

Report on The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare 2024 Consultation August 2024



Executive Summary

Following feedback to the public consultation in June-July 2024, the BBFAW Technical Working Group has decided to proceed with the following changes to the 2024 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare:

1. We will proceed with the proposed changes to the companies assessed in the 2024 Benchmark.
2. We will proceed with the proposed introduction of a new question on breeds with low welfare potential (new Q.10). However, this question will be limited in scope to broiler chickens, beef cattle and pigs. This question will be assessed in 2024 but the points awarded will not be included in companies' overall scores.

As a result, in 2024 the BBFAW will continue to assess 150 companies and the assessment criteria now contain 51 questions, compared to 50 in 2023.

Structure

This report is structured as follows:

- Part I: Background
- Part II: Public Consultation on the 2024 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare
1. Overview of Responses
 2. Summary of the Responses and Our Planned Actions
 - 1.1 Changes to company scope
 - 1.2 Introduction of a new question on breeds with low welfare potential
 - 1.3 Wider benchmark revisions
 2. Closing Remarks

Appendices:

- Appendix I: Company Scope
- Appendix II: Weighting of the Assessment Pillars
- Appendix III: 2024 Benchmark Assessment Criteria

Part I: Background

In preparation for the Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare's (BBFAW's) twelfth Benchmark, the BBFAW consulted stakeholders¹ in the period 26th June to 17th July 2024 on the following issues:

- The scope of companies covered by the Benchmark.
- The introduction of a new question on breeds with low welfare potential.
- Wider benchmark revisions.

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

¹ BBFAW Consultation on 2024 Benchmark <https://bbfaw.com/media/2180/bbfaw-2024-consultation-paper.pdf>

Part II: Public Consultation on the 2024 Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare

1. Overview of the Responses

The BBFAW Secretariat received 25 formal responses to its 2024 public consultation. These were received from 21 food companies, one investor and three other organisations. Responses were received from ten countries, representing all the BBFAW regions: Asia Pacific, Europe, Latin America, North America and UK.

2. Summary of the Responses and Our Planned Actions

2.1. Changes to Company Scope

2.1.1. BBFAW's Proposals

For the 2024 Benchmark, we proposed to continue to assess 150 companies. In response to mergers and acquisitions completed since the BBFAW 2023 assessments, we proposed the following changes to the company scope.

Proposed changes:

- **Autogrill** has been acquired by Dufry, and the group is now named **Avolta AG**. We therefore proposed listing **Avolta AG** in the Benchmark in place of Autogrill.
- **Subway** has been acquired by Roark Capital, also the owner of **Inspire Brands LLC**. Both companies were proposed to be listed in the Benchmark together under **Roark Capital**.

Proposed new additions:

To maintain the total number of companies at 150, we proposed adding:

- **Dino Polska SA** – the third-largest grocery retailer in Poland. Dino is a fast-growing public company with nearly 2,500 stores.

2.1.2. Stakeholder Responses

Respondents were supportive of the proposed company changes.

BBFAW is not currently looking to expand the number of companies assessed in the Benchmark, however, a number of respondents suggested potential companies or

regions for inclusion for greater representation. These suggestions will be useful to informing the evolution of the BBFAW company scope in the future.

2.1.3. Our Planned Actions

Based on the feedback received, we have decided to proceed with the proposed changes to the companies assessed in the 2024 Benchmark.

The 2024 Benchmark will cover:

- 90 public companies
- 42 private companies
- 15 cooperatives
- 3 joint stock/partnership owned companies.

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

2.2. Introduction of a New Question on Breeds with Low Welfare Potential

2.2.1. BBFAW's Proposals

The welfare of farmed animals is not only influenced by management practices and the inputs provided to them, but also by their genetics. Some breeds or strains of farmed animals have certain genetic traits which contribute to poorer welfare outcomes. The choice of breed or strain of animals used in livestock production can therefore have a significant impact on animal welfare.

A question on breeds was first proposed in the BBFAW 2022 consultation. Feedback to the consultation suggested that further definition was required to be able to adequately assess the question.

Consequently, the re-proposed question on breeds was further defined to include species-specific requirements for laying hens, broiler chickens, pigs, dairy cows, and beef cattle. The question was also focused on commitments to ending the use of 'breeds with low welfare potential' rather than 'high-performance breeds'.

