



# Seafood Stewardship Index

## Scoring Guidelines

December 2023

# Table of contents

General comments	4
Type of sources	4
Parent company vs subsidiary disclosure	4
Reporting period	4
Applicability rules	4
Key definitions	5
<b>Cross-Benchmark Indicators</b>	<b>6</b>
Governance and strategy	7
<b>SSI.A1. Sustainability strategy</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>SSI.A2. Accountability for sustainable strategy</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>SSI.A3. Stakeholder engagement</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SSI.A4. Lobbying and advocacy</b>	<b>11</b>
Ecosystems	12
<b>SSI.B1. Sustainable fisheries and aquaculture</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SSI.B2. Sustainable target fish stocks</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>SSI.B3. Bycatch</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>SSI.B4. Endangered species</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>SSI.B5. Sensitive habitats</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>SSI.B6. Abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>SSI.B7. Ecosystem conversion</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>SSI.B8. Marine ingredients in aquaculture feed</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>SSI.B9. Prevention and mitigation of escapes</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>SSI.B10. Disease management and mortality rates</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>SSI.B11. Animal welfare</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>SSI.B12. Antibiotic use and growth-promoting substances</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>SSI.B13. Medicine use</b>	<b>31</b>
Traceability	32
<b>SSI.C1. Commitment to traceable seafood products and aquaculture feed ingredients</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>SSI.C2. Traceability system for seafood products and aquaculture feed ingredients</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>SSI.C3. Risk-based approach to illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>SSI.C4. Disclosure of the source of seafood products and marine feed ingredients</b>	<b>37</b>

Social responsibility	38
<b>SSI.D01-SSI.D18: Core social indicators</b>	<b>38</b>
Respect Human Rights	38
Provide and promote decent work	49
Act ethically	57
<b>SSI.D19. Child labour</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>SSI.D21. Living wage</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>SSI.D22. Health and safety of vulnerable groups</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>SSI.D23. Farmer and fisher livelihoods</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>SSI.D24. Working and living conditions on board fishing vessels</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>SSI.D25. Indigenous peoples' rights</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>SSI.D26. Engagement with and support for local communities</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>SSI.D27. Gender equality and women's empowerment in the supply chain</b>	<b>76</b>

# General comments

## Type of sources

Sustainability reports, annual reports, company policies, company's websites. For SSI in a few cases memberships and/or commitments to industry initiatives are also taken into account, for example: a membership of the Global Ghost Gear Initiative (B6), or a commitment to the Global Dialogue on Seafood Traceability (GDST).

## Parent company vs subsidiary disclosure

A parent company is a single company that has a controlling interest in another company or companies and conducts its own business operations. A subsidiary is a company that belongs to another company, which is usually referred to as the parent company which holds a controlling interest in the subsidiary company, meaning it has or controls more than half of its stock. Subsidiaries are separate and distinct legal entities from their parent companies, which reflects in the independence of their liabilities, taxation, and governance. When researching, unless stated otherwise the focus will be at the parent company disclosure level (which is usually the entity we benchmarked already) for Commitment/Policy and Targets.

## Reporting period

2021 – 2022

## Applicability rules

Given the role and influence of the 30 benchmarked companies in the seafood industry, every company has a part to play in all four measurement areas. As such, all 30 companies are assessed on each measurement area. However, some indicators in the ecosystems measurement area are specific to either fishing, aquaculture or aquaculture feed production, or the degree of influence and impact on certain topics varies. There are, therefore, a limited number of indicators in this measurement area that are not applicable to some of the companies in scope.

Company	Non applicable indicators
Austevoll Seafood	-
BioMar	B9, B10, B11, B12, B13
Bolton Group	B7, B8, B9, B10, B13
Bright Food Group	-
Cargill (Aqua Nutrition)	B9, B10, B11, B12, B13
Charoen Pokphand Group	-
Cooke Aquaculture and Cooke Seafood USA	-
Dongwon Enterprise	B7, B8, B9, B10, B13
FCF Co Ltd	B7, B8, B9, B10, B13
High Liner Foods	B7, B8, B9, B10, B13
Kyokuyo	-
Labeyrie Fine Foods	B7, B8, B9, B10, B13
Marubeni	-
Maruha Nichiro	-
Mitsubishi Corporation	-

