	Domino's Pizza Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
68.	Elior Group	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
69.	Gategroup Holding AG	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Switzerland
70.	Greggs PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
71.	Habib's	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	Brazil

72.	Inspire Brands Inc (now including Dunkin' Brands)	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
73.	JAB Holding Company	Private	5757: Restaurants & Bars	Luxembourg
74.	JD Wetherspoon PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
75.	McDonald's Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
76.	Mitchells & Butlers PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
77.	Papa John's Pizza	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
78.	Restaurant Brands International	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Canada
79.	Sodexo	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	France
80.	SSP Group Limited	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Sweden
81.	Starbucks Corporation	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
82.	Subway/Doctor's Associates Inc	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
83.	The Cheesecake Factory	Public	5757: Restaurants & Bars	USA
	<del>Umoe Gruppen AS</del>	<del>Public</del>	<del>5757: Restaurants and Bars</del>	<del>Norway</del>
84.	Wendy's Company (The)	Private	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
85.	Whitbread PLC	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	UK
86.	Yum! Brands Inc	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	USA
87.	<del>Yum China Holdings</del>	<del>Public</del>	<del>5757: Restaurants and Bars</del>	<del>China</del>
88.	2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd)	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
89.	Agro Super	Public	3570: Food Producer	Chile
90.	Arla Foods Ltd	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
	<del>Associated British Foods PLC</del>	<del>Public</del>	<del>3570: Food Producer</del>	<del>UK</del>
91.	Barilla SpA	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
92.	<del>Beijing Dabeinong Technology Group Co., Ltd.</del>	<del>Private</del>	<del>3570: Food Producer</del>	<del>China</del>
93.	Bimbo	Public	3570: Food Producer	Mexico
94.	BRF SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
95.	Campbell Soup Company	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
96.	Cargill	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
97.	Charoen Pokphand Foods (CPF)	Private	3570: Food Producer	Thailand
98.	China Yurun Group Limited	Private	3570: Food Producer	China
	<del>Chuying Agro-Pastoral Group</del>	<del>Private</del>	<del>3570: Food Producer</del>	<del>China</del>
99.	ConAgra	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
100.	Cooke Seafood Inc	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA

101.	Cooperativa Centrale Aurora Alimentos	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
102.	Cooperl Arc Atlantique	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
103.	Cranswick PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
104.	Dairy Farmers of America	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	USA
105.	Danish Crown AmbA	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
106.	Ferrero SpA	Joint Stock	3570: Food Producer	Italy
107.	Fonterra	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	New Zealand
108.	General Mills Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
109.	Groupe Danone SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	France
110.	Groupe Lactalis	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
111.	Gruppo Veronesi	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
112.	Hershey Co	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
113.	Hilton Food Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK
114.	Hormel Foods Corporation	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
115.	Industrias Bachoco	Public	3570: Food Producer	Mexico
116.	JBS SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
117.	Kerry Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	Ireland
118.	KraftHeinz	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
119.	LDC Groupe	Private	3570: Food Producer	France
120.	Maple Leaf Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	Canada
121.	Marfrig Global Foods SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
122.	Maruha Nichiro	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
123.	Mars Inc	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
124.	Meiji Holdings	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
125.	Minerva Foods	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
126.	Mondelez International	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
127.	Mowi ASA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Norway
128.	Unternehmensgruppe Theo Müller	Private	3570: Food Producer	Germany
129.	Nestlé SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Switzerland
130.	New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	China
131.	Nippon Ham	Public	3570: Food Producer	Japan
132.	Noble Foods	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
133.	OSI Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
134.	Perdue Farms	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
135.	Plukon Food Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
136.	Premier Foods PLC	Public	3570: Food Producer	UK

137.	Royal FrieslandCampina	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
138.	Saputo Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	Canada
139.	Seaboard Corp	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
140.	Terrena Group	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	France
141.	Tönnies Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Germany
142.	Tyson Foods Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
143.	Unilever NV	Public	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
144.	US Foods	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
145.	Vion Food Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	Netherlands
146.	Wayne-Sanderson Farms	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
147.	Wens Foodstuffs Group	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
148.	WH Group Ltd	Public	3570: Food Producer	China
149.	Yili Group	Public	3570: Food Producer	China
150.	Zhongpin Inc	Public	3570: Food Producer	China/USA

## Appendix II: Weighting of the Assessment Pillars

Pillar	BBFAW 2022	
	No. of Points	Weighting
Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments	59	15%
Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management	56	14%
Farm Animal Welfare Targets	40	7%
Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact*	210	55%
<b>Farm Animal Welfare Total</b>	<b>365</b>	
Animal-Sourced Foods Policy Commitments	25	
Animal-Sourced Foods Governance and Management	20	
Animal-Sourced Foods Targets	10	
Animal-Sourced Foods Performance Impact	10	
<b>Animal-Sourced Foods Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*For the species-specific Performance Impact questions (Q29-46), we will only assess those questions that are relevant to the company. We will assess relevant questions and use the average scores to calculate the overall score for these questions.*

