

Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare 2022

Briefing on the BBFAW 2022 Benchmark Pilot
and BBFAW 2023 Benchmark Criteria

July 2023



Executive Summary

In March and April 2023, the BBFAW conducted a pilot assessment of 150 companies against the new 2022 benchmark criteria. Instead of the usual public BBFAW report, this briefing paper summarises methodological findings from the BBFAW 2022 pilot benchmark and includes case study examples of company reporting. The briefing also confirms the assessment approach for the BBFAW 2023 assessments, which are scheduled to take place in October to December 2023.

Findings from the BBFAW 2022 Benchmark pilot

Following the pilot assessments of 150 companies conducted in March and April 2023, the BBFAW partners and secretariat are confident that the revised criteria will drive significant progress on farm animal welfare. Whilst many of the new criteria included in the Benchmark are challenging for companies to achieve, the pilot company assessments have revealed that there are companies able to demonstrate that the criteria are achievable.

As anticipated, the overall effect of the changes to the criteria has resulted in more companies being ranked in lower tiers. However, for a majority of companies, the decrease in scores can be directly attributed to the methodological changes rather than a de-prioritisation of farm animal welfare. That said, the pilot assessments have revealed that many companies have failed to update their reporting on farm animal welfare since the BBFAW 2021 Benchmark. This suggests that the absence of a benchmark in 2022 has had an impact on companies' disclosure on farm animal welfare, and that the BBFAW continues to have an important role to play in driving transparency and reporting on - farm animal welfare.

The BBFAW partners decided to conduct the 2022 Benchmark as a pilot in recognition that companies need time to understand and adapt to the revised assessment criteria. Each company has received a copy of their BBFAW 2022 company summary and question-by-question reports, which detail company scores under the new criteria and highlight individual strengths, weaknesses and recommendations. These reports will help companies to understand how they have performed against the revised criteria, and what improvements are required in preparation for the BBFAW 2023 benchmark to be conducted later in 2023.

Revisions to the 2023 assessment criteria

The BBFAW 2022 Benchmark pilot assessments have indicated that some questions would benefit from further clarification or modification in advance of the BBFAW 2023 Benchmark company assessments. Consequently, changes have been made to five individual questions, and two further changes have been made that will affect all the Animal Sourced Foods questions and all the species-specific Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact questions.

Structure

This report is structured as follows:

1. Introduction
2. Evolving the Benchmark
3. BBFAW 2022 Benchmark Pilot
4. Investor Engagement
5. BBFAW 2023

Appendices:

- Appendix I: Clarifications and Revisions to the 2023 Assessment Criteria
- Appendix II: BBFAW 2023 Company Scope
- Appendix III: BBFAW 2023 Weighting of the Assessment Pillars
- Appendix IV: BBFAW 2023 Assessment Criteria

Part 1: Introduction

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare (BBFAW) is the leading global measure of farm animal welfare management, policy commitment, performance and disclosure in food companies. It enables investors, companies, NGOs and other stakeholders to understand corporate practice and performance on farm animal welfare, and it drives – directly and through the efforts of others – corporate improvements in the welfare of animals reared for food.

This briefing paper summarises the methodological findings from the BBFAW 2022 pilot benchmark and confirms the assessment approach for the BBFAW 2023 assessments.

We recognise that companies need time to understand and adapt to the revised assessment criteria, and, in particular to, to implement the governance and management systems and processes necessary to enable accurate disclosure in line with evolving expectations. This briefing paper therefore does not include detailed data analysis based on the BBFAW 2022 Pilot Benchmark, although it does include case study examples to highlight how companies can meet the new criteria.

This briefing is provided to support companies and their investors in driving systemic change on farm animal welfare. The case study examples and clarifications to the criteria are aimed at assisting companies in their preparations for the BBFAW 2023 Benchmark assessments in October to December 2023. Additionally, the briefing paper provides investors with insight into the application of the new assessment criteria that can be used to inform their investment decision-making and engagement with companies.

Part 2: Evolving the Benchmark

Following the first decade of the BBFAW Benchmark, the annual assessment cycle was paused during 2022 to conduct a thorough revision of the assessment criteria, to ensure they are aligned with evolving expectations of companies on animal welfare.

Background

Since 2012, the BBFAW has become the leading global measure of farm animal welfare. It has developed into a global programme that has enabled investors, companies, and other stakeholders to understand how well companies are managing farm animal welfare and, crucially, to drive improved corporate practice and performance on the issue.

The tenth Benchmark covered 150 of the world's largest food companies, including food retailers and wholesalers, restaurants and bars, and food producers and manufacturers. The results, presented in the 2021 Benchmark report¹ published in March 2022, demonstrated the significant progress made, particularly on policy commitments and the governance and management of farm animal welfare, since the first Benchmark in 2012.

However, despite the overall progress seen, 68 companies (45%) remained in Tiers 5 and 6. These companies provided little or no information on their approach to farm animal welfare. Further, in the 2021 Benchmark, 127 of the 150 companies (85%) achieved an Impact Rating of E or F, indicating that a majority of companies had yet to demonstrate that they are delivering improved welfare impacts for farm animals in their operations or supply chains.

These results indicated that, whilst the Benchmark has successfully driven significant improvements over the past decade, the BBFAW still has a role to play in continuing to drive improved corporate practice and, importantly, performance impact on farm animal welfare.

Changes introduced to the BBFAW 2022 methodology

In response to the findings from the 2021 Benchmark and to increasing demand from investors and other stakeholders, the most substantial change to the assessment criteria has been the increased focus on performance impact. The number of questions on performance impact has been increased from 10 to 20, and these questions now represent 55% of the overall benchmark score.

Another substantial change has been the introduction of questions focused on the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods in human diets. In the context of a resource-constrained world, reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods 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.

The report on the consultation held in January 2023 summarises the feedback received and describes in detail all the changes introduced².

