

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare 2025 Assessment Criteria



Executive Summary

The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare is not introducing any significant changes to the assessment criteria in 2025. For this reason, we have not held a consultation on changes to the assessment criteria this year. The BBFAW 2024 Methodology Report, published in March 2025, outlined a number of clarifications to the criteria that are confirmed, where required, in the explanatory notes to the final BBFAW 2025 Assessment Criteria presented in this document.

We would like to draw attention to three questions where company scores could be impacted in the 2025 or 2026 assessment cycle. These are as follows:

- **Q10 – Ending the use of breeds with low welfare potential:** This question was introduced in 2024 but the points awarded were not included in companies' overall scores. The points awarded for this question will be included in companies' overall scores in 2025.
- **Q27 & Q37 – Ending the use of farrowing crates:** From the 2026 assessment cycle, companies will be required to disclose the duration of any temporary crating used in alternative farrowing systems to continue to receive points.

Contents

| | |
|----------|--|
| Part I: | BBFAW 2025 Benchmark Assessment Criteria |
| Part II: | BBFAW 2025 Company Scope |

Part I: BBFAW 2025 Benchmark Assessment Criteria

Whilst no significant changes to the assessment criteria are being introduced in 2025, we would like to draw attention to three questions where company scores could be impacted in the 2025 or 2026 assessment cycle.

Q10 Ending the use of breeds with low welfare potential

In 2024, a new question on ending the use of breeds with low welfare potential was introduced, focused on broiler chickens, beef cattle and pigs (Q.10)¹. As per the usual protocol when introducing new questions to the criteria, this question was assessed in the 2024 Benchmark without including the points awarded in companies' overall scores. This was to allow time for companies to adjust to the new criteria.

The results of the 2024 Benchmark showed the following:

- 36 out of 130 (28%) companies with beef, chicken or pork in their supply chains had made commitments to end the use of breeds with lower welfare potential.
- 32 companies (25%) had made commitments that applied to at least part of their chicken supply chains to end the use of breeds that do not meet the Better Chicken Commitment/ European Chicken Commitment requirements for improved welfare outcomes; or end use of breeds without a slower growth potential (<40g/d averaged over the growth cycle according to the breeding company specification)
- 5 companies (4%) had made commitments to end the use of double-muscled breeds in beef supply chains.
- 1 company (1%) had made a commitment to end the use of sows with an average >16 piglets liveborn per litter.

The points awarded from this question will be included in companies' overall scores in the BBFAW 2025 Benchmark.

¹ Report on The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare 2024 Consultation August 2024
<https://www.bbfaw.com/media/2184/report-on-bbfaw-2024-consultation.pdf>

Q27 & Q37 Ending the use of farrowing crates

The BBFAW 2024 Methodology Report², published March 2025, stated the BBFAW may look to amend Q27 and Q37 in future years to encourage greater transparency on the degree of confinement that sows in their supply chains are subjected to at farrowing.

The results of the 2024 Benchmark showed that, of the 13 companies scoring points for Q27, only 4 companies currently describe the system being used as an alternative to conventional farrowing crates and/or the temporary crating practices in place within that system.

Most of the evidence awarded points in 2024 related to reporting on outdoor production systems, which do not feature farrowing crates. We also found one company reporting on the use of farrowing systems which feature a more limited period of close confinement around farrowing followed by loose housing until weaning (temporary crating).

There are many variations in design and the extent of close confinement used in alternative farrowing systems—Ultimately, the aim should be to end the use of farrowing crates and to adopt systems that operate without any close confinement throughout farrowing and lactation. To encourage greater transparency on this issue, in order to continue receiving points from the 2026 assessment cycle onwards, companies will be required to make clear whether sows are subject to any close confinement in the alternative farrowing systems used (i.e. whether temporary crating is practiced and if so, its duration) Companies not reporting clearly on temporary crating practices in alternative farrowing systems will be provided a warning in the 2025 assessments that they will need to amend their reporting in order to continue to receive points in the 2026 assessment.