# Appendix III: 2022 Benchmark assessment criteria

## Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments

<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 relevant 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. Recognising animals as sentient beings provides a strong foundation for animal welfare policies.	
<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.	2.5
	The company identifies farm animal welfare as a relevant business issue and recognises farm animals as sentient beings.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for an acknowledgement by the parent company that farm animal welfare is a relevant business issue and that farm animals are sentient beings.</li> <li>• Companies that publish policies that address farm animal welfare, even if they do not explain why this is relevant to the business, are awarded points.</li> <li>• Companies that acknowledge farm animal welfare as a relevant business issue and/or set out the reasons why it might be a business issue (e.g. because of public or customer concerns, security and sustainability of supply, cost, etc.) are awarded points.</li> <li>• Maximum points are awarded to companies that also recognise farm animals as sentient beings.</li> <li>• The score does not take account of the importance assigned by companies to farm animal welfare (e.g. relative to other corporate responsibility issues).</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 2.</b>	<b>Does the company publish an overarching 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 within a policy statement (or equivalent).	2.5
	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.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment does not differentiate between companies that publish stand-alone farm animal welfare policies and companies that incorporate farm animal welfare into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice.</li> <li>• Companies that publish a clear statement of commitment to farm animal welfare that provides a starting point for the company's accountability to its stakeholders are awarded a score of 2.5 points.</li> <li>• Policies issued by company subsidiaries are not considered as overarching policies, and companies with such policies but no overarching (i.e. at the parent company level) policy are therefore not awarded points for this question. These policies are considered when deciding whether to award points for Questions 1, 4-11, 23-28 and 29-48.</li> <li>• Policies focused on specific farm animal welfare issues (e.g. antibiotics where farm animal welfare is mentioned in passing) are not considered as overarching policies. Companies with such policies but no overarching policy on farm animal welfare are therefore not awarded points for this question. These policies are considered when deciding whether to award points for Questions 1, 4-11, 23-28 and 29-48.</li> <li>• Companies that supplement these commitments or principles with details of how these are to be implemented are awarded a score of 5 points. To score maximum points, company farm animal welfare policies need to include most/all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— A clear statement of the reasons why farm animal welfare is important to the business (including both the business case and the ethical case for action)</li> <li>— A clear position regarding expected standards of farm animal welfare</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— A description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy is effectively implemented (e.g. senior management oversight, commitments to continuous improvement, performance monitoring, corrective action if the policy is not being effectively implemented)</li> <li>— A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 3.</b>	<b>Does the farm animal welfare policy 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.	1.5
	Scope is universal across all geographies.	3
<i>3b. Species scope</i>		
	Species scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified species.	1.5
	Scope is universal across all relevant species.	3
<i>3c. Product scope</i>		
	Product scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified products (such as own-brand products).	1.5
	Scope is universal across own brand and other brand products.	3
	<b>(Max Score 9)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only scored if marks have been awarded for Question 2, i.e. when the company has a published farm animal welfare policy.</li> <li>• The sub-questions on geography, species and products are scored separately (i.e. companies could score up to 3 points in each of the three sub-questions, and the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores awarded for the other sub-questions).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market, across species and across product ranges. Companies are given</li> </ul>	

	<p>credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their farm animal welfare policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> <li>• In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 3 points for these sub-questions. When unclear, we ask 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 do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish. If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only partial points are awarded for the species-part of the question.</li> <li>• We define finfish aquaculture as the breeding, rearing and harvesting of aquatic vertebrates (i.e. cold blooded animals with a bony or cartilaginous skeleton and a segmented spinal column) in all types of water environment enclosures, including ponds, rivers, lakes and the ocean.</li> <li>• We do not consider policies for finfish that focus on conservation or sustainable fishing, unless there is an explicit reference to animal welfare within these.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 4.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of close confinement for all species?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Many of the most significant farm animal welfare concerns result from close confinement practices (e.g. cages (battery, enriched/colony and combination/limited access systems) for laying hens; cages for rabbits and other poultry; gestation/sow stalls and farrowing crates for sows; concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs or feedlots) for beef cattle; permanent housing for dairy cows and beef cattle; single penning, tethering, veal crates for young ruminants; force-feeding systems; and, for finfish, recirculating aquaculture systems and close confinement of solitary finfish species, e.g. turbot) or from high stocking densities. 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>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5

	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
		<b>(Max Score 5)</b>
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Companies that simply mention they avoid close confinement but do not state the specific confinement to be avoided receive zero points.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their policies.</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> <li>• In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points. When unclear, we ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks.</li> <li>• Regarding gestation/sow stalls, this question is looking for commitments that do not allow any time in stalls, except for a maximum of 4 hours for management purposes. Companies are expected to state the maximum time permitted within their policies and reporting.</li> <li>• Regarding CAFOs and feedlots, these are defined as systems in which beef cattle are kept at high stocking densities, indoors on fully slatted or solid floors, or outdoors, and there is no opportunity for grazing, instead, feed is brought to the animals.</li> <li>• For companies involved in or using the products from finfish aquaculture, we do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish.</li> </ul>	

	If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only partial points are awarded.
--	---

<b>Question 5.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to the provision of effective, species-specific enrichment for all species?</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; for fish, physical enrichment such as (artificial) plants, floor substrates and structures, as well as sensory enrichment, such as cover or lighting, or occupational enrichment such as currents or water flow to induce swimming exercise. 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. See the BBFAW briefing paper on environmental enrichment for further guidance on suitable forms of enrichment per species.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Companies that simply mention they provide environmental enrichment but do not state the specific environmental enrichment to be provided, receive zero points.</li> <li>• 'Enriched' cages are not awarded points.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their policies.</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> <li>• In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points. When unclear, we ask 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 do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish. If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 6.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of routine mutilations for all species?</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 and any type of flight restraint in poultry, branding with hot irons, as well as disbudding/dehorning of ruminants and tail docking and castration in ruminants and pigs (surgical, rubber rings or clamping), tooth resection in pigs, and fin clipping in finfish aquaculture.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Companies that simply mention they avoid routine mutilations, but do not state the specific mutilations to be avoided, receive zero points.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) mutilations are still commonly performed under derogations (c) a</li> </ul>	

	<p>commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their policies.</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> <li>• In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points. When unclear, we ask 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 do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish. If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 7.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic and routine metaphylactic use of antibiotics for all species?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>Prophylaxis is the treatment of animals without clinical sign of disease. Metaphylaxis is the treatment of a group of animals when some within the group are showing clinical signs of disease.</p> <p>The over-use of antibiotics in humans and in animals is directly linked to the increase in antibiotic resistance. The use of antibiotics on-farm (typically through feed or water) is frequently prophylactic or metaphylactic; 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. 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. Points are not awarded for supply chains marketed as antibiotic-free, e.g., 'no antibiotics ever' due</p>

	to the incentive this creates to withhold antibiotics from animals in need of treatment.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their policies.</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> <li>• Partial points may be awarded for commitments focused on prophylactic use in the absence of a commitment on routine metaphylactic use.</li> <li>• In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points. When unclear, we ask 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 do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish.</li> </ul>	

	If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only partial points are awarded.
--	---

<b>Question 8.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to ending long-distance live transport for all species?</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; less than 4 hours for poultry and rabbits, and less than 8 hours for other species. Unweaned animals, heavily pregnant animals and animals unfit for transport should not be transported. Transport of animals exceeding these limits, including loading and 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>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their policies.</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or</li> </ul>	