¹ Nicky Amos, Rory Sullivan, Basia Romanowicz and Dr Heleen van de Weerd (2022), *The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare: Report 2021* (BBFAW, London). <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

² *Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation on the 2022 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare March 2023* (BBFAW, London). <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

Part 3: BBFAW 2022 Benchmark Pilot

The BBFAW 2022 Benchmark pilot assessments have demonstrated the feasibility of the revisions to the assessment criteria and established a baseline against which company performance can be evaluated in future benchmarks. Following our review of the pilot assessments, the BBFAW partners and secretariat are confident that the revised criteria will, over time, be effective in driving significant progress on farm animal welfare.

The list of companies covered by the 2022 Benchmark and the BBFAW 2022 assessment criteria can be found in the report on the BBFAW 2022 consultation³.

The average scores for each pillar of the 2022 pilot assessment and the overall average score are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: BBFAW 2022 Benchmark pilot average scores

Pillar	Average Score
Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments	36%
Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management	37%
Farm Animal Welfare Targets	23%
Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact	6%
Animal-Sourced Foods	9%
Overall Average Score	16%

As anticipated, the overall effect of the changes to the criteria has resulted in a lower overall average score as well as more companies being ranked in lower tiers. These changes are in line with the modelling previously conducted by the BBFAW secretariat on the revised 2022 benchmark criteria.

The scale of the changes to the assessment criteria and the weighting of the assessment pillars is sufficiently large that it is not possible to draw meaningful comparisons between the 2021 and 2022 benchmarks. All future BBFAW benchmarks will be assessed against the 2022 baseline.

It is important to note that, for a majority of companies, the decrease in company scores can be directly attributed to the methodological changes and not a de-prioritisation of farm animal welfare. That said, the pilot assessments have revealed that many companies have failed to update their reporting on farm animal welfare since the BBFAW 2021 Benchmark. This indicates that the absence of a benchmark in 2022 has had an impact on companies'

³ Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation on the 2022 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare March 2023 (BBFAW, London). <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

disclosure on farm animal welfare and that the BBFAW has an important role to play in driving transparency and reporting on this issue.

Whilst many of the new criteria included in the Benchmark are challenging for companies to achieve, the pilot company assessments have revealed that there are companies, across different sectors and different geographies, able to demonstrate that the criteria are achievable. These examples are highlighted below.

Findings and case study examples from the BBFAW 2022 Benchmark

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments

Q1: Does the company acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue?

Recognising farm animals as sentient beings provides a strong foundation for animal welfare policies. Accordingly, this question has been amended to award maximum points (5 points) to companies that identify farm animal welfare as a relevant business issue and recognise farm animals as sentient beings. Thirty-three companies (22%) recognised farm animals as sentient beings in the pilot company assessments.

“Costco is committed to the welfare and proper handling of animals that are used in the production of products that we sell. This is not only the right thing to do, but it also is an important moral and ethical obligation we owe to our members, suppliers, and most of all to the animals we depend on for these products. Costco has adopted the Five Domains for assessing animal welfare. The domains are: Nutrition, Environment, Health, Behavior, Mental state.” **Costco**

“Vision: All animals in our care are treated as sentient beings and with respect and decency throughout their lives.” **Danish Crown**

Q7: Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic and routine metaphylactic use of antibiotics for all species?

Routine metaphylactic use of antibiotics has been added to this question, bringing it in line with amendments to European Union legislation on antibiotic use⁴. Given this issue has received relatively little attention to date, it is not unexpected that few companies (four companies (3%)) have a clear commitment to ending the routine metaphylactic use of antibiotics. Nonetheless, companies are disclosing commitments on this issue.

“Our objective is the reduction and avoidance of antibiotics for routine prophylactic, and routine metaphylactic use across all our supply base.” **Cranwick**

“In alignment with the principles set out by RUMA, Mitchells & Butlers require supplying farmers and producers to only administer antibiotics under professional veterinary supervision and guidance. By encouraging the adoption of enhanced levels of biosecurity and animal husbandry to reduce risk of disease challenges, Mitchells & Butlers prohibit the routine prophylactic and metaphylactic use of antibiotics across all species used in supply to our business. We do however recognise that eradication of exceptional use of metaphylaxis could lead to welfare issues in extreme cases. In this situation, as with all others regarding control of use application is strictly controlled by veterinary guidance and by derogation.” **Mitchells & Butlers**

⁴ Regulation (EU) 2019/6 on veterinary medicinal products and repealing Directive 2001/82/EC

Q10: Does the company have a clear commitment not to produce or sell foie gras?

Fifteen companies (10%) published clear commitments not to produce or sell foie gras. Whilst this issue is widely understood, and in many cases already avoided, it appears many companies are yet to formalise their approach to this issue through published policy commitments.

“EDEKA does not use products from forced fattening” and “No force feeding of ducks and geese.” **EDEKA**

“We do not produce or sell any foie gras and do not support any inhumane practices of force feeding any animals.” **Waitrose**

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management

Q18a: Does the company describe how it uses welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain?

The Benchmark has assessed company reporting on welfare outcome measures since 2014 however this new sub-question was added to the BBFAW 2022 criteria to assess whether companies describe how they use welfare outcome measures, for example to help drive continuous improvement or as indicators for corrective action. In this baseline assessment, 37 companies (25%) described how welfare outcome measures are used in their operations or supply chain.

“Since 2020, it is a compulsory requirement for all Arla farmers to assess and report animal welfare on a quarterly basis, within the framework of 4 animal-based indicators: cow mobility, cleanliness, absence of injuries and body condition. The Arlagården® requirements and compliance criteria demand that where the minimum performance levels are not met, prompt actions are taken by the farm to address any causative factors.” **Arla Foods**

“One of the most significant, recent improvements for our animal care advisory committee was the use of a new 'Animal Welfare Outcomes' dashboard reporting tool, so we can more easily identify trends for each processing facility and quickly act upon the information. This has helped us keep watch on the bigger animal welfare picture while continuously managing details that make a difference in improving animal welfare.” **Wayne-Sanderson Farms**

Farm Animal Welfare Targets

Q23-27: All Farm Animal Welfare Targets questions

Five new questions were added within the new Farm Animal Welfare Targets pillar on whether companies have clear, time-bound targets addressing specific welfare issues for laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs and dairy cows. The increased focus on setting time-bound targets reflects the importance of this critical step for policy commitments to be translated into action and, thereby, performance impact.

