

The following metrics are to be used in the 2024 analysis:

Theme / Topic / Metric	No.	WBA equivalent	Product or Supply chain	Human or Natural capital
Healthy & Sustainable Diets				
<i>Healthy & sustainable food sales</i>				
Company has a sales based target for, and reports on a % increase in healthy food, menu items or products quantified using a transparent and recognised approach.	N1	C1	P	H & N
Company has a procurement or sales based target for, and reports on, an increase in fruit & veg as %.	N2	C1	P	H
Company has a procurement or sales based target for, and reports on, a % shift in protein that come from animal vs plant-based protein sources.	N3	(Environment) B5	P	H & N
<i>Encouraging healthy & sustainable diets</i>				
Company has a target for, and reports on, the % of menu items or products with intuitive front-of-pack or (restaurants and caterers) consumer-facing nutrition labels (ideal 100%)	N4	C4	P	H
The company's marketing strategy prioritises healthy foods, especially when marketing to children.	N5	C5		H
The company can evidence reducing food insecurity by improving the accessibility and affordability of healthy food via at least one major strategic or collaborative initiative.	N6	C2		H

Theme / Topic / Metric	No.	WBA equivalent	Product or Supply chain	Human or Natural capital
Environment				
<i>Climate change</i>				
Company has a target for % reduction targets, and reports on, scope 1 & 2 emissions reduction (Science-based target)	E1	B1		N
Company has a target for, and reports on, scope 3 emissions reduction (Science-based target), specifically food in supply chain	E2	B2	S	N
<i>Biodiversity</i>				
Company has a target for, and reports on, zero net land-use conversion through company's reliance on palm oil as a product or an ingredient.	E3	B3	S	N
Company has a target for, and reports on, zero net land-use conversion through company's reliance on soy as in animal feed.	E4	B3	S	N
Company has a target for, and reports on, zero net land-use conversion through company's reliance on beef.	E5	B3	S	N
Company has a target for, and reports on, zero net land-use conversion through company's reliance on cocoa.	E6	B3	S	N
Company has a target for, and reports on, zero net land-use conversion through company's reliance on coffee.	E7	B3	S	N
<i>Sustainable food production practices</i>				
Company has a target for, and reports on, the % of wild-caught or farmed fish & seafood certified to higher sustainability standards	E8	B4	S	N
Company has a target for, and reports on, the % of products produced under sustainable production practices and recognised environmental management schemes.	E9	B6 & B7	S	N
<i>Water use</i>				
Company has a target for, and reports on, water use reduction in operations	E10	B8		
Company demonstrates it is working collaboratively on multiple projects (UK & overseas) to reduce water stress.	E11	B8	S	N
<i>Food waste</i>				
Company demonstrates strategies to engage with customers on food waste and contributes to collaborative initiatives (in UK: Food Waste Action Week).	E12	B9	P	H & N
Company has a target for, and reports on, a % reduction in food sold or handled and discloses volumes redistributed, sent to animal feed, anaerobic digestion, and land-fill.	E13	B9	P	H & N
Company demonstrates collaboration with its main suppliers to track, measure and act on food waste in its supply chain.	E14	B9	S	H & N
<i>Animal welfare & antibiotics</i>				
BBFAW tier position or Company has a target for % of animal products certified to high animal welfare standards.	E15	B11	S	H & N

For companies not assessed by BBFAW: Company has a target for, and reports on, zero supply chain use of antibiotics as a prophylactic or growth promoter and to reduce the total use of antibiotics classified as “medically important antimicrobials”.				
---	--	--	--	--

Theme / Topic / Metric	No.	WBA equivalent	Product or Supply chain	Human or Natural capital
Social Inclusion				
<i>Human rights</i>				
Company commits to paying a real liveable wage for all employees and reports on progress towards that.	S1	D21		H
The company has a policy commitment, approved at the highest levels of the company and available publicly, that the company will respect all internationally recognised human rights. These are understood, at a minimum, as those expressed in the International Bill of Human Rights and the principles concerning fundamental rights set out in the International Labour Organization’s (ILO) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. The policy commitment covers all of the company’s activities, including within its own operations, its supply chains and business relationships.	S2	D1, D2	S	H
Company has a target for, and reports on, the % of suppliers engaged to ensure human rights and labour rights are respected, including and beyond tier one. Must include engagement on child and forced labour, and health and safety of workers.	S3	D19, D20, D22	S	H

The following scoring guidelines are to be used in the 2024 analysis:

2024 summary scoring guidelines:

For quantitative metrics with specific targets:

- **Company has a clear target and is reporting against the target.**
- **Company reports performance data but not a target, or has a target but is not reporting against the target.**
- **Company recognises the issue and has taken limited or isolated action.**
- **No evidence is found that a company recognises the issue or is taking action.**

For more qualitative metrics such as those referring to policies, strategies or collaborative actions:

- **Company can demonstrate outcomes from strategies or collaborative action relating to the issue.**
- **Company has policies, strategies or participates in collaborative actions, but lacks clear outcomes from these.**
- **Company recognises the issue through policies, strategies or collaborative actions, but no evidence is found that the company is making it a priority through policies, strategies or collaborative actions.**
- **No evidence is found that a company recognises the issue as being important.**

Specific scoring notes for different metrics:

Metric ID	Scoring notes
Healthy & Sustainable Diets	
<i>Healthy & sustainable food sales</i>	
N1	There is currently no clear consensus on how to quantify “healthy” food in different sectors. As such the maximum score can be applied for a time-bound sales based target and performance data as long as the methodology is provided by the company. Performance data without a target, or a target without performance data achieves a score of 2. Targets and performance data for single ingredients (eg sugar) or categories (eg HFSS products) achieve a score of 1.

N2	A maximum score can be applied for a time bound procurement or sales based target and performance data for both fruit and veg as long as the methodology is provided by the company. Retailers ought to align with the WWF basket disclosure requirements for fruit and veg. Performance data without a target or a target without performance data achieves a score of 2. Less specific data around or activities around fruit and veg achieves a score of 1.
N3	There is currently no clear consensus on the definition to be used for animal-based vs plant-based protein sources, so we align with WWF basket's guidelines. As such the maximum score can be applied for a procurement or sales-based target and performance data for whole food and/or composite products as long as the methodology is provided by the company and both animal-based and plant-based data is included. Retailers ought to align with the WWF basket split/disclosure requirements for animal/plant derived sales. Partial data (for example data that only refers to plant-based food sales) achieves a score of 2. Less specific data around increasing the product range or introducing new plant-based products achieves a score of 1.
<i>Encouraging healthy & sustainable diets</i>	
N4	For supermarkets this relates to intuitive, front-of-pack nutrition labelling (in-store and online). For the out of home sector it relates to menus (onsite or online). For a maximum score transparency is required for the methodology used for the labelling. (Note, this metric is not applicable for wholesalers)
N5	For a maximum score companies should disclose the proportion of marketing budget allocated to healthy products or menus. Evidence of strategic prioritisation of marketing of healthy food to children achieves a score of 2; evidence of initiatives such as individual price promotions, campaigns and a policy that adheres to international marketing guidelines achieves a score of 1.
N6	For a maximum score companies should evidence outcomes from at least one strategic activity to increase affordability or accessibility of healthy food (for example in the UK by adding value to the healthy start scheme, ensuring nutritional quality of free school meals, pricing strategies of healthy options, providing free or discounted healthy options for vulnerable groups, or supporting communities to self-organise change/projects that capitalise on local assets such as cooperative food growing, cooking social enterprise, social eating clubs). Evidence of engaging with such activities mentioned above which supports local community as a whole, achieves a score 3. Intervention which enables people and communities to create networks and social relationships through food such as voucher schemes (healthy start), holiday clubs and shared cooking activities achieves a score 2. Having commitments to provide crisis support such as food banks achieves a score of 1.
Environment	
<i>Climate change</i>	
E1-E2	Maximum scores require time-bound targets and performance data, ideally Science Based target initiative (SBTi) and in line with a 1.5°C trajectory although it is recognised that this is challenging for scope 3 emissions. Lack of target or reported data but no target achieves a score of 2; individual activities that are shown to reduce emissions but without overall data or targets achieves a score of 1.
<i>Biodiversity</i>	
E3-E7	Maximum scores require time-bound targets and reporting data for at least some segregated certification (cocoa, coffee, palm oil and soy) under RSPO, Pro Terra, RTRS, UTZ-Rainforest Alliance, Fairtrade, 4C or other recognised certifications. Reliance on mass balance or credits only achieves a score of 2. Initial steps such as having an appropriate policy or mapping risk on these commodities achieves a score of 1. For beef, evidence of not sourcing beef from South America replaces the reliance on certification.
<i>Sustainable food production practices</i>	
E8	Maximum scores require time-bound targets and performance data either using disclosure on platforms such as Ocean Disclosure Project or via reported data using certifications including MSC, ASC, Global GAP Aquaculture Standard assured, Best Aquaculture Practices (BAP) certified, or RSPCA Assured. Partial data that covers only certain species achieves a score of 2 (unless that is the only species purchased).
E9	There is currently no clear consensus on the definition to be used for sustainable farming practices. As such this metric relies on certification schemes and recognised environmental management schemes (organic, LEAF, and the emerging ELMS work for on-farm metrics). Maximum scores require time-bound targets and performance data for % of food that is produced under these schemes. Partial data (for example focusing only on certain food categories or regions) achieves a score of 2; recognising the need for sustainable food production through policies (but with no clear data on performance) achieves a score of 1. Data on deforestation, seafood sustainability, animal welfare etc that is covered elsewhere in these metrics are not considered here.
<i>Water use</i>	
E10	Maximum scores require time-bound targets and performance data for reducing water use within a companies' own operations. For companies who do not manage their own water use, this should be made clear and evidence