	<p>own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points. When unclear, we ask 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 do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish. If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 9.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to the use of humane methods of pre-slaughter stunning for all species?</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. For poultry, controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion, should be used. For pigs, this question is looking for commitments to end the use of high concentration CO2 gas systems. For salmon and trout, this question is looking for commitments to use percussion or electrical methods. For other fish this question is looking for commitments to end the use of ice slurry.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made</li> </ul>	

	<p>explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their policies.</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> <li>• In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points. When unclear, we ask 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 do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish. If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only partial points are awarded.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 10.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment not to produce or sell foie gras?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Welfare issues associated with the production of foie gras include over-feeding, force-feeding (gavage) and the close confinement of ducks and geese within cages.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• This question is assessed for all companies, not only those that have ducks or geese in their supply chains.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. 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</li> </ul>	

	<p>that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• Partial policies, which are limited to certain species, products or geographies, are not awarded points.</li> <li>• In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points. When unclear, we ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 11.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of other inhumane practices?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Practices covered by this question include the culling of day-old male chicks in egg supply chains; cow-calf separation; fully slatted flooring; and live plucking or live harvesting for geese.	
<b>Scoring</b>	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question may be scored even if marks have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.</li> <li>• This question is assessed for companies that have laying hens, pigs, dairy cattle, beef cattle, rabbits, ducks or geese in their supply chains.</li> <li>• Acceptable alternative practices to the culling of day-old male chicks include the use of in-ovo sexing methods and the use of dual-purpose breeds.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the issues in question. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that specifies any of these issues is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the issue in question is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their policies.</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> <li>• In some cases, companies use terms such as 'all animals' or 'all products'. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points. When unclear, we ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks.</li> </ul>
--	---

### Animal-Sourced Foods Policy Commitments

<b>Question 12.</b>	<b>Does the company acknowledge the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, which may be achieved directly or through protein diversification, is key to ensuring that all animals farmed for food are able to be produced in high welfare systems capable of delivering a good quality of life, and that the food system contributes to planetary and human health. It is good practice for food companies to identify whether and why this is a relevant issue for the business.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is regarded as a relevant business issue.	0
	The company identifies reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods as a relevant business issue.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking for an acknowledgement by the parent company that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue.</li> <li>• Companies that publish policies that address reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, even if they do not explain why this is relevant to the business, are awarded points.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Companies that acknowledge reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods as a relevant business issue and/or set out the reasons why it may be a business issue (e.g. because of public or customer concerns, security and sustainability of supply, cost, etc.) are awarded points.</li> <li>The score does not take account of the importance assigned by companies to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (e.g. relative to other corporate responsibility issues).</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 13.</b>	<b>Does the company publish an overarching policy (or equivalent) on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	It is good practice for companies to formalise their approach to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods in a policy (or equivalent document such as a statement of guiding principles, a code of practice or a sourcing charter). Reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation, changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation). While the existence of a policy may not provide a guarantee of implementation, the absence of a policy is a clear sign that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is not firmly on the business agenda.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence of a formal policy statement (or equivalent) on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	0
	The company has a broad commitment to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods within a policy statement (or equivalent).	5
	The company has a broad commitment to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods 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 does not differentiate between companies that publish stand-alone policies on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods and companies that incorporate reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice.</li> <li>Companies that publish a clear statement of commitment to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods that provides a starting point for the company's accountability to its stakeholders are awarded points.</li> <li>Policies issued by company subsidiaries are not considered as overarching policies, and companies with such policies but no overarching (i.e. at the parent company level) policy are therefore not awarded points for this question. These policies are considered when deciding whether to award points for Questions 17 and 40.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies that supplement these commitments or principles with details of how these are to be implemented are awarded a score of 10 points. To score maximum points, company policies need to include most/all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— A clear statement of the reasons why reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is important to the business (including both the business case and the ethical case for action).</li> <li>— A description of how reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is to be achieved, such as through protein diversification, product reformulation or communication to consumers</li> <li>— A description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy is effectively implemented (e.g. senior management oversight, commitments to continuous improvement, performance monitoring, corrective action if the policy is not being effectively implemented)</li> <li>— A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Companies that publish a policy that only refers to protein diversification without reference to the need to achieve reductions in consumption of animal-sourced foods will be eligible for a maximum of 5 points on this question.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Question 14.</b>	<b>Does the policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods 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 reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
<i>14a. Geographic scope</i>		
	Geographic scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified geographies.	2.5
	Scope is universal across all geographies.	5
<i>14b. Business division scope</i>		
	Business division scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified business divisions.	2.5
	Scope is universal across all business divisions.	5
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	

<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only scored if marks have been awarded for Question 13, i.e. when the company has a published policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.</li> <li>• The sub-questions on geography and products are scored separately (i.e. companies could score up to 5 points in each of the two sub-questions, and the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores awarded for the other sub-question).</li> <li>• The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market and across business divisions. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their policies.</li> <li>• Companies that publish a policy that only refers to protein diversification without reference to the need to achieve reductions in consumption of animal-sourced foods will be eligible for a maximum of 2.5 points for each element of this question, regardless of whether the specified scope is limited or universal.</li> </ul>
--------------------------	---

## Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management

<b>Question 15.</b>	<b>Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for farm animal welfare?</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 effectively managed.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
	<i>15a. 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>15b. 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 are scored separately (i.e. companies could score 5 points for publishing details of who is responsible for farm animal welfare on a day-to-day basis and 5 points for publishing details of senior management responsibility for overseeing the farm animal welfare policy).</li> <li>For the purposes of scoring on day-to-day responsibility, the question is not looking for named individuals, but evidence of roles with responsibility for farm animal welfare (e.g. a statement that this is the responsibility of a dedicated technical or sourcing manager, or a statement that responsibility is divided among a number of functions, with information on the various roles and responsibilities).</li> <li>For the management oversight sub-question, we recognise that companies may assign responsibility to a named senior person or that farm animal welfare may form part of the remit of a wider sustainability, CSR or sourcing committee. Therefore, 5 points are awarded if the company provides a clear account of board or senior management oversight.</li> <li>For the purposes of scoring, the emphasis is on the management of farm animal welfare. General information on the management or oversight of CSR or sustainability is only credited if it is clear that this includes farm animal welfare.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 16.</b>	<b>Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its farm animal welfare policies are effectively implemented?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	The effective implementation of a 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>16a. 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>16b. 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) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores for the other sub-question).</li> <li>On training, companies are only awarded 5 points if the training provided is aimed at employees and if it explicitly addressed farm animal welfare-related issues.</li> <li>The training question does not address the quality of the training provided, the manner in which skills or competencies are assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provided.</li> <li>On internal controls, companies are only awarded 5 points if they explicitly discussed the actions that they take in relation to employee and/or supplier non-compliance with their farm animal welfare policy, e.g. when audit failures are identified. Descriptions of internal controls in relation to CSR or product quality-related policies are scored zero for this sub-question unless it is clear that these policies and processes also cover farm animal welfare.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 17.</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>17a. 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	1.5
	The company incorporates farm animal welfare into contractual obligations for suppliers across all species, products and geographies.	3