In total, 110 companies (73%) scored points across these questions and the average score for this pillar of the assessment was 23%. The BBFAW has assessed companies on their objectives and targets on farm animal welfare since 2012. The relatively strong performance of companies on these new questions is unsurprising given the significant number of

companies that have committed to developing cage-free egg supply chains and to the requirements of the Better Chicken Commitment and European Chicken Commitment.

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact

Q29-46: Species-specific Performance Impact questions

The number of species-specific Performance Impact questions has been 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, resulting in three questions per species.

The average score on the Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact pillar was 6%. It is anticipated that it will take at least two to three years for companies to develop and implement processes to enable reporting on some of the new species-specific Performance Impact questions, and that there will likely be a lag before improvements in the scores will start to be seen. Nonetheless, for all of the species-specific Performance Impact questions there are examples of companies that have been awarded points.

Q49: Does the company report on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production?

This new question assesses companies' reporting on 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 change in volume in the case of a growing business. Given this is a new expectation of companies it is encouraging that 21 companies (14%) were found to be reporting such information.

Volumes (thousands of tons)	2021	2020	Annual variation (%)
Poultry (fresh)	456	465	(2.0%)
Pork and others (fresh)	128	121	5.6%

Example of reporting on volumes of animal-sourced foods from BRF

Animal-Sourced Foods

Q12, 13, 14, 21, 22, 28 and 50: All Animal-Sourced Foods questions

Seven new questions have been introduced on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. In the context of a resource-constrained world, 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.

The structure of the questions to assess companies' approaches to reducing reliance on animal sourced foods follows the structure of the questions on farm animal welfare, with questions focused on Policy Commitments; Governance & Management; Targets; and Performance Reporting. For the purposes of weighting within the overall score, these questions are grouped within one Animal-Sourced Foods pillar.

The average score achieved in the Animal-Sourced Foods pillar was 9%. Whilst low, we recognise that this is a nascent business issue and that the BBFAW, by focusing on animal

sourced foods and not alternative proteins or vegan and vegetarian products, is addressing this issue through a unique perspective. In total, 38 companies (25%) recognise the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue and 18 companies (12%) publish an overarching policy (or equivalent) on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods.

The examples below illustrate company reporting identified through the pilot company assessments. A detailed commentary on how these questions were assessed can be found in Appendix I.

Q12: Does the company acknowledge the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue?

“Reducing meat consumption in favour of a plant-based diet can benefit human health and reduce carbon emissions, while also improving food security by offering alternatives. Our customers are increasingly looking for alternatives to animal-sourced foods and we are responding by expanding our Vegan Range and reducing food waste.” **Greggs**

“To implement a low-carbon strategy, [Casino Group] needs to support the shift in production and consumption practices towards low-carbon products and especially a better balance between animal and vegetable protein in a store’s product offering. Lastly, to reduce the impact of what we eat on the climate and the environment, several studies have demonstrated the need to change the carbon footprint of the average French person’s diet by eating less animal protein and more fruit, vegetables and legumes.” **Casino Group**

Q28: Has the company set time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?

“[By 2025,] 50% of main meals offered in our restaurants will be plant-based [...] 80% of all packaged food offered will be plant-based.” **IKEA**

“€1.5 billion sales per annum by 2025 from plant-based products in categories whose products are traditionally using animal-derived ingredients.” **Unilever**

Q50: Does the company report on progress towards its targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?

“Transitioning to low-carbon recipes is critical in driving deep decarbonisation across the business, so we’ve called on the creativity of our 4,020 chefs to reformulate our extensive recipe library. Successful reformulations have seen an increased focus on local, seasonal, and plant-based ingredients, in pursuit of a 25% switch from animal to plant-based proteins by 2025, and a 40% switch by 2030 [in the United Kingdom and Ireland]. Key results to date include: Reduction of meat by 40% across the top 12 best-selling dishes in our business and industry sector [...]” **Compass Group**

“By the end of 2022, 33% of meals offered by our own brands globally were plant based or vegetarian. While this exceeds our target for at least 30% by 2025, this global figure is primarily driven by a small number of markets, such as India, that have reached more than 40%. We are therefore continuing our focus in other markets to increase our offerings of plant-based and vegetarian options.” **SSP**

Part 4: Investor Engagement

In addition to producing the annual Benchmark, the BBFAW programme proactively engages the investment community, encouraging investors to use their influence to urge companies to take action on farm animal welfare. Investors have played a critical role in making sure that farm animal welfare is on the agenda of food companies, in ensuring that companies have effective systems and processes in place to manage the business risks and opportunities presented by farm animal welfare, and in encouraging these companies to improve the welfare of animals across their entire supply chains.

Keeping farm animal welfare on the investor agenda

With an estimated 80 billion animals being farmed for food every year⁵, farm animal welfare remains a concern for investors in its own right. However, 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. The addition of the new questions on reducing reliance on animal sourced foods aligns with these wider concerns, recognising that to see improvements in the standards of welfare for all animals raised for food within a resource-constrained world it is necessary for there to be a reduction in the consumption of animal-sourced foods⁶. This new focus within the BBFAW broadens the relevance of the BBFAW to investors by aligning with wider issues that are a key focus of investors' engagement with companies.

Engagement activity in 2022

The BBFAW Secretariat has worked closely with investors since 2011⁷ to ensure that the Benchmark and associated tools remain relevant to investors, and to help the investment industry catalyse change in the manner in which companies manage farm animal welfare through their investment decision-making and their engagement with companies. Since 2015, the BBFAW secretariat has coordinated investor engagement through the Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare and convened the signatories to the Global Investor Statement on Farm Animal Welfare.