² The Business Benchmark on Farm Animal Welfare Methodology Report 2024 March 2025
<https://bbfaw.com/media/2194/bbfaw-methodology-report-2024.pdf>

BBFAW 2025 Assessment Criteria

Changes to the criteria are shown in red text.

| 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 | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>being effectively implemented)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>awarded points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some cases, companies use terms such as ‘all animals’ or ‘all products’. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 3 points for these sub-questions. When unclear, we ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks. • For companies involved in or using the products from finfish aquaculture, we do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish. If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only partial points are awarded for the species-part of the question. • We define finfish aquaculture as the breeding, rearing and harvesting of aquatic vertebrates (i.e. cold-blooded animals with a bony or cartilaginous skeleton and a segmented spinal column) in all types of water environment enclosures, including ponds, rivers, lakes and the ocean. • We do not consider policies for finfish that focus on conservation or sustainable fishing, unless there is an explicit reference to animal welfare within these. |
|--|--|

| Question 4. | Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the use of close confinement for all species? | |
|-------------------|--|-----|
| Rationale | <p>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.</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. • Companies that simply mention they avoid close confinement but do not state the specific confinement to be avoided receive zero points. • Statements on ending the use of cages for broiler chickens are not suitable for points, unless the company makes clear that chicken is sourced from a region where | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>these systems are in use (e.g., Asia).</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. • Regarding gestation/sow stalls, this question is looking for commitments that do not allow any time in stalls, except for a maximum of 4 hours for management purposes. Companies are expected to state the maximum time permitted within their policies and reporting. • Regarding CAFOs and feedlots, these are defined as systems in which beef cattle are kept at high stocking densities, indoors on fully slatted or solid floors, or outdoors, and there is no opportunity for grazing, instead, feed is brought to the animals. • For companies involved in or using the products from finfish aquaculture, we do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish. If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only partial points are awarded. |
|--|--|

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Question 5. | Does the company have a clear commitment to the provision of effective, species-specific enrichment for all species? |
| Rationale | Companies are expected to provide animals with stimulating and complex environments that enable species-specific behaviours. Effective environmental modifications allow for the performance of strongly motivated species-specific behaviours and lead to the |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----|
| | <p>expression of a more complex behavioural repertoire. Examples include (but are not limited to) brushes for cattle; manipulable materials such as straw for pigs; pecking and dustbathing substrates, and perches for chickens; bathing water for ducks; outdoor range enhancement, such as artificial or natural shelter; for fish, physical enrichment such as (artificial) plants, floor substrates and structures, as well as sensory enrichment, such as cover or lighting, or occupational enrichment such as currents or water flow to induce swimming exercise. Animals with outdoor access should not be excluded from enrichment (provided outdoors or indoors). The BBFAW does not score outdoor access per se as enrichment. See the BBFAW briefing paper on environmental enrichment for further guidance on suitable forms of enrichment per species.</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. • 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 | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>awarded points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some cases, companies use terms such as ‘all animals’ or ‘all products’. For the purposes of this assessment, we take this to mean that the policy has universal application (with respect to animals and products respectively) and companies receive 5 points. When unclear, we ask companies to clarify the scope in order to keep receiving these points in future Benchmarks. • For companies involved in or using the products from finfish aquaculture, we do not assume that the corporate farm animal welfare policy also applies to finfish (i.e. the policy has universal application) unless the company states otherwise, or has a separate policy that applies to finfish. If it is unclear whether finfish are included, only partial points are awarded. |
|--|---|

| Question 7. | Does the company have a clear commitment to ending the prophylactic and routine metaphylactic use of antibiotics for all species? | |
|-------------------|---|-----|
| Rationale | <p>Prophylaxis is the treatment of animals without clinical sign of disease. Metaphylaxis is the treatment of a group of animals when some within the group are showing clinical signs of disease.</p> <p>The over-use of antibiotics in humans and in animals is directly linked to the increase in antibiotic resistance. The use of antibiotics on-farm (typically through feed or water) is frequently prophylactic or metaphylactic; effectively ‘propping up’ intensive farming systems where animals are kept in confined and stressful conditions and where their immune systems are compromised and disease outbreaks can spread rapidly. Companies are expected to commit to reducing the levels of antibiotics they administer routinely and to develop animal production systems that are not reliant on the routine use of antibiotics for disease prevention. Points are not awarded for supply chains marketed as antibiotic-free 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 | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <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). • 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 | <p>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.</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. • The question covers animals transported on land and by sea, and companies are 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. • 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 percussive 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 | <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. 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; or 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) | |
| 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 limited to certain species covered by this question. <p>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.</p> |
|--|--|