<i>17b. 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.	3
<i>17c. 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.	3
	<b>(Max score 9)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sub-questions (on contracts, auditing and supplier education) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores for the other sub-questions).</li> <li>• On contracts, companies are awarded partial points if they indicated that they included farm animal welfare in contracts but do not indicate whether this applied to all relevant contracts or if they indicated that farm animal welfare is not included in all contracts.</li> <li>• On auditing, companies are only awarded 3 points if it is 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 is clear that these audit processes covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question.</li> <li>• On supplier support and/or education, 3 points are awarded to companies that publish case studies or examples and/or provide a more comprehensive description of their approach. The award of 3 points is 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 is clear that this support also covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 18.</b>	<b>Does the company describe and report on its use of welfare outcome measures (i.e. measures linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?</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 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,

	<p>mental wellbeing and behaviour. There is an increasing focus on positive outcome measures (e.g. active and play behaviour), as well as qualitative Behavioural Assessment (such as animals being content, happy, or fearful, agitated). 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 and cull rates, disease incidence.</li> <li>• For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, feather cleanliness, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter.</li> <li>• For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate, longevity, ease of calving, lesions, swellings, cleanliness, stomach ulcers, acidosis.</li> <li>• For sows: Longevity, lameness, body condition, shoulder and vulva lesions, ear and flank biting.</li> <li>• For pigs: lameness, cleanliness, tail bites, fight marks, bursitis and other lesions.</li> <li>• For broiler chickens: gait score, leg culls, footpad dermatitis, hock burn, breast blisters, feather cleanliness, muscle myopathies.</li> <li>• For beef: body condition, lameness, lesions, swellings, cleanliness, stomach ulcers, acidosis.</li> <li>• For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition.</li> <li>• For fish: fin and body damage, sea lice and other ectoparasite infestations, skeletal deformities, condition factor, mortality and behaviour.</li> <li>• For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort; qualitative behavioural analysis.</li> <li>• For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, bathing (ducks), socialising, swimming (fish).</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>		
	<i>18a. Does the company describe how it uses welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain?</i>	
	No information provided on how the company uses welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain.	0
	The company describes how welfare outcome measures are used to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain.	2
	<i>18b. Does the company report on welfare outcome measures (i.e. measures linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?</i>	
	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 7)</b>	
<p><b>Explanatory Notes</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the sub-question on how welfare outcome measures are used to inform continuous improvement in a company's operations or supply chain, points are awarded to companies that provide a clear description of their approach to using welfare outcome measures. This may include description of how welfare outcome measure data are used to help drive continuous improvement, or as indicators for corrective action.</li> <li>• The sub-question on reporting is looking for explicit, quantitative 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: mortality or 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 in poultry 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 are not awarded for reporting on input-based measures (i.e. measures relating to the type of production system, e.g. caged, barn, free-range, as well as to the practices for transport and slaughter).</li> <li>• Scores are awarded for some health indicators (e.g. somatic cell count and mastitis for dairy cows), as these are often related to high levels of production thereby affecting welfare. Points are not awarded for production measures (e.g. egg output).</li> <li>• Similarly, scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm animal welfare standards but do not report on the welfare outcomes resulting from the implementation of these standards.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 19.</b>	<b>Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Farm assurance schemes provide frameworks and auditing 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
	100% of products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard.	2
	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).	4
	100% of products audited to higher welfare (or company equivalent) assurance standard.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the purposes of this question, we assess farm assurance schemes as either providing a basic or higher standard of animal welfare. Higher welfare schemes include indoor and outdoor (free range, organic) production systems.</li> <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); Best Aquaculture Practice (BAP); Certification de Conformité de Produits; Global Standards; FMI Animal Welfare Standards; GLOBALG.A.P.; North American Meat Institute; Red Tractor Farm Assurance Scheme (standard production), VPF (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 through input requirements, 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. Examples of higher welfare schemes include: Animal Welfare Approved; ABEA levels A, B, C (France), Better Animal Welfare (Denmark); Beter Leven; Certified Humane; European Organic Certification; Global Animal Partnership (GAP 5-Step); KRAV; Neuland; Soil Association Organic; RSPCA Assured; Red Tractor Enhanced Welfare and Free-range; Label Rouge (for poultry, but not pigs).</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies may have developed their own higher welfare standards that they audit their suppliers against. Where this is the case, we need a clear description of how the company standard compares to the relevant basic or higher welfare assurance standards outlined above in order for points to be awarded.</li> <li>• If companies audit against other voluntary schemes that claim to incorporate animal welfare components but without specifying them, they will typically not receive any point, unless they provide a clear description of the farm animal welfare requirements of such standards.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question 20.</b>	<b>Does the company communicate to customers on higher farm animal welfare 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 communicating to customers on higher farm animal welfare.	0
	At least one example of communicating to customers on higher farm animal welfare.	5
	Multiple examples of communicating to customers on higher farm animal welfare.	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 are 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 these issues an integral part of customer communications and engagement.</li> <li>— On-pack or on-shelf labelling – provided this is 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>• Initiatives aimed at showing how products are sourced or produced but without an explicit focus on the welfare of farm animals are not scored in the assessment.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies that produce multiple consumer-facing videos on farm animal welfare are awarded five points, unless it is clear that these are linked to separate consumer engagement programmes or themes.</li> <li>• Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to communicate to consumers.</li> <li>• Social media channels are not separately reviewed, so companies have to link to these channels from their webpages in order to receive points (e.g. for YouTube videos).</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