Mowi	-
Nissui Corporation	-
Nomad Foods	B7, B8, B9, B10, B13
Nueva Pescanova	-
Nutreco (Skretting)	B9, B10, B11, B12, B13
OUG Holdings	B09, B10, B13
Pacific Seafood Group	-
Parlevliet and Van der Plas	B7, B8, B9, B10, B13
Red Chamber Group	B7, B8, B9, B10, B13
Royal Greenland	B7, B8, B9, B10, B13
SalMar	-
Thai Union Group	B8, B9, B10,
Trident Seafoods	B7, B8, B9, B10, B11, B12, B13
Wales Group / Sea Value & Sea Wealth	B7, B8, B9, B10, B13
Yokohama Reito (Yokorei)	-

## Key definitions

- Supply chain: Where we refer to 'supply chain', this means the company's entire supply chain. Best practice would be to go beyond a company's tier 1 suppliers. A supplier is defined as an entity upstream from an organisation (i.e. in the organisation's supply chain), which provides a product or service that is used in the of the organisation's own products or services. A supplier can have a direct business relationship with the organisation (often referred to as a first-tier s development supplier) or an indirect business relationship (GRI, 2021).
- Target: Where we say the company 'has a target', this means a target that is time-bound and set against a baseline.
- Value chain: The range of activities carried out by an organisation, and by entities upstream and downstream from the organisation, to bring the organisation's products or services from their conception to their end use. Entities upstream from the organisation (e.g. suppliers) provide products or services that are used in the development of the organisation's own products or services. Entities downstream from the organisation (e.g. distributors, customers) receive products or services from the organisation. The value chain includes the supply chain (GRI, 2021).
- Annex 3 of the [SSI methodology](#) outlines some of the key concepts and major definitions in the seafood industry.

## Cross-Benchmark Indicators

WBA conducted the Seafood Stewardship Index (SSI) alongside the Nature and the Food and Agriculture (FAB) Benchmarks in 2023. As the methodologies cover similar themes, several indicators are shared across the three benchmarks.

Measurement Area	Indicator	SSI	FAB	NAT
Governance and Strategy	Sustainability strategy	SSI.A01	FAB.A01	NAT.A01
Governance and Strategy	Accountability for sustainable strategy	SSI.A02	FAB.A02	NAT.A02
Governance and Strategy	Stakeholder engagement	SSI.A03	FAB.A03	NAT.A03
Governance and Strategy	Lobbying and advocacy	SSI.A04	FAB.A04	NAT.A04
Ecosystems	Ecosystem conversion	SSI.B07	FAB.B03	
Ecosystems	Sustainable fishing and aquaculture	SSI.B01	FAB.B04	
Ecosystems	Animal welfare	SSI.B11	FAB.B11	
Ecosystems	Antibiotics use and growth promoting substances	SSI.B12	FAB.B12	
Social Responsibility	Indigenous people' rights	SSI.D25		NAT.C02
Social Responsibility	Child labour	SSI.D19	FAB.D19	
Social Responsibility	Forced labour	SSI.D20	FAB.D20	
Social Responsibility	Living wage	SSI.D21	FAB.D21	
Social Responsibility	Health and safety of vulnerable groups	SSI.D22	FAB.D22	
Social Responsibility	Farmer and fisher livelihoods	SSI.D23	FAB.D23	
Core Social Indicators (CSI)	18 Core Social Indicators (CSI)	SSI.D01 - SSI.D18	FAB.D01 - FAB.D18	NAT.D05 - NAT.D22



# Governance and strategy

## SSI.A1. Sustainability strategy

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses its process for identifying and prioritising its most relevant sustainability impacts as well as the outcome of this process, in relation to its sustainability strategy.</p>	<p>The company needs to have a regular exercise at least every 2-3 years. For 2023 benchmarking, any assessment conducted or updated before 2019 does not count.</p> <p>The company needs to disclose a process which meets double materiality. The assessment must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• have involved external stakeholders, for example, through surveys or interviews.</li> <li>• include environmental and social impact reporting, instead of only taking a risk approach/assessment.</li> <li>• provide a list of the most relevant sustainability topics based on the process.</li> </ul>
<p><b>b.</b> The company has a sustainability strategy covering its most significant impacts and sustainability topics in relation to both its own operations and its value chain.</p>	<p>The company must meet three criteria to meet this element.</p> <p>The strategy must include topics included in the three measurement areas of the methodology, and thus the company must receive a non-zero score in at least one indicator of each of the measurement areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measurement area B Ecosystems</li> <li>• Measurement area C Traceability</li> <li>• Measurement area D Social responsibility</li> </ul>
<p><b>c.</b> The company has group-wide targets on key seafood sustainability topics for the most material parts of its value chain.</p>	<p>The company must have time-bound and measurable targets related to at least one indicator in <b>each of the three measurement areas.</b></p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company reports consistently on progress against all its targets.</p>	<p>This element is independently assessed from element c). The company must report on all of the targets it has set. At least one of the targets must meet all of the three following conditions: it must be time-bound, it must reference a baseline year unless it is a target to 0%, 100% or absolute numbers, and the company must disclose performance on the target on the reporting year. The reporting must be quantitative.</p>