| 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 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 | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>with the standard is presented as a way of delivering on its commitment).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, 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 | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>application of their policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 acknowledgement of the need to reduce reliance on animal-sourced foods, are not awarded points. The score does not take account of the importance assigned by companies to reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods (e.g. relative to other corporate responsibility issues). | |

| Question 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 points, company policies need to include most/all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear statement of the reasons why reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is important to the business (including both the business case and the ethical case for action). A description of how reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is to be achieved, such as through protein diversification, product reformulation or communication to consumers A description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy is effectively | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>implemented (e.g. senior management oversight, commitments to continuous improvement, performance monitoring, corrective action if the policy is not being effectively implemented)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 management oversight. For the purposes of scoring, the emphasis is on the management of farm animal welfare. General information on the management or oversight of CSR or | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | sustainability is only credited if it is clear that this includes farm animal welfare. |
|--|--|

| Question 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>18a. 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>18b. 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>18c. 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 companies report that they audit their suppliers against safety and/or quality standards but, unless it is clear | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>that these audit processes cover farm animal welfare, companies score zero for this sub-question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On auditing, companies are expected to explain how they monitor or audit their farm animal welfare policy requirements through their supply chain. Simply stating compliance with a farm assurance standard or evidence of the use of third-party assurance schemes that include welfare requirements is not sufficient in itself to be awarded points for this question. Whilst third-party assurance schemes may feature as part of a company's approach to monitoring and auditing its supply chain, in order to receive points for this question, companies are required to clearly state this is the case or evidence it through, e.g., stating which of the company's animal welfare requirements are assessed by the assurance schemes. 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. |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For broiler chickens: gait score, leg culls, footpad dermatitis, hock burn, breast blisters, feather cleanliness, muscle myopathies. For beef: body condition, lameness, lesions, swellings, cleanliness, stomach ulcers, acidosis. For rabbits: foot lesions, fur coverage, eye condition. For fish: fin and body damage, sea lice and other ectoparasite infestations, skeletal deformities, condition factor, mortality and behaviour. For mental wellbeing: reaction to humans or novelty, fear, comfort; qualitative behavioural analysis. For behaviour: time spent lying/resting, ruminating or being active – foraging, perching, dustbathing, bathing (ducks), socialising, swimming (fish). For transportation: injuries, slips and falls, fatigue, road traffic incidents, mortality (dead-on-arrival/DOA). For slaughter: effectiveness of stunning. | |
| Scoring | <i>18a. Does the company describe how it uses welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain?</i> | |
| | No information provided on how the company uses welfare outcome measures to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain. | 0 |
| | The company describes how welfare outcome measures are used to inform continuous improvement in its operations or supply chain. | 2 |
| | <i>18b. Does the company report on welfare outcome measures (i.e. measures linked to the physical, emotional and/or behavioural wellbeing of animals)?</i> | |
| | No reporting on welfare outcome measures. | 0 |
| | The company partially reports on welfare outcome measures but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products. | 1 |
| | The company reports fully on one welfare outcome measure for each relevant species, covering all geographies and products. | 3 |
| | The company fully reports on multiple welfare outcome measure for each relevant species, covering all geographies and products | 5 |
| | (Max Score 7) | |
| Explanatory Notes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the sub-question on how welfare outcome measures are used to inform continuous improvement in a company's operations or supply chain, points are awarded to companies that provide a clear description of their approach to using welfare outcome measures. This may include description of how welfare outcome measure data are used to help drive continuous improvement, or as indicators for corrective action. The sub-question on reporting is looking for explicit, quantitative reporting on | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>welfare outcome measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mortality rates (as an indicator of potential pain, suffering and suboptimal performance), for fish: mortality or survival rates. ○ Bone breakages (as an indicator of pain, suffering, suboptimal performance, and poor house design). ○ Lameness (as an indicator of potential pain, behavioural restriction and suboptimal environmental and housing conditions). ○ Body marks/injuries (as an indicator of aggressive fight damage, especially during mixing or competition at feeding, or from sexual behaviours). ○ Body condition (as an indicator of good feed management, or competition at feeding). ○ Cleanliness (as an indicator of good environmental control, thermal comfort). ○ 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 | <p>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.</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----|
| 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); Better 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 welfare. | 5 |
| | Multiple examples of communicating to customers on higher farm animal welfare. | 10 |
| | (Max Score 10) | |
| Explanatory Notes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The activities that could be considered in this question are defined broadly. Examples included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of farm animal welfare information on the company's website. Note: This is not just about providing information in the corporate responsibility section of the website but making these issues an integral part of customer communications and engagement. On-pack or on-shelf labelling – provided this is evidenced on the company's website, in its published reports or on social media platforms. Information leaflets or information packs. Media promotions. Supporting third party campaigns or programmes e.g. the RSPCA Farm Animal Week. Customer farm visits, seminars or roundtables. Social media campaigns. Initiatives aimed at showing how products are sourced or produced but without an explicit focus on the welfare of farm animals are not scored in the assessment. Companies that produce multiple consumer-facing videos on farm animal welfare are awarded five points, unless it is clear that these are linked to separate consumer engagement programmes or themes. Companies are only awarded maximum points where there is clear evidence of multiple platforms or channels used to communicate to consumers. Social media channels are not separately reviewed, so companies have to link to these channels from their webpages in order to receive points (e.g. for YouTube videos). | |