### Animal-Sourced Foods Governance and Management

<b>Question 21.</b>	<b>Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?</b>	
<i>Rationale</i>	When looking at the management of reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, which may be achieved through protein diversification, both oversight and implementation responsibilities are important. Oversight is necessary to ensure that senior management is aware of the business implications of reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods and is prepared to intervene when needed (e.g. if there are tensions between the organisation's policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods 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 reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. It is, therefore, important that there are individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is implemented and effectively managed.	
<i>Scoring</i>		
<i>21a. Management responsibility</i>		
	No clearly defined management responsibility.	0
	The company has published details of the management position with responsibility for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods on a day-to-day basis.	5
<i>21b. 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 policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	5

	<b>(Max score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question recognises reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation, changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation).</li> <li>• The two sub-questions are scored separately (i.e. companies could score 5 points for publishing details of who is responsible for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods on a day-to-day basis and 5 points for publishing details of senior management responsibility for overseeing the policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods).</li> <li>• For the purposes of scoring on day-to-day responsibility, the question is not looking for named individuals, but evidence of roles with responsibility for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (e.g. a statement that this is the responsibility of a dedicated technical or sourcing manager, or a statement that responsibility is divided among a number of functions, with information on the various roles and responsibilities).</li> <li>• For the management oversight sub-question, we recognise that companies may assign responsibility to a named senior person or that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may form part of the remit of a wider sustainability, CSR or sourcing committee. Therefore, 5 points are awarded if the company provides a clear account of board or senior management oversight.</li> <li>• For the purposes of scoring, the emphasis is on the management of reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. General information on the management or oversight of CSR or sustainability is only credited if it is clear that this includes reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 22.</b>	<b>Does the company communicate to customers on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods through education and/or awareness-raising activities?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies have an important role to play in raising awareness of reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods among their customers and clients. This, in turn, should contribute to shifts in dietary consumption away from animal-sourced foods.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence of communicating to customers on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	0
	At least one example of communicating to customers on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	5
	Multiple examples of communicating to customers on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question recognises reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation,</li> </ul>	

	<p>changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The activities that could be considered in this question are defined broadly. Examples included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The provision of information on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods or protein diversification on the company's website. Note: This is not just about providing information in the corporate responsibility section of the website but making these issues an integral part of customer communications and engagement.</li> <li>○ On-pack or on-shelf labelling – provided this is 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.</li> <li>○ Customer farm visits, seminars or roundtables.</li> <li>○ Social media campaigns.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Initiatives aimed at showing how products are sourced or produced but without an explicit focus on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods are not scored in the assessment.</li> <li>• Companies that produce multiple consumer-facing videos on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods are awarded five points, unless it is clear that these are linked to separate consumer engagement programmes or themes.</li> <li>• Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to communicate to consumers.</li> <li>• Social media channels are not separately reviewed, so companies have to link to these channels from their webpages in order to receive points (e.g. for YouTube videos).</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

**Farm Animal Welfare Targets**

**Laying Hens**

<b>Question 23.</b>	<b>Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of cages (battery and enriched/colony) for laying hens, or provide evidence that this has already been achieved?</b>
---------------------	--

<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has published a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	5
	The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking for a clear target for ending the use of cages (battery and enriched/colony) for laying hens within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved. It is anticipated that this question will expand in scope to also cover combination and limited access systems in future assessments.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of cages. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all close confinement practices, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy on cages are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits cages is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of cages).</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> </ul>	

### Broiler Chickens

<b>Question 24.</b>	<b>Does the company publish a clear target for achieving the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment for broiler chickens as a minimum, or provide evidence that this has already been achieved?</b>
---------------------	--

<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has published a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	5
	The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking for a clear target for achieving the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment or European Chicken Commitment for broiler chickens or evidence that this has already been achieved (see <a href="http://www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/">www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/</a> and <a href="http://www.welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/">www.welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/</a>).</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant practices, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy on the relevant practices are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the relevant practices).</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> </ul>	

## Pigs

<b>Question 25.</b>	<b>Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of gestation/sow stalls for sows, throughout pregnancy and during the observation period, or provide evidence that this has already been achieved?</b>
---------------------	--

<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has published a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	2.5
	The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant 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 is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking for a clear target for ending the use of gestation/sow stalls for sows, throughout pregnancy and during the observation period, within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved.</li> <li>• This question is looking for targets that do not allow any time in stalls, except for a maximum of 4 hours for management purposes. Companies are expected to state the maximum time permitted within their policies and reporting.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of gestation/sow stalls. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all close confinement practices, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy on gestation/sow stalls are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits gestation/sow stalls is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of gestation/sow stalls).</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 26.</b>	<b>Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of farrowing crates for sows, or provide evidence this has already been achieved?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.

<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has published a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	2.5
	The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant 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 is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking for a clear target for ending the use of farrowing crates for sows within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of farrowing crates. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all close confinement practices, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy on farrowing crates are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits farrowing crates is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of farrowing crates).</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> </ul>	

### Dairy Cows

<b>Question 27.</b>	<b>Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of tethering for dairy cows, or provide evidence this has already been achieved?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0

	The company has published a partial time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, and the scope (in terms of geography or products) is clearly defined.	5
	The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking for a clear target for ending the use of tethering for dairy cows within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved.</li> <li>• Simply stating compliance with legislation is not treated as a proxy for having a clear position on the avoidance of tethering. The reasons are (a) legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all close confinement practices, (b) a commitment to compliance with legislation does not provide guarantees on performance in countries where such legislation is absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy on tethering are, therefore, awarded zero points.</li> <li>• Similarly, simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard that prohibits tethering is not treated as a proxy for having a clearly stated position, unless the commitment to avoidance is made explicit (e.g. compliance with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment to the avoidance of tethering).</li> <li>• To qualify for partial points on product scope, policies need to apply to a significant proportion of a company's supply chain, such as a substantial business division (e.g. a restaurant brand or manufacturing division) or own-brand products (in the case of retailers and wholesalers). Policies which apply to limited product ranges are not awarded points.</li> </ul>	