## SSI.A2. Accountability for sustainable strategy

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses having persons, teams or committees within the company who are responsible for the implementation of its sustainability strategy.</p>	<p>The company needs to have a sustainability strategy that covers both nature and social aspects. Covering only one of the two aspects is not sufficient. In cases where the company does not have an explicit sustainability strategy, as long as it is acting on both environmental and social issues this is sufficient. The company must also disclose who is responsible for the implementation of this strategy.</p> <p>Keywords: CSR Director, ESG Director, CSR Department, ESG Department, Sustainability Department, Sustainability Director, Sustainability Committee</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company provides evidence of assigning decision-making and oversight responsibility for its sustainability strategy to the highest governance body.</p>	<p>As a prerequisite to meet this element, the company must have met element a. It must then also attribute responsibility to the highest governance body. For example, it might describe that the Board reviews the sustainability strategy, or that a specific member of the Board is also the Chair of the Sustainability Committee.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company provides evidence of linking performance criteria in senior executives' remuneration policies to its sustainability targets and objectives.</p>	<p>The company must state that it links senior executives' remuneration to specific targets and objectives that cover both nature and social issues. Covering only one of the two aspects is not sufficient. The targets on which the remuneration depends must be explicitly stated. Social issues can include targets associated with diversity and inclusion, but do not include governance related topics such as corruption, or employee health and safety. The target should extend beyond the sales or revenues of a product, even if it is from a socially or environmentally focused product.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company provides evidence that its highest governance body has expertise with respect to the company's most material sustainability topics.</p>	<p>The expertise of the highest governance body must cover aspects across its most material sustainability topics including ecosystems, traceability and social inclusion. The expertise must explicitly mention one of the following: academic or professional training, former experiences in specialized organizations, or proven technical knowledge.</p> <p>The conditions for this element can also be met in instances where companies describe that the</p>



highest governance body has direct access to expertise, such as a specialised committee composed of external experts for which a board member is the chairperson. In these cases, it must be specified what the scope of the committee is and how often it meets.

### SSI.A3. Stakeholder engagement

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses an overview of the issues raised during its stakeholder engagement activities.</p>	<p>The company discloses the issues raised by stakeholders, and specifies what stakeholder group they correspond to. The list of issues should go beyond the materiality assessment.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company discloses its process for identifying relevant stakeholders across its value chain.</p>	<p>The company defines who they consider their stakeholder groups to be or how the company determined with which stakeholders to engage. A simple statement such as “based on their strategic importance to the company” or “based on its impact on our business” is sufficient.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company discloses its process for engaging with stakeholder groups, including frequency and channels, beyond its materiality assessment or an equivalent.</p>	<p>The company must disclose what channels it used to engage with the different stakeholder groups. It is insufficient for the company to specify a list of channels if they do not indicate how these correspond to each stakeholder group. The company should also state with what frequency it engages with stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company discloses the outcomes of its stakeholder engagement activities and their integration into its sustainability strategy.</p>	<p>The company explains how it has responded to key issues raised by its stakeholders. The company must disclose specific and concrete outcomes based on the year’s engagement. A general description of guidelines or a recap of the materiality assessment is insufficient.</p>
<p><b>e.</b> The company’s stakeholder engagement covers its most <b>seafood</b> material sustainability topics.</p>	<p>Stakeholder engagement needs to cover topics related to the three measurement areas of the methodology: ecosystems, traceability, and social responsibility.</p>