Animal-Sourced Foods 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 | <p>When looking at the management of reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods, which may be achieved through protein diversification, both oversight and implementation responsibilities are important. Oversight is necessary to ensure that senior management is aware of the business implications of reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods and is prepared to intervene when needed (e.g. if there are tensions between the organisation's policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods and other business objectives). However, it is often the case that those charged with oversight know relatively little about the specific details of how to effectively manage reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods. It is, therefore, important that there are individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the policy on reducing reliance on animal-sourced foods is implemented and effectively managed.</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). | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Therefore, 5 points are awarded if the company provides a clear account of board or senior management oversight. For the purposes of scoring, the emphasis is on the management of 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 | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. ○ 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 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. • 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 | 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. 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. • In order to continue to receive points from the 2026 assessments onwards, companies will be required to provide make clear whether sows are subject to any close confinement in the alternative farrowing systems used. Specifically, we are looking for companies to make clear whether temporary crating is used and, if so, specify the duration of such confinement. Companies not reporting clearly on temporary crating practices will be provided a warning in the 2025 assessments that they will need to amend their reporting in order to continue to receive points in the 2026 assessment. 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 | 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. • 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 | 0% of laying hens is cage-free, or no reported information. | 0 |
| | 1 – 20% of laying hens is cage-free. | 1 |
| | 21 – 40% of laying hens is cage-free. | 2 |
| | 41 – 60% of laying hens is cage-free. | 3 |
| | 61 – 80% of laying hens is cage-free. | 5 |
| | 81 – 98% of laying hens is cage-free. | 7 |
| | 99 – 100% of laying hens is cage-free. | 10 |
| | (Max Score 10) | |
| Explanatory Notes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This question is only assessed for those companies that produce, use or sell eggs or egg-based products. This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of laying hens in the company's global supply chain that is cage-free, including battery and enriched/colony cages. It is anticipated that this question will expand in scope to also cover combination and limited access systems in future assessments. Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of laying hens affected. Companies that report on the total number of laying hens affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of animals used or processed globally (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear), are awarded minimal points. Companies that report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free but limit their reporting to specified products and/or geographies are 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 | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>explicitly report on the proportion of laying hens that is cage-free in line with these standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 and tipping? | |
| Rationale | Companies should report on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming and 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 and tipping, or no reported information. | 0 |
| | 1 – 20% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping. | 1 |
| | 21 – 40% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping. | 2 |
| | 41 – 60% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping. | 3 |
| | 61 – 80% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping. | 5 |
| | 81 – 98% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and tipping. | 7 |
| | 99 – 100% of laying hens is free from beak trimming and 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 both beak trimming and tipping. Partial points are awarded if companies report on the proportion of animals 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 and tipping but limited their reporting to specified products and/or | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>geographies are either awarded the equivalent of 1 or 2 points, depending on whether the scope of this partial reporting is substantial or not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scores are not awarded for companies that report on the proportion of 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 and tipping in line with these standards. Companies that make general statements about “Our laying hens” or “All chickens” being free from beak trimming and tipping are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of laying hens that is free from beak trimming and 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. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 from close confinement (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our broiler chickens ...'). We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy-to-understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations. | |

| | | |
|--------------|--|---|
| Question 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. 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. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 need 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 atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion in line with these standards. • Companies that make general statements about "Our broiler chickens" or "All broiler chickens" being subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of broiler chickens that is subject to controlled atmospheric stunning using inert gas or multi-phase systems, or effective electrical stunning without live inversion (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our broiler chickens ...'). • We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy-to-understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations. | |