## Animal-Sourced Foods Targets

<b>Question 28.</b>	<b>Has the company set time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of the targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No published time-bound targets.	0
	The company has published a partial time-bound target and the scope (in terms of geography or business division) is clearly defined.	5

	The company has published a universal time-bound target, across all geographies and business divisions.	10
		<b>(Max score 10)</b>
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is looking for evidence of explicit, time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods within a reasonable timeframe.</li> <li>This question recognises reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation, changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation).</li> <li>Companies that publish a target that only refers to protein diversification without reference to the need to achieve reductions in consumption of animal-sourced foods will be eligible for a maximum of 5 points on this question.</li> <li>We do not award points for targets adopted for other purposes (e.g. quality), unless reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is an explicit aim of these targets.</li> <li>For the purposes of scoring, we do not differentiate between targets relating to process (e.g. to formalise management systems, to introduce reporting) and performance (e.g. to achieve a specific reduction).</li> </ul>	

## Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact

### Laying Hens

<b>Question 29.</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>	Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of laying hens is cage-free, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of laying hens is cage-free.	1
	21 – 40% of laying hens is cage-free.	2
	41 – 60% of laying hens is cage-free.	3
	61 – 80% of laying hens is cage-free.	5
	81 – 98% of laying hens is cage-free.	7
	99 – 100% of laying hens is cage-free.	10
		<b>(Max Score 10)</b>

<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain that is cage-free, including battery and enriched/colony cages. It is anticipated that this question will expand in scope to also cover combination and limited access systems in future assessments.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of laying hens affected. Companies that report on the total number of laying hens affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear), are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of laying hens managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our laying hens" or "All laying hens" being cage-free are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our laying hens ...').</li> <li>• We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy-to-understand format and with a clear description of the proportion of the supply chain that this data 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 30.</b>	<b>What proportion of laying hens (for shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients) 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. 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 – 20% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	1
	21 – 40% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	2
	41 – 60% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	3
	61 – 80% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	5
	81 – 98% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	7
	99 – 100% of laying hens is free from beak trimming or tipping.	10

	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain that is free from beak trimming or tipping.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our laying hens" or "All chickens" being free from beak trimming or tipping are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• We expect 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 31.</b>	<b>What proportion of laying hens (for shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	1
	21 – 40% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	2
	41 – 60% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	3
	61 – 80% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	5

	81 – 98% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	7
	99 – 100% of laying hens from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products.</li> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain that is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that report on the proportion of laying hens that is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about "Our laying hens" or "All chickens" being from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>We expect 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>	

## Broiler Chickens

<b>Question 32.</b>	<b>What proportion of broiler chickens (for fresh/frozen chicken products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 30kg/m<sup>2</sup> or 6lbs/sq ft or less)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 30kg/m <sup>2</sup> or 6lbs/sq ft or less). 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 – 20% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	1
	21 – 40% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	2
	41 – 60% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	3
	61 – 80% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	5
	81 – 98% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	7
	99 – 100% of broiler chickens is reared at lower stocking densities.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products.</li> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens in the company's global supply chain that is reared at lower stocking densities, specifically, 30kg/m<sup>2</sup> or 6Lbs/sq ft or less.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of broiler chickens affected. Companies that report on the total number of broiler chickens affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of broiler chickens used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities, but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about "Our broiler chickens" or "All broiler chickens" being reared at lower stocking densities are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that is free from close confinement (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our broiler chickens ...').</li> <li>We expect 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 broiler chickens (for fresh/frozen chicken products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is from approved breeds with improved welfare outcomes or with a slower growth potential)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes or with a slower growth potential. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of products is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential, or no reported information.	0

	1 – 20% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	1
	21 – 40% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	2
	41 – 60% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	3
	61 – 80% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	5
	81 – 98% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	7
	99 – 100% of broiler chickens is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes and with a slower growth potential.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens in the company's global supply chain that is from breeds that meet the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment requirements, with improved welfare outcomes or with a slower growth potential, defined as &lt;40g/d averaged over the growth cycle according to the breeding company specification (see <a href="http://www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/">www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/</a> and <a href="http://www.welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/">www.welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/</a>).</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of broiler chickens affected. Companies that report on the total number of broiler chickens affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of broiler chickens used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes or a slower growth potential but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the breeds with improved welfare outcomes or with slower growth potential in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our broiler chickens" or "All broiler chickens" being from breeds with improved welfare outcomes or a slower growth potential are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens</li> </ul>	

	<p>that is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes or slower growth potential (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our broiler chickens ...').</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where companies report on their own breeds with improved welfare outcomes or 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 or a slower growth potential.</li> <li>• We expect 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 34.</b>	<b>What proportion of broiler chickens (for fresh/frozen chicken products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion. For all companies, this question applies to all products (own-brand and other).	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	1
	21 – 40% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	2
	41 – 60% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	3
	61 – 80% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	5
	81 – 98% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	7
	99 – 100% of broiler chickens is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens in the company's global supply chain that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of broiler chickens affected. Companies that reported on the total number of broiler chickens affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of broiler chickens used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of broiler chickens managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our broiler chickens" or "All broiler chickens" being subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our broiler chickens ...').</li> <li>• We expect 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>
--	---

**Pigs**

<b>Question 35.</b>	<b>What proportion of sows (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from gestation/sow stalls?</b>	
<i>Rationale</i>	Companies should report on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation/sow stalls throughout pregnancy and during the observation period. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<i>Scoring</i>	0% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	1
	21 – 40% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	2

	41 – 60% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	3
	61 – 80% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	5
	81 – 98% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	7
	99 – 100% of sows is free from gestation/sow stalls.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of sows in the company's global supply chain that is free from gestation/sow stalls throughout pregnancy and during the observation period (i.e are group housed from weaning to pre-farrowing).</li> <li>• This question is looking for commitments that do not allow any time in stalls, except for a maximum of 4 hours for management purposes. Companies are expected to state the maximum time permitted within their policies and reporting.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of sows affected. Companies that report on the total number of sows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of sows used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation/sow stalls but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of sows managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation/sow stalls in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our sows" or "All sows" being free from gestation/sow stalls are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation/sow stalls (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our sows...').</li> <li>• We expect 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 36.</b>	<b>What proportion of sows (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from farrowing crates?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of sows that is free from farrowing crates. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of sows is free from farrowing crates, or no reported information.	0

