

**The following metrics are to be used in the Plating Up Progress 2025 analysis:**

Theme / Topic / Metric	No.	WBA equivalent
<b>Healthy &amp; Sustainable Diets</b>		
<i>Healthy &amp; 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
Company has a procurement or sales-based target for, and reports on, an increase in fruit & veg as %.	N2	C1
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
<i>Encouraging healthy &amp; sustainable diets</i>		
Company has a target for, and reports on, the % of-products with intuitive front-of-pack labelling or (restaurants and caterers) consumer-facing nutrition information on menus and online (ideal 100%)	N4	C4
The company's marketing strategy prioritises healthy foods, especially when marketing to children.	N5	C5
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

Theme / Topic / Metric	No.	WBA equivalent
<b>Environment</b>		
<i>Climate change</i>		
Company has a target for % reduction targets, and reports on, scope 1 & 2 emissions reduction (Science-based target)	E1	B1
Company has a target for, and reports on, scope 3 emissions reduction (Science-based target), specifically food in supply chain	E2	B2
<i>Biodiversity</i>		
Company has a target to demonstrate that it is achieving deforestation-free and conversion-free supply chains for company's reliance on palm oil as a product or an ingredient.	E3	B3
Company has a target to demonstrates that it is achieving deforestation-free and conversion-free supply chains for company's reliance on soy as a product or an ingredient.	E4	B3
Company has a target to demonstrate that it is achieving deforestation-free and conversion-free supply chains for company's reliance on beef as a product or an ingredient.	E5	B3
Company has a target to demonstrates that it is achieving deforestation-free and conversion-free supply chains for company's reliance on cocoa as a product or an ingredient.	E6	B3
Company has a target to demonstrates that it is achieving deforestation-free and conversion-free supply chains for company's reliance on coffee as a product or an ingredient.	E7	B3
<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
Company has a target for, and reports on, the % of products produced under sustainable production practices and recognised environmental management schemes.	E9	B6 & B7
<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
<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
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
Company demonstrates collaboration with its main suppliers to track, measure and act on food waste in its supply chain.	E14	B9

<i>Animal welfare &amp; antibiotics</i>		
For companies not assessed by BBFAW, company has a target for and reports on the % of meat sourced that complies with higher welfare across all species, including zero supply chain use of antibiotics as a prophylactic or growth promoter to reduce the total use of antibiotics classified as 'medically important antimicrobials.	E15	B11

Theme / Topic / Metric	No.	WBA equivalent
<b>Social Inclusion</b>		
<i>Human rights</i>		
Company recognises the need for a real liveable wage for all employees and reports on progress towards that.	S1	D21
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
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

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

**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
<b>Healthy &amp; Sustainable Diets</b>	
<i>Healthy &amp; sustainable food sales</i>	
N1	<p>Primary source: corporate reports &amp; desktop research.</p> <p>There is currently no clear consensus on how to quantify “healthy” food across different sectors.</p> <p>As such, the maximum score can be applied for a time-bound UK sales-based target and performance data, (at a minimum, for own-brand products), provided the company supplies the methodology. Volume tonnage is the gold standard. Performance data without a target, or a target without performance data achieves a score of 2. Targets and performance data for single ingredients (e.g. sugar) or categories (e.g. HFSS products) achieve a score of 1.</p>
N2	<p>A maximum score can be applied for a time bound UK procurement or sales-based target and performance data, ideally in tonnage for both fruit and veg, (at a minimum, for own-brand products), provided the company supplies the methodology. We recommend retailers 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 or activities around fruit and veg achieves a score of 1.</p>
N3	<p>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.</p> <p>As such, the maximum score can be applied for a UK 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 includes both animal-based and plant-based data. Retailers should align with the WWF Basket's split/disclosure requirements for animal/plant derived sales. Partial sales targets or data which are only on growing plant-based ranges rather than as % of protein 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.</p>
<i>Encouraging healthy &amp; sustainable diets</i>	
N4	<p>For supermarkets, company must have a target for and report on the % of products with intuitive front-of-pack nutrition labelling that goes beyond calorie labelling (at a minimum, for own-brand products).</p> <p>For the out of home sector, company has nutrition labelling (onsite or online), beyond just calorie labelling.</p> <p>For a maximum score, a time-bound target and progress is required as well as transparency in the methodology used. For a score of 2, transparency is required for the methodology used for the labelling or a target or progress data. For a score of 1, transparent methodology is required.</p>
N5	<p>Primary source: corporate reports &amp; desktop research.</p> <p>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.</p>
N6	<p>Primary source: corporate reports &amp; desktop research.</p> <p>or 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).</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Environment</b>	
<i>Climate change</i>	
E1-E2	Primary source: CDP Carbon. Secondary source: corporate reports, desktop search and SBTi.