## SSI.A4. Lobbying and advocacy

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses a list of trade associations of which it is a member for all jurisdictions in which it operates.</p>	<p>The company needs to disclose <b>at least 5 trade/industry associations</b> of which it is a member. Partnerships and other organisations other than trade or industry associations do not count.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company discloses a clear and detailed framework for assessing alignment of its trade associations with its <b>seafood</b> sustainability targets.</p>	<p>The company must state a concrete framework that it uses to assess alignment with seafood-related policies.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company provides evidence of annually applying the framework across all trade associations.</p>	<p>The company explains how the assessment has been applied to each industry association it is a member of.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company reports any misalignment between the lobbying activities of its trade associations and its <b>seafood</b> sustainability targets.</p>	<p>The company must provide details on the misalignment it has identified. General remarks about misalignment without explaining what it is and why it exists are not sufficient.</p>
<p><b>e.</b> The company discloses an action plan to address misalignment which includes clear escalation steps.</p>	<p>Strict on action plan here: "we may" is not accepted.</p>
<p><b>f.</b> The company discloses clear deadlines for each of its escalation steps and consistently reports on their application.</p>	<p>The action plan should include escalation steps and clear deadlines. The company should disclose examples of action to address misalignment.</p>
<p><b>g.</b> The company discloses an annual review of all the advocacy activities it has undertaken.</p>	<p>Company should disclose all advocacy activities on specific items of regulation and legislation which are material to the company's operations, business sector, and/or the region(s) in which it operates.</p>

# Ecosystems

## SSI.B1. Sustainable fisheries and aquaculture

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company provides qualitative evidence of a commitment to sustainable fishing and aquaculture with reference to environmental sourcing criteria.</p>	<p>The company discloses commitments on the production and/or sourcing of seafood which include the criteria used to define the level of sustainability of its portfolio or linked to the types of certification schemes, ratings or programmes used by the company.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company provides quantitative evidence of increasing the percentage of its sustainable fisheries and aquaculture operations and sourcing.</p>	<p>The company discloses an increase in the percentage of its sustainable fisheries and aquaculture operations and sourcing based on two-years period comparability. Comparability is based on a 2-year period, e.g. 2022 vs 2020 data. If 2021 is the latest reporting year, look for 2021 vs 2019 data.</p> <p>The evidence can cover certification schemes benchmarked by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (GSSI)</li> <li>• The ISEAL Code Compliant members (e.g. MSC, ASC, Marin Trust).</li> </ul> <p>Improvement projects, other ratings or programmes are not being rewarded to meet this element.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company has a target for sustainable fisheries and aquaculture for 100% of its portfolio, and reports progress against this target. In its progress reporting, the company discloses the proportion of its portfolio covered by each certification scheme, improvement project or other sustainability programme.</p>	<p>The company discloses a time-bound target which covers its entire portfolio. If the company provides examples of programmes, then it must specify the proportion of their portfolio that is covered by each programme.</p> <p>Examples of sustainability programmes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certification schemes (e.g. MSC, ASC, Global GAP, BAP, MarinTrust)</li> <li>• Improvement programmes (FIPs, AIPs, MarinTrust improver programme)</li> <li>• FishSource scores.</li> </ul>
<p><b>d.</b> The company provides evidence that 100% of its portfolio comes from sustainable fisheries and aquaculture.</p>	<p>The company provides evidence that 100% of its portfolio is covered by certification schemes that have been benchmarked by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (GSSI)</li> <li>• The ISEAL Code Compliant members (e.g. MSC, ASC, Marin Trust)</li> </ul> <p>The proportion covered by each of these schemes must be disclosed.</p>

## SSI.B2. Sustainable target fish stocks

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses examples of activities to reduce impact or improve the management status of target species fish stocks in its operations and/or supply chain. Examples of activities are improvement projects, gear modification, closing of fishing areas, policy advocacy to support the development and adoption of harvest strategies, participating in collective industry platforms (e.g. ISSF, Global Tuna Alliance) and supporting data collection programmes.</p>	<p>Most companies report on how they are reducing their impact on fish stocks. There are several examples, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement in Fishery improvement projects,</li> <li>• Gear modification,</li> <li>• Closing of fishing areas,</li> <li>• Policy advocacy to support the development and adoption of harvest strategies,</li> <li>• Participating in collective industry platforms (e.g. ISSF, Global Tuna Alliance),</li> <li>• Supporting data collection programmes,</li> <li>• Working with certifications.</li> </ul> <p>Any activities that companies demonstrate to reduce impacts are rewarded under this element.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company quantitatively reports on progress of the activities it undertakes to reduce impact or improve the management status of target species fish stocks, <b>OR</b> The company reports having achieved certification for at least 50% of its portfolio.</p>	<p>When a company meets element a) because it discloses only one activity, and reports on the progress of this activity, it is NOT sufficient to meet element b). We want to see at least TWO activities with progress reporting.</p> <p>Several companies are referring to Fishery improvement projects when it comes to progress reporting. <a href="#">Here's</a> the overview of FIP's. FIP profiles include progress reporting, but for element b) it is only accepted when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's clear how a company contributes to a FIP</li> <li>• There is actual progress reported, i.e. A, B or C rating</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatively</b>, companies can also meet this element if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% of their entire portfolio is covered by certification schemes or other programmes (not FIPs).</li> </ul>
<p><b>c.</b> The company reports having achieved certification for at least 80% of its portfolio and discloses the proportion per certification scheme.</p>	<p>Companies receive 1.5p if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of their entire portfolio is certified with schemes benchmarked by the Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (<a href="#">GSSI</a>) or <a href="#">ISEAL</a> Code Compliant members (e.g. MSC, ASC, Marin Trust).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When there is no insight in the proportion per certification but the total % disclosed is based on GSSI and/or ISEAL Code Compliant certifications, this is also accepted.</li> </ul> <p>Improvement projects such as Fishery Improvement Projects or MarinTrust improver programmes are NOT counted as certification. Other programmes or ratings are also not awarded.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company demonstrates how it mitigates impacts across 100% of its operations and/or supply chain, OR The company reports having achieved certification for 100% of its portfolio and discloses the proportion per certification scheme.</p>	<p>Companies receive 2p if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% of their entire portfolio is certified with schemes benchmarked by the Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (<a href="#">GSSI</a>) or <a href="#">ISEAL</a> Code Compliant members (e.g. MSC, ASC, Marin Trust)</li> <li>The proportion per certification is disclosed.</li> </ul> <p>Improvement projects such as Fishery Improvement Projects or MarinTrust improver programmes are NOT counted as certification. Other programmes or ratings are also not awarded.</p>