	1 – 20% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	1
	21 – 40% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	2
	41 – 60% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	3
	61 – 80% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	5
	81 – 98% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	7
	99 – 100% of sows is free from farrowing crates.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of sows in the company's global supply chain that is free from farrowing crates.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of sows affected. Companies that report on the total number of sows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of sows used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of sows that is free from farrowing crates but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of sows managed according to particular higher welfare or organic standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of sows that is free from farrowing crates in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our sows" or "All sows" being free from farrowing crates are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of sows that is free from farrowing crates (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our sows...').</li> <li>• We expect 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 37.</b>	<b>What proportion of pigs (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) 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. 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 – 20% of pigs is free from tail docking.	1
	21 – 40% of pigs is free from tail docking.	2
	41 – 60% of pigs is free from tail docking.	3

	61 – 80% of pigs is free from tail docking.	5
	81 – 98% of pigs is free from tail docking.	7
	99 – 100% of pigs is free from tail docking.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of pigs in the company's global supply chain that is free from tail docking.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of pigs affected. Companies that reported on the total number of pigs affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of pigs used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of pigs managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our pigs" or "All pigs" being free from tail docking are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of pigs that are free from tail docking (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our pigs...').</li> <li>• We expect 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>	

## Dairy Cows

<b>Question 38.</b>	<b>What proportion of dairy cattle (for fresh/frozen milk and milk products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from tethering?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from tethering. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of dairy cows is free from tethering, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	1
	21 – 40% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	2
	41 – 60 of dairy cows is free from tethering.	3

	61 – 80% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	5
	81 – 98% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	7
	99 – 100% of dairy cows is free from tethering.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products.</li> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that is free from tethering.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of dairy cows affected. Companies that report on the total number of dairy cows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of dairy cows used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being free from tethering are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from tethering (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our dairy cows...').</li> <li>We expect 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 39.</b>	<b>What proportion of dairy cattle (for fresh/frozen milk and milk products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is provided with pasture access?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is provided with pasture access (at least 6 hours per day for 120 days per year). For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	1
	21 – 40% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	2
	41 – 60 of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	3
	61 – 80% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	5

	81 – 98% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	7
	99 – 100% of dairy cows is provided with pasture access.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products.</li> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that is provided with pasture access for at least 6 hours per day for 120 days per year.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of dairy cows affected. Companies that report on the total number of dairy cows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of dairy cows used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows that is provided with pasture access but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is provided with pasture access in line with these standards.</li> <li>Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being provided with pasture access are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that is provided with pasture access (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our dairy cows...').</li> <li>We expect 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 40.</b>	<b>What proportion of dairy cows (for fresh/frozen milk and milk products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from disbudding/dehorning?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	1
	21 – 40% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	2
	41 – 60% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	3
	61 – 80% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	5

	81 – 98% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	7
	99 – 100% of dairy cows is free from disbudding/dehorning.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that is free from disbudding/dehorning. Reporting related to the proportion of polled breed animals in the company's global supply chain will also be taken into account.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of dairy cows affected. Companies that reported on the total number of dairy cows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of dairy cows used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from disbudding/dehorning but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of dairy cows managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from disbudding/dehorning in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being free from disbudding/dehorning are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from disbudding/dehorning (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our dairy cows ...').</li> <li>• We expect 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>	

### Beef Cattle

<b>Question 41.</b>	<b>What proportion of beef cattle (for fresh/frozen beef products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots, or no reported information.	0

	1 – 20% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	1
	21 – 40% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	2
	41 – 60 of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	3
	61 – 80% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	5
	81 – 98% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	7
	99 – 100% of beef cattle is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell beef or beef-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of beef cattle in the company's global supply chain that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots. CAFOs and feedlots are defined as systems in which beef cattle are kept at high stocking densities, indoors on fully slatted or solid floors, or outdoors, and there is no opportunity for grazing, instead, feed is brought to the animals.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of beef cattle affected. Companies that report on the total number of beef cattle affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of beef cattle used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of beef cattle managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our beef cattle" or "All beef cattle" being free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our beef cattle ...').</li> <li>• We expect 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 42.</b>	<b>What proportion of beef cattle (for fresh/frozen beef products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is group housed throughout rearing?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is group housed throughout rearing, including calves from birth (minimum pairs), calves originating from the dairy supply and veal calves. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.

<b>Scoring</b>	0% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	1
	21 – 40% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	2
	41 – 60% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	3
	61 – 80% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	5
	81 – 98% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	7
	99 – 100% of beef cattle is group housed throughout rearing.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell beef or beef-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of beef cattle in the company's global supply chain that is group housed throughout rearing, including calves from birth (minimum pairs) and calves originating from the dairy supply.</li> <li>• Animals that are diseased or injured may be kept in hospital pens as required to protect the animals' health and welfare.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of beef cattle affected. Companies that reported on the total number of beef cattle affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of beef cattle used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of beef cattle that is group housed throughout rearing but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of beef cattle managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of beef cattle that is group housed throughout rearing in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our beef cattle" or "All beef cattle" being group housed throughout rearing are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of beef cattle that is group housed throughout rearing (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our beef cattle ...').</li> <li>• We expect 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 43.</b>	<b>What proportion of beef cattle (for fresh/frozen beef products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from disbudding/dehorning?</b>
---------------------	--

<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	1
	21 – 40% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	2
	41 – 60% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	3
	61 – 80% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	5
	81 – 98% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	7
	99 – 100% of beef cattle is free from disbudding/dehorning.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell beef or beef-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of beef cattle in the company's global supply chain that is free from disbudding/dehorning. Reporting related to the proportion of polled breed animals in the company's global supply chain will also be taken into account.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of beef cattle affected. Companies that reported on the total number of beef cattle affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of beef cattle used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of beef cattle managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our beef cattle" or "All beef cattle" being free from disbudding/dehorning are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our beef cattle ...').</li> <li>• We expect 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>	