Following the protocol used in previous years when introducing new questions, we proposed allowing a one-year grace period on the scoring of this question. This means that in 2024, the points awarded to companies for this new question would be excluded from their overall scoring. This would allow time for companies to adjust to the new criteria.

Proposed new question on breeds with low welfare potential:

Question 10	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of breeds with low welfare potential?	
Rationale	<p>The welfare of farmed animals is not only influenced by management practices and the inputs provided to them, but also by their genetics. For example, some breeds selected for high growth rate and lean meat deposition can suffer a range of physiological and metabolic health issues, as well as poor immunity and lethargy and poor behavioural expression. The choice of breed or strain of animals used in livestock production can therefore have a significant impact on animal welfare.</p> <p>Specific requirements for the species covered by this question are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • laying hens: end use of breeds laying more than 300 eggs/year • broiler chickens: end use of breeds that do not meet the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment requirements for improved welfare outcomes, or a slower growth potential, defined as <40g/d averaged over the growth cycle according to the breeding company specification • pigs: end use of sows with an average >16 piglets liveborn per litter • dairy cows: end use of breeds producing >7,000l of milk/year • beef cattle: end use of double-muscled breeds (e.g. Belgian Blue and Piedmontese) 	
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)	

2.2.2. Stakeholder Responses

There was limited support for the proposed new question on breeds with low welfare potential. Concerns focused, in particular, on the level of ambition presented by the specific requirements stated for laying hens and dairy cows, and the challenge of moving towards these from current, conventional production. Respondents also provided additional evidence challenging the specific productivity thresholds suggested and highlighted the need for holistic approaches to improving animal welfare.

Selected comments:

“It should be ensured that the criteria and the ambition levels/limit values are achievable. We expect, e.g., the limit values for dairy cows as too low and realistically not feasible. Furthermore, milk yield is not an appropriate factor to define or assess animal welfare. Other factors such as breed, housing and

welfare metrics (including lameness and mastitis) should be used to assess welfare.” [European food company]

“Breed is an important part of an animals way of living, but it is the combination of housing system, feeding, farmers taking care (management) and the animals genes which determine the life of the animal. Therefore, the welfare of animals is best measured by looking at specific animal-based indicators, their behaviour and relevant KPIs. [...] We know that high milk production often is associated with health problems and reduced welfare. However, this is not an obligatory outcome, as high performance is only possible in healthy cows/animals. Based on available research and literature, there is no clear evidence that breeding for higher milk yield is correlated to poor animal welfare.” [European food company]

“We can achieve a high level of animal welfare with high-performance breeds. We do not see slow-growing breeds as a guaranteed improvement in animal welfare. Another key point is the conflict between raising slow-growing breeds and sustainability, as slow-growing breeds consume up to 50% more feed than high-performance breeds, potentially making the business financially unviable in the medium and long term. We believe we can maintain high levels of animal welfare and sustainability with the currently used breeds, as well as financial sustainability and business continuity”. [Latin American food company]

“As a business we do not agree with the new question regarding breeds. Specifically in relation to laying hens given genetics for all commercial birds across Europe and UK have a laying rate >300 per bird/annum. This is with the exception of ‘special breeds’, which only accounts for a small percentage of the market. We would request and welcome a discussion on the logic to the number 300 given the lay rates of the industry is greater than this even for higher welfare system types such as Organic, RSPCA free range etc. We therefore strongly contest this potential change/addition regarding laying hens.” [UK food company]

“The suggestion that pig dam lines which produce litters of 16 or more are inherently subject to compromised welfare overlooks the fact that prolificacy is only one element of selective breeding programmes of some of the biggest genetics companies. Where robustness and phenotypic traits of both dam and litter e.g. number of teats and leg conformation in dam and average birth weight is litter, then litter size alone cannot be taken as a reliable indicator of net welfare (either positive or negative). For example the PIC Camborough 50 would be classed as potentially a welfare compromised breed according to the proposed criteria and yet it is the damline that holds significant market share specifically for outdoor bred production in the UK.” [UK other respondent]

“The performance of all animals is subject to the environment and management conditions they are raised in, and we do not believe prescriptive standards related to breed are the most effective way to encourage animal welfare improvement.” [North American food company]

“Certain double muscle breeds, such as Belgian Blue and Piemontese are already not permitted in our supply.” [UK food company]

2.2.3. Our Planned Actions

In response to the feedback received, it has been decided to reduce the scope of species included in this question in 2024, to focus the question on the species for which there is the strongest rationale behind the suggested productivity thresholds. The question will therefore focus on broiler chickens, beef cattle and pigs.