The BBFAW Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare is now supported by 35 institutional investors with over £2.5 trillion in assets under management⁸. In June 2022, investors in the BBFAW Investor Collaboration wrote to the CEOs of all companies covered by the BBFAW to commend leading and improving companies on their performance in the Benchmark and to challenge poorer performers to improve. In total, 53 of the 150 companies (35%) submitted formal

⁵ UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) statistics. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QA>

⁶ 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.

⁷ We estimate that we have engaged with over 300 institutional investment organisations in this time, and with many of these on multiple occasions.

⁸ Listed at <https://www.bbfa.com/investors/>

responses to investors, up from 49 in 2021. Many of these companies provided detailed responses to investors on both their performance in the BBFAW and on their wider animal welfare strategies.

Throughout the year, the BBFAW partners and the BBFAW secretariat engage directly with more than half of the companies covered by the Benchmark – through one-on-one meetings and calls, and through online group events. Forty-four of the 150 companies assessed provided comments on their draft 2022 assessments and 39 companies responded to the BBFAW annual consultation on proposed changes to the Benchmark criteria.

Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare BBFAW 2022 Benchmark Letters:

The BBFAW Investor Collaboration will be writing to the CEOs of all the companies covered by the BBFAW 2022 Benchmark pilot in September 2023. Given the BBFAW 2022 Benchmark has been conducted as a pilot, investors will not have been provided with companies' Tier rankings or scores. The letters will therefore not focus on scoring specifically, but will provide an opportunity for companies and investors to engage on how companies are responding to the revised criteria. Further, it will be an opportunity for investors to encourage continued disclosure on farm animal welfare by companies and adoption of the individual recommendations provided in the BBFAW 2022 Benchmark pilot feedback reports.

Part 5: BBFAW 2023

The BBFAW 2023 Benchmark assessments will take place October to December 2023 and the results will be published in April 2024, providing a return to the public ranking of companies and an in-depth analysis of the data.

The BBFAW 2022 Benchmark pilot assessments have indicated that some questions would benefit from further clarification or modification in advance of the BBFAW 2023 Benchmark company assessments. Consequently, changes have been made to five individual questions, and two further changes have been made that will affect all the Animal Sourced Foods questions and all the species-specific Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact questions. The amended 2023 assessment criteria, including the rationale for the changes, are detailed in Appendix I.

Companies have received copies of their individual BBFAW 2022 company summary and question-by-question reports, which detail company scores under the new criteria and highlight individual strengths, weaknesses and recommendations. These enable companies to fully understand how they have performed under the revised criteria and the changes required to prepare for the BBFAW 2023.

The weighting of the BBFAW 2023 assessment pillars, unchanged from BBFAW 2022, are detailed in Appendix III. The complete BBFAW 2023 Benchmark assessment criteria are presented in Appendix IV, with amendments introduced for 2023 shown in red.

BBFAW 2023 company scope

The scope of companies included in BBFAW 2023 is unchanged from BBFAW 2022. The list of companies to be covered by the BBFAW 2023 Benchmark can be found in Appendix II.

BBFAW 2023 timeline

September 2023:

- Letters to company CEOs on behalf of investors in the Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare, providing an opportunity for companies and investors to engage on how companies are responding to the revised criteria piloted in the BBFAW 2022 Benchmark.

16th October-9th December 2023:

- Evaluation of companies against the BBFAW 2023 Benchmark methodology.

April 2024:

- Publication of results of the 2023 BBFAW Benchmark, including a public ranking of companies and an in-depth analysis of the data.

July 2024:

- Letters to company CEOs on behalf of the Global Investor Collaboration on Farm Animal Welfare, providing an opportunity for companies and investors to engage on how companies have performed in the BBFAW 2023 Benchmark.

Appendix I: Clarifications and Revisions to the 2023 Assessment Criteria

Following the BBFAW 2022 pilot assessments, a number of questions have been clarified or modified.

The assessment criteria that have been adapted in advance of the BBFAW 2023 are detailed below. The complete assessment criteria are presented in Appendix IV, with amendments introduced for 2023 shown in red.

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments

Q1: Does the company acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue?

A new requirement for companies to recognise farm animals as sentient beings was added to this question in BBFAW 2022, in order for the maximum points to be awarded.

Following the BBFAW 2022 pilot assessments, it became apparent that further clarity was required to specify what is suitable evidence for recognition of sentience.

Resulting change to the criteria:

The following description has been added to the explanatory notes for the question: *Maximum points are awarded to companies that also recognise farm animals as sentient beings. This may be through recognition of the 'Five Freedoms of Animal Welfare' in combination with recognition of the need to promote positive welfare states, recognition of the 'Five Domains of Animal Welfare', or explicit recognition of animal sentience.*

See Section 3 of this briefing paper for case study examples of company reporting awarded points on this question.

Q7: Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic and routine metaphylactic use of antibiotics for all species?

Both aspects of this question (prophylactic use and routine metaphylactic use) applied to all species in the BBFAW 2022. However, this question has been amended in recognition that routine metaphylactic use of antibiotics for farmed fish is particularly challenging to avoid.

Resulting change to the criteria:

The question has been amended to state that, for farmed fish, the question is looking for a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics only.

Q10: Does the company have a clear commitment not to produce or sell foie gras?

This question applied to all companies in the BBFAW 2022, regardless of the likely relevance of foie gras to their supply chain.

To ensure the relevance of this question, this question will now apply only to companies with ducks or geese in their supply chain. Additionally, the assessment criteria have been further specified to clarify that this question does not only apply to foie gras, but also meat from birds reared for foie gras.

Resulting change to the criteria:

The question is now: *Does the company have a clear commitment not to produce or sell foie gras or meat from birds reared for foie gras?* This question will now apply only to companies with ducks or geese in their supply chain.

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management

Q19: Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?

Results from the pilot assessments revealed that few companies were able to score points on this question since it has been amended to remove the lower points options.