## Farmed Salmon

<b>Question 44.</b>	<b>What proportion of farmed salmon (for fresh/frozen salmon products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 10kg/m<sup>3</sup> or less)?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	1
	21 – 40% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	2
	41 – 60 of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	3
	61 – 80% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	5
	81 – 98% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	7
	99 – 100% of farmed salmon is reared at lower stocking densities.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell farmed salmon or farmed salmon-based products.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon in the company's global supply chain that is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 10kg/m<sup>3</sup> or less).</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of farmed salmon affected. Companies that report on the total number of farmed salmon affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of farmed salmon used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of farmed salmon managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our farmed salmon" or "All farmed salmon" being reared at lower stocking densities are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our farmed salmon ...').</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We expect 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 45.</b>	<b>What proportion of farmed salmon (for fresh/frozen salmon products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	1
	21 – 40% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	2
	41 – 60% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	3
	61 – 80% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	5
	81 – 98% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	7
	99 – 100% of farmed salmon is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell farmed salmon or products containing farmed salmon.</li> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon in the company's global supply chain that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours.</li> <li>Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of farmed salmon affected. Companies that reported on the total number of farmed salmon affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of farmed salmon used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>Companies that report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of farmed salmon managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of farmed salmon</li> </ul>	

	<p>that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours in line with these standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies that make general statements about “Our farmed salmon” or “All farmed salmon” being free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our farmed salmon ...’).</li> <li>• We expect 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 46.</b>	<b>What proportion of farmed salmon (for fresh/frozen salmon products and ingredients) in the company’s global supply chain is stun-killed using percussion or electrocution or is pre-slaughter stunned using effective percussion or electrocution followed up by a kill method before recovery of consciousness?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is stun-killed using percussion or electrocution or is pre-slaughter stunned using effective percussion or electrocution followed up by a kill method before recovery of consciousness. For retailers and wholesalers, this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	1
	21 – 40% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	2
	41 – 60% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	3
	61 – 80% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	5
	81 – 98% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	7
	99 – 100% of farmed salmon is effectively stunned and killed.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell farmed salmon or products containing farmed salmon.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon in the company’s global supply chain that is stun-killed using percussion or electrocution or is pre-slaughter stunned using effective percussion or electrocution followed up by a kill method before recovery of consciousness.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of farmed salmon affected. Companies that reported on the total number of farmed salmon affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of farmed salmon used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is effectively stunned and killed but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of farmed salmon managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is effectively stunned and killed in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about “Our farmed salmon” or “All farmed salmon” being effectively stunned and killed are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon that is effectively stunned and killed (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our farmed salmon ...’).</li> <li>• We expect 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>
--	---

**All Species**

<b>Question 47.</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>	Companies should report on the proportion of animals that is transported within specified maximum journey times. 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; less than 4 hours for poultry and rabbits, and less than 8 hours for other species. Transport of animals exceeding these limits, including loading and unloading, has been shown to decrease welfare significantly. For all companies, this question applies to all products (own-brand and other).	
<b>Scoring</b>	0% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	1
	21 – 40% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	2
	41 – 60% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	3
	61 – 80% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	5
	81 – 98% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	7

	99 – 100% of animals is transported within specified maximum journey times.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is assessed for all companies.</li> <li>• This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of animals in the company's global supply chain that are transported within specified maximum journey times.</li> <li>• Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of animals that is transported within specified maximum journey times but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that is transported within specified maximum journey times in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that is transported within specified maximum journey times (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• We expect 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 48.</b>	<b>What proportion of animals (including fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should report on the proportion of animals that is pre-slaughter stunned. It is essential to render an animal unconscious (through for example captive bolt and stun-to-kill methods including electrical stunning, gas stunning) before the animal is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. 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 – 20% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	1
	21 – 40% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	2

	41 – 60% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	3
	61 – 80% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	5
	81 – 98% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	7
	99 – 100% of products is from animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question is assessed for all companies.</li> <li>• This question is 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 are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that reported on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</li> <li>• Companies that report on the proportion of animals that is pre-slaughter stunned but limited their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</li> <li>• Scores are not awarded for companies that reported on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of animals that is pre-slaughter stunned in line with these standards.</li> <li>• Companies that make general statements about "Our animals" or "All animals" being pre-slaughter stunned are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of animals that have been pre-slaughter stunned (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our animals...').</li> <li>• We expect 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 49.</b>	<b>Does the company report on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies are expected to publish volumes of animal-sourced foods by type and/or by method of production, increasing transparency of the extent to which the company is reliant on animal-sourced foods and supporting higher welfare production. Volumes may be reported as numbers of animals.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production.	0

	The company reports on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	5
	The company reports fully on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production, covering all relevant geographies, species and products.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is looking specifically for reporting on the volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production in the company's supply chain.</li> <li>Reporting should reflect volumes, by weight, of product sold (for companies in the Retailers and Wholesalers, and Restaurants and Bars sub-sectors) or produced (for companies in the Producers and Manufacturers sub-sector). Alternatively, numbers of animals may be reported.</li> <li>Volumes of different forms of meat, dairy, fish or eggs may be reported separately or combined. For example, one combined volume of meat may be reported for pork, beef and poultry. However, this question is looking for volumes of each category (meat, dairy, fish and eggs) to be reported separately.</li> <li>For maximum points, the question is looking for reporting that covers all relevant geographies, species and products, and encompasses all products containing meat, dairy, fish or eggs as ingredients.</li> </ul>	

### Animal-Sourced Foods Performance Reporting

<b>Question 50.</b>	<b>Does the company report on progress towards its targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to develop reporting criteria and publish details of progress made against targets set for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on progress towards targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.	0
	The company reports on progress towards targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies or business divisions.	5
	The company reports fully on progress towards targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, covering all relevant geographies and business divisions.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	
<b>Explanatory Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This question is only scored if Question 39 is met fully or partially.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This question recognises reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods may be achieved in multiple ways, including direct action on reduction (e.g., waste reduction, better utilisation, changes to business focus) or through protein diversification (e.g., new product development, reformulation).</li><li>• Companies that publish a target that only refers to protein diversification without reference to the need to achieve reductions in consumption of animal-sourced foods will be eligible for a maximum of 5 points on this question.</li><li>• This question is looking specifically for explicit monitoring data, this can be quantitative (e.g., reporting on the proportion by which the company has reduced its sales of animal-sourced foods, or the proportion by which the company has increased its sales of alternative proteins) or qualitative (development of management systems), and based on process or performance.</li></ul>
--	--