	Maximum scores require time-bound targets and performance data, ideally science-based, SBTi approved including FLAG although it is recognised that this is challenging for Scope 3 emissions. Performance data without a target, or a target without performance data achieves a score of 2; individual activities that demonstrate emission reductions but without overall data or targets achieves a score of 1.
<i>Biodiversity</i>	
E3, E4, E6, E7	Maximum score requires time-bound targets and report data for a mixture of both mass balance and segregated certification for cocoa, coffee, palm oil and soy under RSPO, Pro Terra, RTRS, UTZ-Rainforest Alliance, Fairtrade, 4C or other recognised certifications or physically traceable or identity preserved. This requirement applies at a minimum to own-brand products and products entering the UK supply chain. Reliance on solely mass balance or credits achieves a score of 2. Initial steps, such as having an appropriate policy or mapping risk on these commodities achieves a score of 1.
E5	Maximum score require evidence of zero sourcing of beef from South America, at a minimum, across their own-brand products. Time-bound targets and/or reporting data evidencing some beef are sourced from land-use area achieves a score of 2. Initial steps, such as having an appropriate policy or mapping risk of land-use beef achieves a score of 1.
<i>Sustainable food production practices</i>	
E8	Primary sources: Corporate reports, ODP, desktop research. 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	Primary sources: Corporate reports. Secondary source: desktop search. 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 (LEAF, organic such as Soil Association organic, EU Organic or OF&G Organic 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, across all produce. Partial data (e.g. focusing only on certain food categories or regions) achieves a score of 2; Target and data for the % of food produced under the Red Tractor certification achieve a score of 1.  Data on deforestation, seafood sustainability, animal welfare (e.g. eggs) etc are covered elsewhere in these metrics are not considered here.
<i>Water use</i>	
E10	Primary source: CDP Water. Secondary source: corporate reports and desktop search. 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	Primary source: CDP Water. Secondary source: corporate reports and desktop search. 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	Primary source: corporate reports, WRAP There is currently no clear consensus on the best way to quantify how a company can evidence its 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 (e.g. clear use by dates, portion size control, storage advice including freezing and defrosting) as well as evidence of contributing to collaborative initiatives (for example, in the UK: Food Waste Action Week). Strategies to engage with customers and data on individual company initiatives achieve a score of 2; recognising the company's role in helping customers to reduce food waste achieves a score of 1.
E13	Primary source: corporate reports, WRAP Food Waste Reduction Roadmap This metric aligns with WRAP in the UK. Maximum scores require both a target and performance data for a % reduction in food waste compared with food 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 surplus such as volumes redistributed, sent to animal feed, and food waste to anaerobic digestion, or zero land-fill targets achieves a score of 1.
E14	<p>Primary source: corporate reports and desktop search.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Animal welfare &amp; antibiotics</b>	
E15	<p>Primary source: BBFAW. Secondary source: corporate reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BBFAW Tier 1.</li> <li>- BBFAW Tier 2.</li> <li>- BBFAW Tier 3 &amp; 4.</li> <li>- BBFAW Tier 5 &amp; 6.</li> </ul> <p>For companies not included in BBFAW, a maximum score requires time-bound target and performance data for a high animal welfare scheme/s across all species, using RSPCA Assured, European Organic Certification, Global Animal Partnership (GAP 5-Step), Soil Association Organic Certification, or Chicken Commitment/European Chicken Commitment.</p> <p>A target but no performance data or vice versa, across all species using certification, achieves a score of 2. Partial data for basic farm assurance standard such as Assured British Meat Scheme, Global standards, FMI Animal Welfare Standards and Red Tractor Assurance Scheme achieves a score of 1.</p>
<b>Social Inclusion</b>	
<b>Human rights</b>	
S1	<p>Primary source: Living Wage Accreditation, corporate reports and desktop search.</p> <p>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.</p>
S2	<p>Primary source: corporate reports and desktop research</p> <p>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.</p>
S3	<p>Maximum scores require companies to disclose the % of main suppliers (beyond tier one) with engagement processes to monitor and respond to concerns about child labour, forced labour and health &amp; safety. Partial information beyond tier one or information for tier one only (e.g. 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.</p>

## 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