The requirements for broiler chickens are as per the Better Chicken Commitment/ European Chicken Commitment or a slower growth potential, defined as average <40g/day. The assessment criteria already include questions on the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment within the Farm Animal Welfare Targets and Performance Impact pillars (Q.25 and Q.34) and this is a commitment that several hundred companies are now signatory to. The alternative requirement, to end the use of breeds without a slower growth potential, defined as <40g/day is based on research demonstrating poorer welfare outcomes above this threshold².

The requirements for beef cattle are focused on the use of double-muscled breeds, for example, the Belgian Blue and the Piedmontese. This question is looking for the end of the use of these breeds in pure-bred and cross-bred form. Again, there is strong evidence demonstrating poor welfare outcomes associated with these breeds³⁴.

There was concern expressed regarding the specific requirements for pigs. However, we have decided to proceed with the proposed inclusion of pigs within the question on the basis that there is a body of scientific evidence supporting the premise that average litter sizes greater than 16 piglets liveborn are detrimental to welfare. Most significantly, this includes the EFSA Scientific Opinion on the Welfare of Pigs on Farm 2022⁵ which comprises an extensive review of the available research and concludes:

² Castellini, C., et al., (2016). Adaptation to organic rearing system of eight different chicken genotypes: behaviour, welfare and performance. Italian journal of animal science, 15(1), 37-46.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303734263_Adaptation_to_organic_rearing_system_of_eight_different_chicken_genotypes_Behaviour_welfare_and_performance.

³ Sandøe, P., et al., (2018). Breeding Blues: an ethical evaluation of the plan to reduce calving difficulties in Danish Blue cattle. Conference Paper., 14th Congress of the European Society for Agricultural and Food Ethics.
https://www.wageningenacademic.com/doi/10.3920/978-90-8686-869-8_19

⁴ Mckimmie, C., et al., (2024). Evaluating the Potential of Double-Muscled Angus Sires to Produce Progeny from Dairy Cows to Meet Premium Beef Brand Specifications. Appl. Sci., 14(15)
<https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/14/15/6440>

⁵ EFSA Scientific Opinion on the Welfare of Pigs on Farm 2022
<https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.2903/j.efsa.2022.7421>

“Recommendations on the effect of litter size to sow and piglet welfare:

- 1) To avoid excessive competition for access to teats and significantly increased piglet mortality in large litters, the average number of piglets born alive in a given sow breed or line should not exceed, and preferably be lower than, the average number of functional teats in the population of this breed or line.
- 2) For breeding to be sustainable in terms of sow longevity, selection for litter size should be limited to an average number of 12–14 piglets born alive.
- 3) Selection for litter size should be supplemented to a larger extent with selection for low birth weight variation within litters and other traits resulting in low piglet mortality before weaning.”

Whilst EFSA have recommended a limit of 12-14 piglets per litter, the BBFAW requirement of ending use of sows with average >16 piglets liveborn per litter is based on research from Oliviero (2022). This research defines hyperprolific sows as those producing more than 16 piglets per litter and concludes: “Although in polytocous species like pigs a certain degree of mortality at birth is considered normal, the increased prolificacy of hyperprolific sows has caused increases in perinatal piglet mortality with reported increased duration of farrowing and increased stillbirth rate due to hypoxia during parturition. There are also many reports on increased mortality before weaning in large litters.”⁶

We acknowledge the concerns expressed regarding the specific thresholds proposed for laying hens and dairy cattle and have decided to remove these from the question in 2024. We appreciate the detailed responses provided to the proposals and will seek further discussion with respondents on how requirements for laying hen and dairy cattle breeds could be formulated for inclusion in future.

This new question will be assessed in 2024 but the points awarded will not be included in companies’ overall scores. This will provide a baseline assessment of this question and allow time for companies to adjust to the new criteria.

2.3. Wider Benchmark Revisions

2.3.1. BBFAW’s Proposals

Beyond the changes to company scope and the addition of the question on breeds with low welfare potential, we did not propose further significant changes to the BBFAW 2024 assessment criteria. This was to provide consistency after the

⁶ Oliviero, C., (2022). Offspring of hyper prolific sows: Immunity, birthweight, and heterogeneous litters. *Molecular Reproduction and Development* 90(7)
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/mrd.23572>

significant revisions to the criteria made in 2022. There were, however, a number of minor edits or additions to either the rationale or explanatory notes of some questions to provide clarification of the assessment approach (see p21-23 in the BBFAW 2023 Methodology Report⁷ for further explanation of some of these).