## SSI.B3. Bycatch

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses examples of activities to reduce bycatch in its operations and/or supply chain. Examples of activities that companies can undertake are improvement projects, using more selective fishing gear and methods, collecting data or supporting data collection (e.g. through 100% observer coverage), and providing crew training on bycatch mitigation and release practices.</p>	<p>Most companies report on how they are addressing bycatch. There are several examples, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement in Fishery improvement projects,</li> <li>• Using more selective fishing gear and methods,</li> <li>• Collecting data or supporting data collection (e.g. through 100% observer coverage),</li> <li>• Providing crew training on bycatch mitigation and release practices.</li> <li>• Working with certifications.</li> </ul> <p>Any activities that companies demonstrate to reduce bycatch are rewarded under this element.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company quantitatively reports on progress of the activities it undertakes to reduce bycatch in its operations and/or supply chain, OR The company reports having achieved certification for at least 50% of its portfolio.</p>	<p>When a company meets element a) because it discloses only one activity, and reports on the progress of this activity, it is NOT sufficient to meet element b). We want to see at least TWO activities with progress reporting.</p> <p>Several companies are referring to Fishery improvement projects when it comes to progress reporting. <a href="#">Here's</a> the overview of FIP's. FIP profiles include progress reporting, but for element b) it is only accepted when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's clear how a company contributes to a FIP</li> <li>• There is actual progress on bycatch reported</li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, companies address bycatch by fishing or sourcing from fisheries that are certified. Certification schemes have requirements on how bycatch should be addressed. Therefore, companies can also meet this element if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% of their entire portfolio is covered by certification schemes or other programmes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>c.</b> The company reports having achieved certification for at least 80% of its portfolio and discloses the proportion per certification scheme.</p>	<p>Companies receive 1.5p if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of their entire portfolio is certified with schemes benchmarked by the Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (<a href="#">GSSI</a>) or <a href="#">ISEAL</a> Code Compliant members (e.g. MSC, ASC, Marin Trust).</li> <li>• When there is no insight in the proportion per certification but the total % disclosed is based on GSSI and/or ISEAL Code Compliant certifications, this is also accepted.</li> </ul>



	<p>Improvement projects such as Fishery Improvement Projects or MarinTrust improver programmes are NOT counted as certification. Other programmes or ratings are also not awarded.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company demonstrates how it mitigates bycatch impacts across 100% of its operations and/or supply chain, OR The company reports having achieved certification for 100% of its portfolio and discloses the proportion per certification scheme.</p>	<p>Companies receive 2p if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of their entire portfolio is certified with schemes benchmarked by the Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (<a href="#">GSSI</a>) or <a href="#">ISEAL</a> Code Compliant members (e.g. MSC, ASC, Marin Trust)</li> <li>• The proportion per certification is disclosed.</li> </ul> <p>Improvement projects such as Fishery Improvement Projects or MarinTrust improver programmes are NOT counted as certification.</p>