| Pigs | | |
|-------------------|---|----|
| Question 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 expected to state the maximum time permitted within their policies and reporting. Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of sows affected. Companies that report on the total number of sows affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of sows used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points. Companies that report on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation 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 | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>explicitly report on the proportion of sows that is free from gestation/sow stalls in line with these standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. In order to continue to receive points from the 2026 assessments onwards, companies will be required to make clear whether sows are subject to any close confinement in the alternative farrowing systems used. Specifically, we are looking for companies to make clear whether temporary crating is used and, if so, specify the duration of such confinement. Companies not reporting clearly on temporary crating practices will be provided a warning in the 2025 assessments that they will need to amend their reporting in order to continue to receive points in the 2026 assessment. 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 | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>sows 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 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. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 and dehorning? | |
| Rationale | Companies should report on the proportion of dairy cattle that is free from disbudding and 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 and dehorning, or no reported information. | 0 |
| | 1 – 20% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 1 |
| | 21 – 40% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 2 |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----|
| | 41 – 60% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 3 |
| | 61 – 80% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 5 |
| | 81 – 98% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 7 |
| | 99 – 100% of dairy cows is free from disbudding and 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 both disbudding and dehorning. Reporting related to the proportion of polled breed animals in the company's global supply chain will also be taken into account. Partial points are awarded if companies report on the proportion of animals free from disbudding or dehorning. • 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 and 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 and dehorning in line with these standards. • Companies that make general statements about "Our dairy cows" or "All dairy cows" being free from disbudding and dehorning are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of dairy cows that is free from disbudding and dehorning (e.g. with statements such as: 'xx% of our dairy cows ...'). • We expect companies to report impact figures in an easy-to-understand format and with a description of the proportion of the supply chain represented by the data, without relying on the assessor to make the calculations. | |

| Beef Cattle | | |
|-------------------|---|----|
| Question 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. 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 | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from confinement in CAFOs or feedlots in line with these standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 and dehorning? | |
|--------------|---|----|
| Rationale | Companies should report on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding and 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 and dehorning, or no reported information. | 0 |
| | 1 – 20% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 1 |
| | 21 – 40% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 2 |
| | 41 – 60% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 3 |
| | 61 – 80% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 5 |
| | 81 – 98% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 7 |
| | 99 – 100% of beef cattle is free from disbudding and dehorning. | 10 |
| | (Max Score 10) | |

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <p>Explanatory Notes</p> | <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 both disbudding and dehorning. Reporting related to the proportion of polled breed animals in the company's global supply chain will also be taken into account. Partial points are awarded if companies report on the proportion of animals free from disbudding or dehorning. • 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 and 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 and dehorning in line with these standards. • Companies that make general statements about "Our beef cattle" or "All beef cattle" being free from disbudding and dehorning are not awarded points unless there is explicit reporting on the proportion of beef cattle that is free from disbudding and 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 | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>explicitly report on the proportion of farmed salmon that is reared at lower stocking densities in line with these standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Companies that make general statements about “Our farmed salmon” or “All farmed salmon” being 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 ...’). 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. | |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question is looking specifically for reporting on the proportion of farmed salmon in the company's global supply chain that is stun-killed using percussion or electrocution or is pre-slaughter stunned using effective percussion or electrocution followed up by a kill method before recovery of consciousness. • Points are only awarded if the company is explicit about the proportion of farmed salmon affected. Companies that reported on the total number of farmed salmon affected but do not put this number into context of the total number of farmed salmon used or processed globally, (i.e. the scope of reported figures is unclear) are awarded minimal points. • 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...'). | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <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. |
|--|--|

| 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). | |

Part II: BBFAW 2025 Company Scope

| | Company | ICB classification | Ownership | Country of origin/ incorporation | Species |
|----|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|---|
| 1 | (The) Kroger Company | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 2 | 2 Sisters Food Group (Boparan Holdings Ltd) | 3570: Food Producer | Private | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 3 | Aeon Group | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Japan | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 4 | Agrosuper | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Chile | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 5 | Ahold Delhaize | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Netherlands | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 6 | Albertsons | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 7 | ALDI Einkauf SE & Co. oHG (ALDI Nord) | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | Germany | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 8 | ALDI Süd/ALDI Einkauf SE & Co. OHG | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | Germany | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 9 | Alimentation Couche-Tard | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Canada | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 10 | Amazon/Whole Foods Market | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 11 | Aramark Corporation | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 12 | Arla Foods Ltd | 3570: Food Producer | Cooperative | Denmark | Dairy cows |
| 13 | Asda (Bellis Topco Ltd.) | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | United Kingdom | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 14 | Avolta AG | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | Switzerland | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 15 | Barilla SpA | 3570: Food Producer | Private | Italy | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |

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

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| 34 | Coles Group | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Australia | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 35 | Colruyt | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | Belgium | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 36 | Compass Group PLC | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 37 | Conad Consorzio Nazionale | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Cooperative | Italy | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 38 | ConAgra | 3570: Food Producer | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 39 | Cooke Seafood Inc | 3570: Food Producer | Private | USA | Pigs Farmed Salmon |
| 40 | Coop Group (Switzerland)/Coop Genossenschaft | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Cooperative | Switzerland | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 41 | Coop Italia | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Cooperative | Italy | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 42 | Co-op UK | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Cooperative | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 43 | Cooperativa Central Aurora Alimentos | 3570: Food Producer | Cooperative | Brazil | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Ducks or Geese |
| 44 | Coopérative U Enseigne | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Cooperative | France | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 45 | Cooperl Arc Atlantique | 3570: Food Producer | Public | France | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 46 | Costco Wholesale Corporation | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 47 | Cracker Barrel | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 48 | Cranswick PLC | 3570: Food Producer | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Ducks or Geese |
| 49 | Cremonini SpA | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Private | Italy | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 50 | Dairy Farmers of America | 3570: Food Producer | Cooperative | USA | Laying Hens Dairy cows |
| 51 | Danish Crown AmbA | 3570: Food Producer | Joint Stock | Denmark | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |

| | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| 52 | Darden Restaurants PLC | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 53 | Dico's/Ting Hsin International Group | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | China | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 54 | Dino Polska SA | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Poland | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 55 | Domino's Pizza Inc | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 56 | E.Leclerc | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Cooperative | France | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 57 | EDEKA Group | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | Germany | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 58 | Elior Group | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | France | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 59 | Elo Group | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | France | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 60 | Empire Company/Sobey's | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Canada | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 61 | Ferrero Group | 3570: Food Producer | Joint Stock | Italy | Laying Hens Dairy cows |
| 62 | Fonterra | 3570: Food Producer | Cooperative | New Zealand | Dairy cows |
| 63 | Gategroup Holding AG | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | Switzerland | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 64 | General Mills Inc | 3570: Food Producer | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 65 | Greggs PLC | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 66 | Groupe Danone SA | 3570: Food Producer | Public | France | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 67 | Groupe Lactalis | 3570: Food Producer | Private | France | Laying Hens Dairy cows |
| 68 | Gruppo Veronesi | 3570: Food Producer | Private | Italy | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 69 | H E Butt Company | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|------------|---|
| 70 | Habib's | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Private | Brazil | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 71 | Hershey Co | 3570: Food Producer | Public | USA | Laying Hens Dairy cows |
| 72 | Hilton Food Group | 3570: Food Producer | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 73 | Hormel Foods Corporation | 3570: Food Producer | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 74 | ICA Gruppen AB | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Sweden | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 75 | IKEA (Inter IKEA Group) | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | Sweden | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 76 | Industrias Bachoco | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Mexico | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Beef Cattle |
| 77 | J Sainsbury PLC | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 78 | JAB Holding Company | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Private | Luxembourg | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 79 | JBS SA | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Brazil | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 80 | JD Wetherspoon PLC | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 81 | Jeronimo Martins | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Portugal | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 82 | Kerry Group | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Ireland | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Ducks or Geese |
| 83 | Kraft Heinz Company | 3570: Food Producer | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 84 | LDC Groupe | 3570: Food Producer | Private | France | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 85 | Les Mousquetaires | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | France | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 86 | Lianhua Supermarket Holdings Co | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | PRC | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 87 | Loblaw Companies Limited | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Canada | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 88 | Maple Leaf Foods | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Canada | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| 89 | Marfrig Global Foods SA* | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Brazil | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 90 | Marks & Spencer PLC | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 91 | Mars Inc | 3570: Food Producer | Private | UK | Laying Hens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 92 | Maruha Nichiro | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Japan | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 93 | McDonald's Corporation | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 94 | Meiji Holdings | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Japan | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 95 | Mercadona SA | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | Spain | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 96 | METRO AG | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Germany | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 97 | Metro Inc | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Canada | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 98 | Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Cooperative | Switzerland | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 99 | Minerva Foods | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Brazil | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 100 | Mitchells & Butlers PLC | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 101 | Mondelēz International | 3570: Food Producer | Public | USA | Laying Hens Dairy cows |
| 102 | Mowi ASA | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Norway | Laying Hens Pigs Dairy cows Farmed Salmon |
| 103 | Nestlé SA | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Switzerland | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 104 | New Hope Liuhe Co Ltd | 3570: Food Producer | Public | PRC | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Ducks or Geese |
| 105 | Nippon Ham | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Japan | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 106 | Noble Foods | 3570: Food Producer | Private | UK | Laying Hens |
| 107 | OSI Group | 3570: Food Producer | Private | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 108 | Papa John's Pizza | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 109 | Perdue Farms | 3570: Food Producer | Private | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| 110 | Plukon Food Group | 3570: Food Producer | Private | Netherlands | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 111 | Premier Foods PLC | 3570: Food Producer | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 112 | Publix Super Markets Inc | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 113 | Restaurant Brands International | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | Canada | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 114 | REWE Group | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Cooperative | Germany | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 115 | Roark Capital (Inspire Brands, Subway et al.) | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Private | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 116 | Royal FrieslandCampina | 3570: Food Producer | Cooperative | Netherlands | Laying Hens Dairy cows |
| 117 | Saputo Inc | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Canada | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 118 | Schwarz Gruppe | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | Germany | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 119 | Seaboard Corp | 3570: Food Producer | Public | USA | Pigs |
| 120 | Seven & i Holdings | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Japan | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 121 | Sodexo | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | France | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 122 | Spar Holding AG | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Private | Netherlands | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 123 | SSP Group | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | Sweden | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 124 | Starbucks Corporation | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 125 | Sysco Corporation | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 126 | Target Corporation | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Ducks or Geese |
| 127 | Terrena Group | 3570: Food Producer | Cooperative | France | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Ducks or Geese |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| 128 | Tesco PLC | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 129 | The Cheesecake Factory | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 130 | Tönnies Group | 3570: Food Producer | Private | Germany | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 131 | Tyson Foods Inc | 3570: Food Producer | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Ducks or Geese |
| 132 | UNFI | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 133 | Unilever NV | 3570: Food Producer | Public | Netherlands | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Laying Hens Broiler |
| 134 | Unternehmensgruppe Theo Müller | 3570: Food Producer | Private | Germany | Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 135 | US Foods | 3570: Food Producer | Private | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon |
| 136 | Vion Food Group | 3570: Food Producer | Private | Netherlands | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 137 | Waitrose | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Partnership | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 138 | Walmart Inc | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 139 | Wayne-Sanderson Farms | 3570: Food Producer | Public | USA | Broiler Chickens Dairy cows |
| 140 | Wendy's Company (The) | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Private | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 141 | Wens Foodstuff Group | 3570: Food Producer | Private | China | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Ducks or Geese |
| 142 | WH Group Ltd | 3570: Food Producer | Public | PRC | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Ducks or Geese |
| 143 | Whitbread PLC | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 144 | Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | UK | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 145 | Woolworths Limited | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | Australia | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 146 | Yili Group | 3570: Food Producer | Public | China | Dairy cows |
| 147 | Yonghui Superstores Co Ltd | 5337: Food Retailers and Wholesalers | Public | PRC | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---------|---|
| 148 | Yum China Holdings | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | China | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle Farmed Salmon Ducks or Geese |
| 149 | Yum! Brands Inc | 5757: Restaurants and Bars | Public | USA | Laying Hens Broiler Chickens Pigs Dairy cows Beef Cattle |
| 150 | Zhongpin Inc (Huayu Holdings) | 3570: Food Producer | Public | PRC/USA | Broiler Chickens Pigs Beef Cattle |

* A proposed merger between BRF S.A. and Marfrig Global Foods S.A. has been formally announced, although not yet concluded. Should the merger be finalized before the next benchmark cycle, BBFAW will assess the newly formed parent in accordance with its standard approach.