Previously companies were awarded points for providing evidence that a proportion of supply was audited to either basic or higher welfare farm assurance standards (or equivalent company standards). In BBFAW 2022, the lowest points option (2 points) was only provided to companies that audited all products to at least basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standards, across all species, products and geographies.

Resulting change to the criteria:

To continue to encourage companies to audit to farm assurance standards, an entry-level points option (1 point) has been added to award companies points for providing evidence that a substantial⁹ proportion of products are audited to either basic or higher farm assurance (or equivalent company) standards.

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact

Q29-46: All species-specific Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact questions

The scope of these questions has previously been limited to all own-brand products for retailers and wholesalers. Following feedback from restaurants and bars companies that also sell branded products through some of their outlets, we will also apply this same scope for restaurants and bars companies within the benchmark.

⁹ For details of how the BBFAW defines this, see the *Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare Consultation 2021* (BBFAW, London), page 10. <https://bbfaw.com/publications>

Resulting change to the criteria:

For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars, the species-specific Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact questions now apply to all own-brand products only.

Animal-Sourced Foods

Q12, 13, 14, 21, 22, 28 and 50: All Animal Sourced Foods questions

In the BBFAW 2022 pilot assessments, partial points were awarded on questions 13, 14, 21, 22, 28 and 50 for evidence related to protein diversification in the absence of wider recognition provided of the need to reduce reliance on animal sourced foods. Full points were available for evidence clearly focused on reducing reliance on animal sourced foods. As such, these questions 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). Q12 only awarded points for companies that recognised the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue and did not award any points for evidence solely focused on protein diversification.

During the course of the pilot assessments it became necessary to develop a clear definition to be able to distinguish between evidence focused on protein diversification and evidence focused on reducing reliance on animal sourced foods. Evidence was categorised as follows:

Evidence related to protein diversification:

- Evidence which focuses on 'vegan', 'vegetarian', or 'plant-based' products, or menu items, that does not make any reference to these products being replacements for animal-sourced foods.
- This evidence is typically focused on offering consumers more choice or responding to consumer trends.

Evidence related to reducing reliance on animal sourced foods:

- Evidence which refers to products clearly positioned as replacements for animal-sourced foods. For example, described as 'meat-', 'egg-' or 'dairy-alternatives', or as 'plant-based alternatives' or 'alternative protein' products.
- Evidence may also refer to these products in the context of 'enabling required shifts in dietary consumption', 'supporting dietary transition', etc.
- The link to a reduction in animal-sourced foods needs to be clear, but it may be explicit or implied.

In the pilot assessments, we found that some companies provide evidence related to protein diversification but do not recognise the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods. For example, companies that state they provide vegetarian menu items in order to offer choice to consumers. The Animal Sourced Foods questions were added to the BBFAW in recognition that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods 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. As such, it has been decided that evidence related to protein diversification alone, without any acknowledgement of the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods, is

not sufficiently in line with the objectives of the benchmark, and therefore will not be awarded points.

Resulting change to the criteria:

The animal sourced foods questions (Q13, 14, 21, 22, 28 and 50) will only award partial points for evidence related to protein diversification provided the company has recognised the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue, i.e., only if points have been awarded for Q12.

Q28 & Q50: Has the company set time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods and does the company report progress against these?

Another finding from the pilot assessments was that evidence related to reducing reliance on animal sourced foods was often implied rather than explicit. For example, companies more often reported efforts to increase the proportion of sales or products from alternative proteins, the implication being that this has the potential to decrease the proportion of sales or products from animal sourced foods. At this stage, relatively few companies are explicitly reporting efforts to decrease volumes or proportions of animal sourced foods.

Resulting change to the criteria:

To better recognise companies that are explicitly focused on efforts to reduce reliance on animal sourced foods, the scoring of Q28 & Q50 on animal sourced foods targets has been amended. Targets explicitly focused on efforts to reduce volumes or proportions of animal sourced foods will be eligible for maximum points (10 points), whereas targets which imply reductions in animal sourced foods (e.g. focused on increasing the proportion of alternative proteins menu items) will be eligible for partial points (5 points). This approach will be reviewed following the BBFAW 2023 Benchmark.

Appendix II: BBFAW 2023 company scope

	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
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.	Metro Inc	Public	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Canada
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
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
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.	Yum China Holdings	Public	5757: Restaurants and Bars	China
88.	2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd)	Private	3570: Food Producer	UK
89.	Agro Super	Public	3570: Food Producer	Chile
90.	Arla Foods Ltd	Cooperative	3570: Food Producer	Denmark
91.	Barilla SpA	Private	3570: Food Producer	Italy
92.	Beijing Dabeinong Technology Group Co., Ltd.	Private	3570: Food Producer	China
93.	Bimbo	Public	3570: Food Producer	Mexico
94.	BRF SA	Public	3570: Food Producer	Brazil
95.	Campbell Soup Company	Public	3570: Food Producer	USA
96.	Cargill	Private	3570: Food Producer	USA
97.	Charoen Pokphand Foods (CPF)	Private	3570: Food Producer	Thailand
98.	China Yurun Group Limited	Private	3570: Food Producer	China
99.	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 III: BBFAW 2023 Weighting of the Assessment Pillars

The weightings for the BBFAW 2023 are unchanged from 2022.

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%
Farm Animal Welfare Total	365	
Animal-Sourced Foods Policy Commitments	25	
Animal-Sourced Foods Governance and Management	20	
Animal-Sourced Foods Targets	10	
Animal-Sourced Foods Performance Impact	10	
Animal-Sourced Foods Total	65	9%
Overall Total	430	100%

**For the species-specific Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments, Farm Animal Welfare Target and Performance Impact questions, we will only assess those questions that are relevant to the company.*

Appendix IV: BBFAW 2023 assessment criteria

N.B. Changes from 2022 are shown in red.