## SSI.B4. Endangered species

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses examples of activities to reduce its impact on endangered species in its operations and supply chain. Examples of activities include improvement projects, modifying fishing techniques, reducing wildlife interactions in aquaculture, or not catching or sourcing endangered species.</p>	<p>Most companies report on how they are addressing their impact on endangered species. There are several examples, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement in Fishery improvement projects,</li> <li>• Modifying fishing techniques,</li> <li>• Reducing wildlife interactions in aquaculture,</li> <li>• Not catching or sourcing endangered species.</li> <li>• Working with certifications.</li> </ul> <p>Any activities that companies demonstrate to reduce its impact on endangered species are rewarded under this element.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company quantitatively reports on progress of the activities it undertakes to reduce impacts on endangered species in its operations and/or supply chain, OR The company reports having achieved certification for at least 50% of its portfolio.</p>	<p>When a company meets element a) because it discloses only one activity, and reports on the progress of this activity, it is NOT sufficient to meet element b). We want to see at least TWO activities with progress reporting.</p> <p>Several companies are referring to Fishery improvement projects when it comes to progress reporting. <a href="#">Here's</a> the overview of FIP's. FIP profiles include progress reporting, but for element b) it is only accepted when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's clear how a company contributes to a FIP</li> <li>• There is actual progress on reducing impacts on endangered species reported</li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, companies reducing impacts on endangered species by sourcing from fisheries or aquaculture that are certified. Certification schemes have requirements on reducing impacts on endangered species should be addressed. Therefore, companies can also meet this element if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% of their entire portfolio is covered by certification schemes or other programmes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>c.</b> The company reports having achieved certification for at least 80% of its portfolio and discloses the proportion per certification scheme.</p>	<p>Companies receive 1.5p if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of their entire portfolio is certified with schemes benchmarked by the Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (<a href="#">GSSI</a>) or <a href="#">ISEAL</a> Code Compliant members (e.g. MSC, ASC, Marin Trust).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When there is no insight in the proportion per certification but the total % disclosed is based on GSSI and/or ISEAL Code Compliant certifications, this is also accepted.</li> </ul> <p>Improvement projects such as Fishery Improvement Projects or MarinTrust improver programmes are NOT counted as certification. Other programmes or ratings are also not awarded.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company demonstrates how it mitigates impact on endangered species across 100% of its operations and/or supply chain, OR The company reports having achieved certification for 100% of its portfolio and discloses the proportion per certification scheme.</p>	<p>Companies receive 2p if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% of their entire portfolio is certified with schemes benchmarked by the Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (<a href="#">GSSI</a>) or <a href="#">ISEAL</a> Code Compliant members (e.g. MSC, ASC, Marin Trust)</li> <li>The proportion per certification is disclosed.</li> </ul> <p>Improvement projects such as Fishery Improvement Projects or MarinTrust improver programmes are NOT counted as certification. Other programmes or ratings are also not awarded.</p>

## SSI.B5. Sensitive habitats

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses examples of activities to reduce its impact on sensitive habitats in its operations and supply chain. Examples of such activities are changing to alternative fishing techniques, refraining from fishing or aquaculture activities in or near protected areas, or ensuring that aquaculture feed ingredients are sourced from areas with no negative impacts on surrounding habitats.</p>	<p>Most companies report on how they are addressing their impact on sensitive habitats. There are several examples, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing to alternative fishing techniques,</li> <li>• Refraining from fishing or aquaculture activities in or near protected areas,</li> <li>• Ensuring that aquaculture feed ingredients are sourced from areas with no negative impacts on surrounding habitats.</li> <li>• Working with certifications.</li> </ul> <p>Any activities that companies demonstrate to reduce its impact on sensitive habitats are rewarded under this element.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company quantitatively reports on progress of the activities it undertakes to reduce impacts on sensitive habitats in its operations and/or supply chain, OR The company reports having achieved certification for at least 50% of its portfolio.</p>	<p>When a company meets element a) because it discloses only one activity, and reports on the progress of this activity, it is NOT sufficient to meet element b). We want to see at least TWO activities with progress reporting.</p> <p>Several companies are referring to Fishery improvement projects when it comes to progress reporting. <a href="#">Here's</a> the overview of FIP's. FIP profiles include progress reporting, but for element b) it is only accepted when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's clear how a company contributes to a FIP</li> <li>• There is actual progress on reducing impacts on sensitive habitats reported</li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, companies reducing impacts on sensitive habitats by sourcing from fisheries or aquaculture that are certified. Certification schemes have requirements on reducing impacts on endangered species should be addressed. Therefore, companies can also meet this element if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% of their entire portfolio is covered by certification schemes or other programmes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>c.</b> The company reports having achieved certification for at least 80% of its portfolio and discloses the proportion per certification scheme.</p>	<p>Companies receive 1.5p if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of their entire portfolio is certified with schemes benchmarked by the Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (<a href="#">GSSI</a>) or <a href="#">ISEAL</a> Code Compliant members (e.g. MSC, ASC, Marin Trust).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When there is no insight in the proportion per certification but the total % disclosed is based on GSSI and/or ISEAL Code Compliant certifications, this is also accepted.</li> </ul> <p>Improvement projects such as Fishery Improvement Projects or MarinTrust improver programmes are NOT counted as certification. Other programmes or ratings are also not awarded.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company demonstrates how it mitigates impact on sensitive habitats across 100% of its operations and/or supply chain, OR The company reports having achieved certification for 100% of its portfolio and discloses the proportion per certification scheme.</p>	<p>Companies receive 2p if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of their entire portfolio is certified with schemes benchmarked by the Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (<a href="#">GSSI</a>) or <a href="#">ISEAL</a> Code Compliant members (e.g. MSC, ASC, Marin Trust)</li> <li>• The proportion per certification is disclosed.</li> </ul> <p>Improvement projects such as Fishery Improvement Projects or MarinTrust improver programmes are NOT counted as certification.</p>