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

2.3.2. Stakeholder Responses

We received a number of comments on the continued inclusion of questions on reducing reliance on animal sourced foods, which were introduced to the assessment criteria in BBFAW 2022. There were also calls to weight company scores on the species-specific questions according to the relevance of each species to individual companies.

Selected comments:

“As the BBFAW is an animal welfare benchmark we do not agree with the strict movement to reducing animal sourced foods in food companies' supply chains. Even if we acknowledge that a transition to plant-based food systems is crucial it does not directly translate to higher animal welfare. More flexibility should be allowed e.g., achieving points by promoting more plants in customers' diets instead of reducing animal protein consumption in general. That said, the BBFAW needs to remain an animal welfare benchmark.” [European food company]

“We welcome the inclusion of questions about alternative proteins. However, we believe that the current questionnaire does not adequately capture what organizations are actually doing and investing in regarding alternative proteins to reduce reliance on animal welfare protein. We understand that the ranking should focus on implementing good animal welfare practices, and not on reducing the consumption of animal protein itself. This change, in our opinion, is mischaracterizing the purpose of BBFAW on implementing good animal handling practices.” [Latin American food company]

“We remain concerned by the implications of the new questions focused on the need to 'reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods in human diets.' We fully recognise the global need to encourage more plant-based proteins in diets and to reduce carbon emissions from agriculture, including livestock agriculture, if we

⁷ BBFAW 2023 Methodology Report <https://bbfaw.com/media/2175/bbfaw-methodology-report-final.pdf>

are to reach net zero. However, we do not see reducing the reliance on animal-based foods as a standalone issue that slots neatly into an animal welfare benchmark. Encouraging plant-based diets is only one part of a much wider and complex environmental picture.” [UK food company]

“The methodology should reflect the efforts of the assessed companies, particularly where only certain species are significant in terms of operational volume. For example, 65% of the protein processed may be chicken, or 95% may be beef. However, some companies are currently being evaluated on less relevant proteins/species with the same weight/measure. To ensure a fair and consistent assessment that aligns with reality, the methodology should focus on the most relevant proteins or assign different weights accordingly.” [Latin American food company]

Regarding the clarification that calves originating from the dairy supply should be included in reporting for the question on group housing of calves (Q43): “If veal is included in group housing, surely it also needs to be included in disbudding [Q.44]? It will take both supply chains and both volumes to provide the answer. The addition now infers that if beef come from dairy herds they are not included in the disbudding impact”. [UK other respondent]

2.3.3. Our Planned Actions

We acknowledge the continued concern expressed in the feedback regarding the questions on reducing reliance on animal sourced foods. In response to some of the specific points raised, it is important to note that BBFAW does not have an objective to work towards the phase-out of livestock in food supply chains. BBFAW remains focused on the issue of farm animal welfare but is aware that it needs to recognise the context within which improvements in animal welfare lie. Evolving consumer attitudes to animal sourced foods, coupled with the need to create a more sustainable food system, places an expectation on companies to play an active part in the transition towards sustainable diets which feature reduced consumption of animal sourced foods. Corporate action is essential to create a sustainable food system that supports the basic principles of food nutrition, planetary health, human well-being, and animal health and welfare.

Regarding the suggestions to weight company scores on the species-specific questions according to the relevance of each species to individual companies, this is part of the rationale for the introduction of the question assessing company reporting on volumes of animal-sourced foods (Q.50) in BBFAW 2022. To be able to introduce such a weighting, it is first necessary to understand which species are most relevant to individual companies. Currently, reporting on volumes of animal-sourced foods is limited and therefore it is not possible to consistently determine the relevance of different species to individual companies. This is an area we will continue to consider as company reporting on volumes of animal-sourced foods develops.

In response to the specific comment received regarding the performance impact questions on disbudding in beef cattle supply chains (Q.44), we have added to the

explanatory notes of Q.44 to clarify calves originating from dairy supply chains should be included in the reported figures. We have also amended the explanatory notes for the other beef cattle Performance Impact questions (Q.42 and Q.43) to provide consistency. These edits do not change how these questions are assessed.

We appreciate all the further suggestions provided and will reflect on these as we evolve the Benchmark in future years.