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments		
Question 1.	Does the company acknowledge farm animal welfare as a business issue?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 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. Maximum points are awarded to companies that also recognise farm animals as sentient beings. This may be through recognition of the 'Five Freedoms of Animal Welfare' in combination with recognition of the need to promote positive welfare states, recognition of the 'Five Domains of Animal Welfare', or explicit recognition of animal sentience. The score does not take account of the importance assigned by companies to farm animal welfare (e.g. relative to other corporate responsibility issues). 	

Question 2.	Does the company publish an overarching farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent)?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment does not differentiate between companies that publish stand-alone farm animal welfare policies and companies that incorporate farm animal welfare into wider responsible sourcing or sustainability policies or codes of practice. • Companies that publish a clear statement of commitment to farm animal welfare that provides a starting point for the company's accountability to its stakeholders are awarded a score of 2.5 points. • Policies issued by company subsidiaries are not considered as overarching policies, and companies with such policies but no overarching (i.e. at the parent company level) policy are therefore not awarded points for this question. These policies are considered when deciding whether to award points for Questions 1, 4-11, 23-28 and 29-48. • 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. • 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"> — 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) 	

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

Question 3.	Does the farm animal welfare policy provide a clear explanation of scope?	
Rationale	Understanding the scope of a policy is important to understand the breadth of a company's commitment to action on farm animal welfare.	
Scoring		
<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
	(Max Score 9)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 2, i.e. when the company has a published farm animal welfare policy. • The sub-questions on geography, species and products are scored separately (i.e. companies 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). 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question acknowledges that policies can vary from market to market, across species and across product ranges. Companies are given credit if they clearly specify the limits to the application of their farm animal welfare policies. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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.
--	--

Question 4.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of close confinement for all species?	
Rationale	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 high stocking densities.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0

	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • Companies that simply mention they avoid close confinement but do not state the specific confinement to be avoided receive zero points. • 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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.
--	---

Question 5.	Does the company have a clear commitment to the provision of effective, species-specific enrichment for all species?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • Companies that simply mention they provide environmental enrichment but do not state the specific environmental enrichment to be provided, receive zero points. • 'Enriched' cages are not awarded points. • 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. • 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 	

	<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"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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.
--	--

Question 6.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of routine mutilations for all species?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • Companies that simply mention they avoid routine mutilations, but do not state the specific mutilations to be avoided, receive zero points. • 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) 	

	<p>legislation, even in the EU, does not cover all relevant issues, (b) mutilations are still commonly performed under derogations (c) 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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.
--	---

Question 7.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic and routine metaphylactic use of antibiotics for all species?	
Rationale	<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 to the incentive this creates to withhold antibiotics from animals in need of treatment.</p> <p>For farmed fish, this question is looking for a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic use of antibiotics only.</p>	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • 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. • 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). • 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. • 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 	

	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial points may be awarded for commitments focused on prophylactic use in the absence of a commitment on routine metaphylactic use. • 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. • 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.
--	--

Question 8.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending long-distance live transport for all species?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • 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 	

	<p>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"> • 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). • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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.
--	---

Question 9.	Does the company have a clear commitment to the use of humane methods of pre-slaughter stunning for all species?	
Rationale	It is essential to render an animal unconscious before it is slaughtered in order for it to be insensible to pain, discomfort and stress, until death occurs. 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.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	

Explanatory Notes

- This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries.
- 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.
- 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).
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Ducks or Geese

Question 10.	Does the company have a clear commitment not to produce or sell foie gras or meat from birds reared for foie gras?
Rationale	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.

Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. This question is only assessed for those companies that have ducks or geese in their supply chains. 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. 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). Partial policies, which are limited to certain species, products or geographies, are not awarded points. 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. 	

Laying Hens, Pigs, Dairy Cattle, Beef Cattle, Rabbits, Ducks or Geese

Question 11.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of other inhumane practices?	
Rationale	Practices covered by this question include the culling of day-old male chicks in egg supply chains; cow-calf separation in dairy and beef supply chains; fully slatted flooring for pigs, dairy and beef cattle, ducks and rabbits; and live plucking or live harvesting for geese.	
Scoring	Not addressed.	0
	Limited to certain species, products or geographies.	2.5

	Universal across all relevant species, products and geographies.	5
		(Max Score 5)
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question may be scored even if points have not been awarded for Question 2. Points may be awarded for policies issued by company subsidiaries. • This question is only assessed for those companies that have laying hens, pigs, dairy cattle, beef cattle, rabbits, ducks or geese in their supply chains. • 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. • 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. • 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). • 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. • 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. • 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. 	

Animal-Sourced Foods Policy Commitments

Question 12.	Does the company acknowledge the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue?
---------------------	--

Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking for an acknowledgement by the parent company that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue. • 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. • 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. • 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). 	

Question 13.	Does the company publish an overarching policy (or equivalent) on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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

	<p>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.</p>	10
	(Max Score 10)	
<p>Explanatory Notes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 12, i.e., if the parent company recognises that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue. • 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. • 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. • 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 22 and 28. • 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"> — 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). — 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 — 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) — A commitment to continuous improvement and public reporting on performance. • 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. 	

Question 14.	Does the policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods provide a clear explanation of scope?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring		
<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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 13, i.e. when the company has a published policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. • 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). • 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. • 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management

Question 15.	Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for farm animal welfare?
---------------------	---

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

Question 16.	Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its farm animal welfare policies are effectively implemented?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring		
<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
	(Max score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sub-questions (on training and on internal controls) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores for the other sub-question). On training, companies are only awarded 5 points if the training provided is aimed at employees and if it explicitly addressed farm animal welfare-related issues. The training question does not address the quality of the training provided, the manner in which skills or competencies are assessed, the number of employees receiving training or the number of hours of training provided. On internal controls, companies are only awarded 5 points if they explicitly 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. 	