## SSI.B6. Abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company demonstrates a commitment to prevent and reduce ALDFG.</p>	<p>Companies meet this element when they have formulated commitments around reducing ALDFG (often referred to as ghost gear) or when there is a policy on this topic. Also companies that do not fish can be assessed against this indicator by explaining what they are doing to address this topic in their supply chain. Aquaculture companies can report on this topic as well, by explaining what they do with their farming systems. Companies that are member of the <a href="#">Global Ghost Gear Initiative</a> (GGGI) meet this element. This includes companies that are member of SeaBOS, joined GGGI in 2019.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company implements measures to prevent and reduce ALDFG in its operations and supply chain.</p>	<p>Companies describe activities to prevent and reduce ALDFG.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company has conducted an assessment that demonstrates in which part of its operations and/or supply chain ALDFG is a risk. The company publicly discloses the results of that assessment.</p>	<p>Companies meet this element if they have assessed ALDFG risks in their operations and/or supply chain, and also report on the results of this assessment.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company demonstrates results and impacts of measures it has implemented for preventing and reducing ALDFG across the full scope of its operations and/or supply chain.</p>	<p>This element can only be met, if elements a), b) and c) are met.</p>

## SSI.B7. Ecosystem conversion

**Applicability rule:** the indicator is applicable only to companies who produce and/or source key high-risk commodities, e.g.: Soy and Palm Oil

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses qualitative evidence that it is achieving a deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) supply chain for its relevant high-risk commodities.</p>	<p>The company discloses actual actions (qualitative) for at least one high-risk commodity, material realm, or supply chain.</p> <p>Qualitative evidence can be policies, programs, or statements on achieving deforestation while demonstration of actual actions can include mentioning and/or describing initiatives or programs, engaging and collaborating with suppliers (in the context of ecosystem conversion issues), or disclosing commodities sourced according to certification programs and standards.</p> <p>Statements committing to achieve conversion-free supply chains are not valid.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company discloses the proportion of commodities that are DCF-free.</p>	<p>Statements such as “we have made progress” and “we have reduced” without providing quantitative data are not sufficient to receive points for this element.</p> <p>Some relevant certifications include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">RSPO</a> and its credit system (Palm Oil).</li> <li>• <a href="#">ProTerra</a> and <a href="#">RTRS</a> (Soy).</li> <li>• <a href="#">The Sustainable Farming Assurance Programme (SFAP)</a> (mainly Soy)</li> </ul> <p>For Palm Oil, can search <a href="#">RSPO website</a> for more information on the company’s profile. For RSPO, we do <b>not</b> consider ‘Book and Claim’ certification. <a href="#">Full explanation</a>. Essentially it is not traceable and does not separate sustainable from non-sustainable palm oil. Instead look for information on the portfolio / proportion of palm oil from the company (‘RSPO Credits + Book &amp; Claim’ / ‘Mass Balance’ / ‘Segregated’ / ‘Identity Preserved’).</p> <p>National certifications do not count as these are not as strong as the global mentioned above and as we are measuring companies on their global presence, highly likely that it will not be applied across all operations/supply chain. Examples: <a href="#">ISPO</a> / <a href="#">MSPO</a>.</p>