3. Closing Remarks

We are extremely grateful for the feedback received in response to the 2024 consultation. We would also like to thank the companies, investors and other stakeholders that have engaged with the BBFAW programme over the last year. The annual public consultation forms an integral part of our Benchmark cycle and the feedback received to this consultation has played an important role in helping to refine the 2024 Benchmark to ensure that it remains relevant and credible and continues its role as a key driver of change in investment and corporate practice on farm animal welfare.

The BBFAW partners, Compassion in World Farming and FOUR PAWS, and the Secretariat would like to thank the organisations that took the time to respond to our 2024 public consultation, and we look forward to continued engagement with all stakeholders as we further develop the Benchmark.

Appendix I: BBFAW 2024 Company Scope

Note: Changes from BBFAW 2023 are shown in red.

	Company	ICB Classification	Ownership	Country of origin/ incorporation
1	(The) Kroger Company	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA
2	2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd)	3570: Food Producer	Private	UK
3	Aeon Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Japan
4	Agro Super	3570: Food Producer	Public	Chile
5	Ahold Delhaize	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Netherlands
6	Albertsons	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	USA
7	ALDI Einkauf SE & Co. oHG (ALDI Nord)	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Germany
8	ALDI SOUTH Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Germany
9	Alimentation Couche-Tard	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Canada
10	Amazon/Whole Foods Market	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA
11	Aramark Corporation	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
12	Arla Foods Ltd	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	Denmark
13	Asda (Bellis Topco Ltd)	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	United Kingdom
14	Avolta AG	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	Switzerland
15	Barilla SpA	3570: Food Producer	Private	Italy

16	Beijing Dabeinong Technology Group Co., Ltd.	3570: Food Producer	Private	China
17	Bimbo	3570: Food Producer	Public	Mexico
18	BJ's Wholesale Club Holdings	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA
19	Bloomin' Brands Inc	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
20	BRF SA	3570: Food Producer	Public	Brazil
21	C&S Wholesale	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	USA
22	Campbell Soup Company	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
23	Camst – La Ristorazione Italiana Soc. Coop. ARL	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Cooperative	Italy
24	Cargill	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA
25	Carrefour SA	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	France
26	Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	France
27	Cencosud	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Chile
28	Charoen Pokphand Foods	3570: Food Producer	Private	Thailand
29	Chick-fil-A	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	USA
30	China Resources Vanguard	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	China
31	China Yurun Group Limited	3570: Food Producer	Private	China
32	Chipotle Mexican Grill	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
33	CKE Restaurants	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	USA
34	Coles Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Australia

35	Colruyt	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Belgium
36	Compass Group PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK
37	Conad Consorzio Nazionale	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	Italy
38	ConAgra	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
39	Cooke Seafood Inc	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA
40	Coop Group (Switzerland)/Coop Genossenschaft	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	Switzerland
41	Coop Italia	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	Italy
42	Co-op UK	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	UK
43	Cooperativa Central Aurora Alimentos	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	Brazil
44	Coopérative U Enseigne	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	France
45	Cooperl Arc Atlantique	3570: Food Producer	Public	France
46	Costco Wholesale Corporation	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA
47	Cracker Barrel	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
48	Cranswick PLC	3570: Food Producer	Public	UK
49	Cremonini SpA	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	Italy
50	Dairy Farmers of America	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	USA
51	Danish Crown AmbA	3570: Food Producer	Joint Stock	Denmark
52	Darden Restaurants PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
53	Dico's/Ting Hsin International Group	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	China

54	Dino Polska SA	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Poland
55	Domino's Pizza Inc	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
56	E.Leclerc	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	France
57	EDEKA Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Germany
58	Elior Group	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	France
59	Elo Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	France
60	Empire Company/Sobey's	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Canada
61	Ferrero Group	3570: Food Producer	Joint Stock	Italy
62	Fonterra	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	New Zealand
63	Gategroup Holding AG	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	Switzerland
64	General Mills Inc	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
65	Greggs PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK
66	Groupe Danone SA	3570: Food Producer	Public	France
67	Groupe Lactalis	3570: Food Producer	Private	France
68	Gruppo Veronesi	3570: Food Producer	Private	Italy
69	H E Butt Company	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	USA
70	Habib's	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	Brazil
71	Hershey Co	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
72	Hilton Food Group	3570: Food Producer	Public	UK
73	Hormel Foods Corporation	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA

74	ICA Gruppen AB	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Sweden
75	IKEA (Inter IKEA Group)	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Sweden
76	Industrias Bachoco	3570: Food Producer	Public	Mexico
77	J Sainsbury PLC	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	UK
78	JAB Holding Company	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	Luxembourg
79	JBS SA	3570: Food Producer	Public	Brazil
80	JD Wetherspoon PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK
81	Jeronimo Martins	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Portugal
82	Kerry Group	3570: Food Producer	Public	Ireland
83	Kraft Heinz Company	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
84	LDC Groupe	3570: Food Producer	Private	France
85	Les Mousquetaires	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	France
86	Lianhua Supermarket Holdings Co	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	PRC
87	Loblaw Companies Limited	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Canada
88	Maple Leaf Foods	3570: Food Producer	Public	Canada
89	Marfrig Global Foods SA	3570: Food Producer	Public	Brazil
90	Marks & Spencer PLC	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	UK
91	Mars Inc	3570: Food Producer	Private	UK
92	Maruha Nichiro	3570: Food Producer	Public	Japan
93	McDonald's Corporation	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA

94	Meiji Holdings	3570: Food Producer	Public	Japan
95	Mercadona SA	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Spain
96	METRO AG	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Germany
97	Metro Inc	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Canada
98	Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	Switzerland
99	Minerva Foods	3570: Food Producer	Public	Brazil
100	Mitchells & Butlers PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK
101	Mondelēz International	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
102	Mowi ASA	3570: Food Producer	Public	Norway
103	Nestlé SA	3570: Food Producer	Public	Switzerland
104	New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd	3570: Food Producer	Public	PRC
105	Nippon Ham	3570: Food Producer	Public	Japan
106	Noble Foods	3570: Food Producer	Private	UK
107	OSI Group	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA
108	Papa John's Pizza	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
109	Perdue Farms	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA
110	Plukon Food Group	3570: Food Producer	Private	Netherlands
111	Premier Foods PLC	3570: Food Producer	Public	UK
112	Publix Super Markets Inc	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	USA
113	Restaurant Brands International	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	Canada
114	REWE Group	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Cooperative	Germany

115	Roark Capital (Inspire Brands, Subway et al.)	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	USA
116	Royal FrieslandCampina	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	Netherlands
117	Saputo Inc	3570: Food Producer	Public	Canada
118	Schwarz Gruppe	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Germany
119	Seaboard Corp	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
120	Seven & i Holdings	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Japan
121	Sodexo	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	France
122	Spar Holding AG	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Private	Netherlands
123	SSP Group	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	Sweden
124	Starbucks Corporation	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
125	Sysco Corporation	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA
126	Target Corporation	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA
127	Terrena Group	3570: Food Producer	Cooperative	France
128	Tesco PLC	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	UK
129	The Cheesecake Factory	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
130	Tönnies Group	3570: Food Producer	Private	Germany
131	Tyson Foods Inc	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
132	UNFI	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA
133	Unilever NV	3570: Food Producer	Public	Netherlands

134	Unternehmensgruppe Theo Müller	3570: Food Producer	Private	Germany
135	US Foods	3570: Food Producer	Private	USA
136	Vion Food Group	3570: Food Producer	Private	Netherlands
137	Waitrose	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Partnership	UK
138	Walmart Inc	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	USA
139	Wayne-Sanderson Farms	3570: Food Producer	Public	USA
140	Wendy's Company (The)	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Private	USA
141	Wens Foodstuff Group	3570: Food Producer	Private	China
142	WH Group Ltd	3570: Food Producer	Public	PRC
143	Whitbread PLC	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	UK
144	Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	UK
145	Woolworths Limited	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	Australia
146	Yili Group	3570: Food Producer	Public	China
147	Yonghui Superstores Co Ltd	5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers	Public	PRC
148	Yum China Holdings	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	China
149	Yum! Brands Inc	5757: Restaurants and Bars	Public	USA
150	Zhongpin Inc	3570: Food Producer	Public	PRC/USA

Appendix II: Weighting of the Assessment Pillars

There are no changes to the weightings of the assessment pillars from BBAW 2023. The changes in the number of points for the Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitment pillar and Overall Total points (shown in red) are a result of additional points available for the new question on breeds with lower welfare potential (Q10).