Question 17.	Does the company describe how it implements its farm animal welfare policy (or equivalent) through its supply chain?	
Rationale	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).	
Scoring		
	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
	(Max score 9)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sub-questions (on contracts, auditing and supplier education) are scored independently (i.e. the scores for each sub-question do not influence the scores for the other sub-questions). On contracts, companies are awarded 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. 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 	

	<p>processes covered farm animal welfare, companies scored zero for this sub-question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
--	---

Question 18.	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)?
Rationale	<p>In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at welfare outcome measures (WOMs) relating to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals. WOMs may be quantitative, or qualitative. They should focus on the most important species-specific measures, of physical wellbeing, mental wellbeing and behaviour. There is an increasing focus on positive outcome measures (e.g. active and play behaviour), 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"> For all species: mortality and cull rates, disease incidence. For laying hens: end of lay feather coverage, feather cleanliness, keel bone fractures, bone breakages at slaughter. For dairy cows: lameness, mastitis, body condition, involuntary culling rate, longevity, ease of calving, lesions, swellings, cleanliness, stomach ulcers, acidosis. For sows: Longevity, lameness, body condition, shoulder and vulva lesions, ear and flank biting. For pigs: lameness, cleanliness, tail bites, fight marks, bursitis and other lesions. For broiler chickens: gait score, leg culls, footpad dermatitis, hock burn, breast blisters, feather cleanliness, muscle myopathies. For beef: body condition, lameness, lesions, swellings, cleanliness, stomach ulcers, acidosis. For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition. For fish: fin and body damage, sea lice and other ectoparasite infestations, skeletal deformities, condition factor, mortality and behaviour. For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort; qualitative behavioural analysis. For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, bathing (ducks), socialising, swimming (fish). For transportation: injuries, slips and falls, fatigue, road traffic incidents, mortality (dead-on-arrival/DOA).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For slaughter: effectiveness of stunning. 	
Scoring		
<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
	(Max Score 7)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The sub-question on reporting is looking for explicit, quantitative reporting on welfare outcome measures such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mortality rates (as an indicator of potential pain, suffering and suboptimal performance), for fish: mortality or survival rates. Bone breakages (as an indicator of pain, suffering, suboptimal performance, and poor house design). Lameness (as an indicator of potential pain, behavioural restriction and suboptimal environmental and housing conditions). Body marks/injuries (as an indicator of aggressive fight damage, especially during mixing or competition at feeding, or from sexual behaviours). Body condition (as an indicator of good feed management, or competition at feeding). Cleanliness (as an indicator of good environmental control, thermal comfort). 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Positive flock or herd behaviour (as an indicator of a varied stimulating environment, good management and suitable breed for production system). ○ 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). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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). • Similarly, scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm animal welfare standards but do not report on the welfare outcomes resulting from the implementation of these standards. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed are not awarded points.
--	---

Question 19.	Does the company assure its welfare scheme to a prescribed standard?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	No assurance standard specified.	0
	A substantial proportion of products audited to either basic or higher farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard.	1
	All products audited to basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard across all species, products and geographies.	2
	All products audited to a combination of a basic farm assurance (or equivalent company) standard and a higher welfare assurance (or company equivalent standard), across all species, products and geographies.	4
	All products audited to higher welfare (or company equivalent) assurance standard, across all species, products and geographies.	10

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

Question 20.	Does the company communicate to customers on higher farm animal welfare through education and/or awareness-raising activities?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activities that could be considered in this question are defined broadly. Examples included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — The provision of farm animal welfare information on the company's website. Note: This is not just about providing information in the corporate responsibility section of the website but making these issues an integral part of customer communications and engagement. — On-pack or on-shelf labelling – provided this is evidenced on the company's website, in its published reports or on social media platforms. — Information leaflets or information packs. — Media promotions. — Supporting third party campaigns or programmes e.g. the RSPCA Farm Animal Week. — Customer farm visits, seminars or roundtables. — Social media campaigns. • Initiatives aimed at showing how products are sourced or produced but without an explicit focus on the welfare of farm animals are not scored in the assessment. • Companies that produce multiple consumer-facing videos on farm animal welfare are awarded five points, unless it is clear that these are linked to separate consumer engagement programmes or themes. • Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to communicate to consumers. • Social media channels are not separately reviewed, so companies have to link to these channels from their webpages in order to receive points (e.g. for YouTube videos). 	

Animal-Sourced Foods Governance and Management

Question 21.	Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?
Rationale	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.	
Scoring		
<i>21a. Day-to-day management responsibility</i>		
	No clearly defined day-to-day 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
	(Max score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 12, i.e., if the parent company recognises that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue. • 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). • 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). • 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). • 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 	

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

Question 22.	Does the company communicate to customers on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods through education and/or awareness-raising activities?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 12, i.e., if the parent company recognises that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue. 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). The activities that could be considered in this question are defined broadly. Examples included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. On-pack or on-shelf labelling – provided this is evidenced on the company's website, in its published reports or on social media platforms. Information leaflets or information packs. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Media promotions. ○ Supporting third party campaigns or programmes. ○ Customer farm visits, seminars or roundtables. ○ Social media campaigns. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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. ● Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to communicate to consumers. ● Social media channels are not separately reviewed, so companies have to link to these channels from their webpages in order to receive points (e.g. for YouTube videos). 	
--	--	--

Farm Animal Welfare Targets

Laying Hens

Question 23.	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?	
<i>Rationale</i>	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.	
<i>Scoring</i>	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
	(Max Score 10)	
<i>Explanatory Notes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products. ● 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 	

	<p>anticipated that this question will expand in scope to also cover combination and limited access systems in future assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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). • 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.
--	---

Broiler Chickens

Question 24.	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?	
<i>Rationale</i>	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.	
<i>Scoring</i>	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
	(Max Score 10)	
<i>Explanatory Notes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products. • 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 	

	<p>www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/ and www.welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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). • 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.
--	---

Pigs

Question 25.	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?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products. • 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 (the period between weaning and pregnancy 	

	<p>confirmation), within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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). • 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.
--	---

Question 26.	Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of farrowing crates for sows, or provide evidence this has already been achieved?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 5)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products. • 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. 	