	provided that all contracts include water management reporting. Partial data and individual initiatives for these achieves a score of 1.
E11	There is currently no clear consensus on the best way to quantify sustainable water use in supply chains for stressed supply regions. However most impactful work in this has involved collaborative initiatives to tackle water issues in targeted water catchments. As such, maximum scores require the company to evidence it is actively engaged in collaborative initiatives in at least one such approach in the UK and abroad where water stress has been identified as a risk in their supply chain. Individual case studies or mapping water stress risk achieve a score of 2; recognising sustainable water use as an issues in supply chains achieves a score of 1.
<i>Food waste</i>	
E12	There is currently no clear consensus on the best way to quantify how a company can evidence it's achievements in helping customers to reduce food waste. As such maximum scores require both evidence that a company has strategies to engage with customers on food waste (eg clear use by dates, portion size control) and contributes to collaborative initiatives (in UK: Food Waste Action Week). Strategies to engage with customers and date on individual initiatives achieve a score of 2; recognising the company's role in helping customers to reduce food waste achieves a score of 1.
E13	This metric aligns with WRAP in the UK. Maximum scores require both a target and performance data for a % reduction in food sold or handled and that the company discloses volumes redistributed, sent to animal feed, anaerobic digestion, and land-fill. Reporting on food waste data, only having a target, or having partial data around this achieves a score of 2. Only disclosing "directional data" for food waste such as volumes redistributed, sent to animal feed, to anaerobic digestion, or zero land-fill targets achieves a score of 1.
E14	There is currently no clear consensus on the best way to quantify how a company can evidence outcomes in reducing food waste in its supply chain. As such maximum scores require evidence that a company is engaged with its main suppliers to track, monitor and act on food waste and has at least some reportable data on outcomes. Evidence of working with a limited number of suppliers achieves a score of 2; recognising the issue but not providing at least clear case studies achieves a score of 1.
<i>Animal welfare & antibiotics</i>	
E15	<p>This metrics uses the BBFAW tier ranking for companies as per 2020. For companies not included in BBFAW, maximum scores require a time-bound target and performance data for high standard animal welfare across all species, using RSPCA Assured or organic as the certifications. A target but no performance data or vice versa achieves a score of 2; partial data (either on limited species or lacking a target other initiatives and standards or focusing on only individual outcomes such as tail-docking) achieves as score of 1.</p> <p>For companies not assessed by BBFAW: Maximum scores require both targets and reporting for zero use of growth-promoting substances and prophylactic use, as well as target to reduce "medically important" antibiotics. Partial data (either only focusing on prophylactic but not overall reduction in "medically important") achieves a score of 2; companies with only a policy but no clear evidence of outcomes should score 1.</p>
<i>Social Inclusion</i>	
<i>Human rights</i>	
S1	Maximum scores require companies to be accredited by the Living Wage Foundation in the UK, or to provide evidence they are paying a wage at least in line with LWF requirements. Foodservice companies can also be a LWF Recognised Service Providers. Companies that disclose wage levels (but that are between national living wage and LWF level) achieve a score of 2. Companies providing evidence of employee wage reviews and increases and recognition of the importance of living wages can achieve a score of 1.
S2	Maximum scores require companies to have a clear Human Rights policy which is publicly available and communicated to workers, business relationships and other stakeholders such as investors and stakeholders as well as approval by the highest levels of the company which for larger companies is the Board. A clear Human Rights policy which is publicly available and communicated to workers, business relationships and other stakeholders achieves a score of 2. Companies providing a clear Human Rights policy achieves a score of 1.
S3	Maximum scores require companies to disclose the % of main suppliers with engagement processes to monitor and respond to concerns about child labour, forced labour and health & safety. Partial information (eg case studies, supply chain risk assessment, or focus on only one issue) achieve a score of 2; having a clear policy and supplier code of conduct that excludes child and forced labour and enforces health and safety achieves a score of 1.

Scoring and weighting

Scoring on each topic and weighting between topics has not changed since 2020. Each metric is given equal weighting within a topic and we do not aggregate scores beyond the topic level.

Traffic light scoring for aggregated topic scores is as follows:

- Metric-based traffic lights are score 0-3 according to the colour (red = 0, green = 3).
- Metric-based scores are aggregated into topic scores and averaged to 2 decimal places for each topic
- Topic traffic lighting is scored as follows:
 - Average score >2.4
 - Average score 1.5 - 2.39
 - Average score 0.7 - 1.49
 - Average score <0.7

In order to improve the overall methodology and balance the number of metrics in each topic, the topics and metrics are now organised as follows:

Healthy & sustainable food sales: N1, N2, N3

Encouraging healthy diets: N4, N5, N6

Climate change: E1, E2

Landscape biodiversity: E3, E4, E5, E6, E7

Sustainable food production: E8, E9

Water: E10, E11

Food waste & loss: E12, E13, E14,

Animal welfare & antibiotics: E15,

Human rights: S1, S2, S3