Pillar	BBAW 2024	
	No. of Points	Weighting
Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitments	69	15%
Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management	56	14%
Farm Animal Welfare Targets	40	7%
Farm Animal Welfare Performance Impact*	200	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	20	
Animal-Sourced Foods Total	75	9%
Overall Total	440	100%

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

Appendix III: BBFAW 2024 Benchmark Assessment Criteria

Farm Animal Welfare Policy Commitment

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, 4-12, 24-28 and 30-50. • 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, 4-12, 24-28 and 30-50. • 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) ○ 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). • 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 	

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

	<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. • 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	<p>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</p>

	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 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 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 have a commitment to ending routine mutilations but do not state the specific mutilations they are looking to end the use of 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) 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. • 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. 	

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

	<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. • 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. • The question covers animals transported on land and by sea, and companies are 	

	<p>expected to include sea transport in their policies and reporting on transport times. We encourage companies to clearly state whether sea transport is included in their policies, or clearly state that they do not transport animals by sea.</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 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.
--	--

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	<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 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. 	

Laying Hens, Pigs and Beef Cattle	
Question 10.	Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of breeds with low welfare potential?
Rationale	The welfare of farmed animals is not only influenced by management practices and the inputs provided to them, but also by their genetics. For example, some breeds selected for high growth rate and lean meat deposition can suffer a range of physiological and

	<p>metabolic health issues, as well as poor immunity and lethargy and poor behavioural expression. Double-muscled breeds of beef cattle are associated with higher rates of dystocia (difficulty calving). The choice of breed or strain of animals used in livestock production can therefore have a significant impact on animal welfare.</p> <p>Specific requirements for the species covered by this question are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> broiler chickens: end use of breeds that do not meet the Better Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment requirements for improved welfare outcomes; <u>or</u> end use of breeds without a slower growth potential, defined as <40g/d averaged over the growth cycle according to the breeding company specification pigs: end use of sows with an average >16 piglets liveborn per litter beef cattle: end use of double-muscled breeds (e.g. Belgian Blue and Piedmontese) in pure-bred and cross-bred form. 	
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)	

Ducks and Geese		
Question 11.	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. Companies that only mention they do not produce or sell foie gras products do not qualify for points. Companies are required to also include meat from birds reared for foie gras within their commitments. 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 	

	<p>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). • 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, Ducks or Geese		
Question 12.	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 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, 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, 	

	<p>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).</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.
--	--

Animal-Sourced Foods Policy Commitments		
Question 13.	Does the company acknowledge the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods as a business issue?	
Rationale	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. 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. • Companies that only provide evidence related to protein diversification, without any 	

	<p>acknowledgement of the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods, are not awarded points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 14.	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
	The company has a broad commitment to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods within a policy statement (or equivalent) and a description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy is effectively implemented.	10
	(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. 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 	

	<p>points, company policies need to include most/all of the following:</p> <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.
--	---

Question 15.	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>3a. 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>3b. 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. 	

Farm Animal Welfare Governance and Management

Question 16.	Has the company assigned day-to-day and board or senior management responsibility for farm animal welfare?	
Rationale	<p>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.</p>	
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 	

	<p>management oversight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 17.	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>15a. Employee training</i>	
	No information provided on employee training in farm animal welfare.	0
	The company provides specific training to employees in farm animal welfare.	5
	<i>15b. Actions taken in the event of non-compliance</i>	
	The company provides no information on the actions to be taken in the event of non-compliance with the farm animal welfare policy.	0
	The company describes the actions it takes in the event of non-compliance with its farm animal welfare policy.	5
	(Max Score 10)	
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 18.	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 processes covered farm animal welfare, 	

	<p>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 19.	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 and restaurants and bars, 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

	<p>behavioural analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • For slaughter: effectiveness of stunning. 	
Scoring	<p><i>18a. Does the company describe how it uses welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain?</i></p>	
	<p>No information provided on how the company uses welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain.</p>	0
	<p>The company describes how welfare outcome measures are used to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain.</p>	2
	<p><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></p>	
	<p>No reporting on welfare outcome measures.</p>	0
	<p>The company partially reports on welfare outcome measures but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.</p>	1
	<p>The company reports fully on one welfare outcome measure for each relevant species, covering all geographies and products.</p>	3
	<p>The company fully reports on multiple welfare outcome measure for each relevant species, covering all geographies and products</p>	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). 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Body condition (as an indicator of good feed management, or competition at feeding). ○ Cleanliness (as an indicator of good environmental control, thermal comfort). ○ Positive flock or herd behaviour (as an indicator of a varied stimulating environment, good management and suitable breed 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 20.	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 and restaurants and bars, 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; AEBEA 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 21.	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	5

	welfare.	
	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 Policy Commitments

Question 22.	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

	<p>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.</p>	
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 a wider sustainability, CSR or sourcing committee. 	