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

Dairy Cows

Question 27.	Does the company publish a clear target for ending the use of tethering for dairy cows, or provide evidence this has already been achieved?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products. • 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. • 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 	

	<p>absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy on tethering are, therefore, awarded zero points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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.
--	---

Animal-Sourced Foods Targets

Question 28.	Has the company set time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if points have been awarded for Question 12, i.e., if the parent company recognises that reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is a relevant business issue. • This question is looking for evidence of explicit, time-bound targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods within a reasonable timeframe. • 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). • Companies that publish a target that only refers to protein diversification without reference to the need to achieve reductions in consumption of 	

	<p>animal-sourced foods will be eligible for a maximum of 5 points on this question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targets explicitly focused on efforts to decrease volumes or proportions of animal sourced foods will be eligible for maximum points (10 points), whereas targets which imply reductions in animal sourced foods (e.g. focused on increasing the proportion of alternative proteins menu items) will be eligible for partial points (5 points).
--	---

Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact

Laying Hens

Question 29.	What proportion of laying hens (for shell eggs and fresh/frozen products and ingredients) in the company’s global supply chain is cage-free?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products. This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of 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. 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. Companies that report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are 	

	<p>either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 ...’). • 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).
--	---

Question 30.	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?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company’s global supply chain that is free from beak trimming or tipping. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points. • 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, 	

	<p>depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of animals managed according to particular farm assurance standards but do not explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping in line with these standards. • Companies that make general statements about “Our laying hens” or “All chickens” being free from beak trimming or tipping are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming or tipping (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our animals...’). • 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.
--	--

Question 31.	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?	
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company’s global supply chain that is from supply chains in which the day-old male chicks are not killed. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of animals affected. Companies that report on the total number of animals 	

	<p>affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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.
--	--

Broiler Chickens

Question 32.	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/m² or 6lbs/sq ft or less)?	
<i>Rationale</i>	Companies should report on the proportion of broiler chickens that is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 30kg/m ² or 6lbs/sq ft or less). For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
<i>Scoring</i>	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
	(Max Score 10)	

Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens in the company's global supply chain that is reared at lower stocking densities, specifically, 30kg/m² or 6Lbs/sq ft or less. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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.
--------------------------	---

Question 33.	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)?	
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler 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 <40g/d averaged over the growth cycle according to the breeding company specification (see www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/ and www.welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/). • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 that is from breeds with improved welfare outcomes or slower growth potential (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our broiler chickens ...'). • 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. • 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.
--	---

Question 34.	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?	
Rationale	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 retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell chicken or chicken-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of broiler 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. • 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 	

	<p>globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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 ...’). • 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.
--	--

Pigs

Question 35.	What proportion of sows (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company’s global supply chain is free from gestation/sow stalls?	
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	

Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of sows in the company's global supply chain that is free from gestation/sow stalls throughout pregnancy and during the observation period (i.e are group housed from weaning to pre-farrowing). • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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.
--------------------------	--

Question 36.	What proportion of sows (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from farrowing crates?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of sows that is free from farrowing crates. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of sows in the company's global supply chain that is free from farrowing crates. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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. 	

Question 37.	What proportion of pigs (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from tail docking?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of pigs that is free from tail docking. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	

Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell pork or pork-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of pigs in the company’s global supply chain that is free from tail docking. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...’). • 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.
--------------------------	---

Dairy Cows

Question 38.	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?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from tethering. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	

Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of dairy cows in the company's global supply chain that is free from tethering. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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.
--------------------------	---

Question 39.	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?	
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	

Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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.
--------------------------	---

Question 40.	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?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	

Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell dairy or dairy-based products. • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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.
--------------------------	---

Beef Cattle

Question 41.	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?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell beef or beef-based products. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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. 	

Question 42.	What proportion of beef cattle (for fresh/frozen beef products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is group housed as calves, throughout rearing?	
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell beef or beef-based products. • 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. • Animals that are diseased or injured may be kept in hospital pens as required to protect the animals' health and welfare. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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. 	

Question 43.	What proportion of beef cattle (for fresh/frozen beef products and ingredients) in the company's global supply chain is free from disbudding/dehorning?
---------------------	--

Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding/dehorning. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell beef or beef-based products. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). • 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. 	

Farmed Salmon

Question 44.	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/m³ or less)?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell farmed salmon or farmed salmon-based products. • 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/m³ or less). • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 ...'). 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
--	--

Question 45.	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?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours. For retailers and wholesalers and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell farmed salmon or products containing farmed salmon. 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. 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. 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. 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 	

	<p>that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours in line with these standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 ...’). • 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.
--	--

Question 46.	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?	
Rationale	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 and restaurants and bars , this question applies to all own-brand products.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell farmed salmon or products containing farmed salmon. • 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. • 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. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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 ...’). • 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.
--	---

All Species

Question 47.	What proportion of animals (excluding fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is transported within specified maximum journey times?	
Rationale	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).	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is assessed for all companies. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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. 	

Question 48.	What proportion of animals (including fin fish) in the company's global supply chain is pre-slaughter stunned?	
Rationale	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).	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is assessed for all companies. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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...'). • 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. 	

Question 49.	Does the company report on volumes of animal-sourced foods by type (meat, dairy, fish, eggs) and/or by method of production?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	
Explanatory Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. Companies can report volumes in the context of overall volumes, i.e., to demonstrate a relative change in volume. • 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. • 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. 	

Animal-Sourced Foods Performance Reporting

Question 50.	Does the company report on progress towards its targets for reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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
	(Max Score 10)	

<p>Explanatory Notes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is only scored if Question 28 is met fully or partially. • 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). • 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. • Reporting on targets explicitly focused on efforts to decrease volumes or proportions of animal sourced foods will be eligible for maximum points (10 points), whereas reporting on targets which imply reductions in animal sourced foods (e.g. focused on increasing the proportion of alternative proteins menu items) will be eligible for partial points (5 points). • 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).
---------------------------------	--