	<p>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 23.	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. Media promotions. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 24.	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?	
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 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 	

	<p>this has already been achieved. It is anticipated that this question will expand in scope to also cover combination and limited access systems in future assessments.</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 25.	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?								
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	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">No stated position.</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>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.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </table>	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)	
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 chicken or chicken-based products. 								

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/ and www.welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/). • To qualify for points, companies need to explicitly state their commitment to the Better Chicken Commitment or the European Chicken Commitment. • 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 26.	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 confirmation), within a reasonable timeframe, or evidence that this has already been achieved. • 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 27.	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. • 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 28.	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	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">No stated position.</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>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.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The company has published a universal time-bound target, or evidence of achievement, across all relevant own-brand and other brand products and geographies.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </table>	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)	
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 absent. Companies that state that they comply with legislation but do not have a formal policy on tethering are, therefore, awarded zero points. • 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 29.	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. 	

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

Laying Hens																	
Question 30.	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	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">0% of laying hens is cage-free, or no reported information.</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">1 – 20% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">21 – 40% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">41 – 60% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">61 – 80% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">81 – 98% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">99 – 100% of laying hens is cage-free.</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">(Max Score 10)</td> </tr> </table>	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)	
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 																

	<p>enriched/colony cages. It is 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"> • 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 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 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 31.	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, 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 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 32.	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 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 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 33.	What proportion of broiler chickens (for fresh/frozen chicken products and ingredients) in the company’s global supply chain is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 30kg/m ² or 6lbs/sq ft or less)?	
Rationale	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.	
Scoring	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 	

	<p>from close confinement (e.g. with statements such as: ‘xx% of our broiler chickens ...’).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 34.	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 according to the breeding company specification (see www.betterchickencommitment.com/policy/ and www.welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/); <u>or</u> breeds with a slower growth potential, defined as <40g/d averaged over the growth cycle. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Companies should state the breeds used or that the breeds are RSPCA or GAP-approved within their reporting. • 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 35.	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 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 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 	

	<p>atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion in line with these standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 36.	What proportion of sows (for fresh/frozen pork products and ingredients) in the company’s global supply chain is free from gestation crates /sow stalls?	
Rationale	Companies should report on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation crates /sow stalls throughout pregnancy including 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 crates/sow stalls, or no reported information.	0
	1 – 20% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	1
	21 – 40% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	2
	41 – 60% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	3
	61 – 80% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	5
	81 – 98% of sows is free from gestation crates/sow stalls.	7
	99 – 100% of sows is free from gestation crates/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 crates/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 	

	<p>expected to state the maximum time permitted within their policies and reporting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 crates/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 crates/sow stalls are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation crates/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 37.	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 38.	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 39.	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 40.	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 41.	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 ...’). 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 42.	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. This question is looking for reporting to cover all beef cattle in the company's supply chain, including veal calves and calves originating from dairy supply chains. Points are only awarded if the company explicitly mentions CAFOs or feedlots and 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. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 43.	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. Calves should be reared in groups (minimum pairs) from birth. 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. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, from birth (minimum pairs). • This question is looking for reporting to cover all beef cattle in the company’s supply chain, including veal calves and calves originating from dairy supply chains. • 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 44.	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. • This question is looking for reporting to cover all beef cattle in the company’s supply chain, including veal calves and calves originating from dairy supply chains. • 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 45.	What proportion of farmed salmon (for fresh/frozen salmon products and ingredients) in the company’s global supply chain is reared at lower stocking densities (specifically, 10kg/m ³ 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). • Scores are not awarded for companies that report average stocking densities for salmon. • 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 46.	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 that is free from fasting lasting longer than 72 hours in line with these standards. 	

	<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 47.	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 	

	<p>salmon 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 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 48.	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. • Companies are expected to include transport by sea within their reporting on transport times. We encourage companies to clearly state whether sea transport is included in their reporting, or clearly state that they do not transport animals by sea. • 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 49.	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 50.	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. Scores are not awarded for companies that report on proportions of animal sourced foods vs. other proteins. • 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 51.	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)	
Explanatory Notes	<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). • 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). 	