	<p>Not accepting <a href="#">GreenPalm</a>. Full explanation <a href="#">here</a> but based on RSPO's Book and Claim model and therefore cannot guarantee the oil purchased is completely DCF free.</p> <p>For Soy: We will not consider "commitment to" / "adherence to" <a href="#">European Compound Feed Manufacturers' Federation (FEFAC)</a>. You can find a <a href="#">Full explanation</a>. Deforestation and 'conversion-free' land remains only a "voluntary" add-on to the FEFAC benchmark (rather than an "essential" criteria).</p>
<b>c.</b>	<p>The company has a DCF target and reports progress against it.</p> <p>The company discloses a target that covers at least one high-risk commodity and reports progress against it.</p>
<b>d.</b>	<p>The company's DCF target covers all its high-risk commodities.</p> <p>The company discloses targets for each high-risk commodity and/or material realms which are applicable to all commodities and regions from which the commodity is sourced.</p>
<b>e.</b>	<p>The company discloses evidence that it has achieved a 100% DCF supply chain for all its relevant high-risk commodities.</p> <p>The company demonstrates that it sources all its high-risk commodities without any kind of conversion. Certification schemes are assessed to verify that it has achieved zero conversion.</p>

## SSI.B8. Marine ingredients in aquaculture feed

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company reports on the use of marine ingredients by disclosing the forage fish dependency ratio (FFDR) of fishmeal and fish oil used in aquaculture feed production or aquaculture farming across 100% of its operations.</p>	<p>Marine ingredients are limited resources that should be used responsibly. The FFDR is a ratio that indicates the amount of wild marine resources (fish) used to produce 1 kg of fish or shrimp.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company provides quantitative evidence of decreasing the FFDR of fishmeal and fish oil used in aquaculture feed production or aquaculture farming across 100% of its operations.</p>	<p>When companies disclose the FFDR for fish meal and fish oil, this element assessed whether this ratio has decreased over the past 2 years. Ideally, we compare 2022 data with 2020, otherwise 2021 vs. 2019.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company provides quantitative evidence of increasing the use of trimmings in aquaculture feed production or aquaculture farming across 100% of its operations.</p>	<p>Trimming are waste material from wild and farmed fish caught. This waste can also be used as marine ingredients to produce aquaculture feed. Most feed producing companies report on the use of trimmings in feed. Ideally, we compare 2022 data with 2020, otherwise 2021 vs. 2019.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company has set a target for the use of alternative feed ingredients and reports progress against its target.</p>	<p>There are concerns about the contribution of fish oil and fishmeal production to overfishing, and the potential competition for fish resources between feed production and human consumption. Feed companies are expected to work towards using more alternative ingredients instead of fish meal and fish oil. Feed companies report on alternative sources they are working on, but often it is not clear how far they are on this journey, and where they are working towards. Therefore, this element assesses whether companies set target on the use of alternative feed ingredients and report progress against it.</p>

## SSI.B9. Prevention and mitigation of escapes

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company reports on the species, the number of incidents, the location and the number of fish that escaped in 2021 and 2022. The company also discloses its farming operations for which escapes are relevant.</p>	<p>The company must report on escaped fish incidents in its locations as well as the location and species of the escaped fish. It should also report on the number of escaped fish in 2021 and 2022. Be aware that when a company that farms fish or shrimp states that it had 0 escapes, double-check the species it farms. Only in certain aquaculture systems, like for example salmon farming, escapes are a risk. In 2021, for example <a href="#">Nueva Pescanova</a> reported that they had 0 escapes, but because their aquaculture all seems land-based, the risks are much less compared to salmon farming. To meet this element, the company does not need to have a policy, but a general statement (in the Annual Report or Sustainability Report).</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company did not have major incident in 2021 and 2022.</p>	<p>In 2021 and 2019, an outbreak of 1,500 species or more was considered as a major outbreak. The company reports that it did not have any major incidents in 2021 and 2022. The company has to report on these years. It is not met if they report on previous years without these years. Additionally, if the company does not say anything about an incident, we should assume that there has been one so this is no evidence.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company has a policy on incidents that presents a detailed approach to prevent and mitigate incidents.</p>	<p>The company should have a policy on what it does to mitigate incidents that covers all its farming operations.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> In the event of an incident, the company presents the measures it took to address the negative impacts of the incident.</p>	<p>When an escape outbreak occurs, the company describes what it does to mitigate the effects of the outbreak.</p>

## SSI.B10. Disease management and mortality rates

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses information about disease management plans.</p>	<p>The company must disclose general information on a disease management plan. There is no requirement for survival / mortality rates.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company discloses its approach to manage diseases and reports mortality or survival rates across 100% of its operations.</p>	<p>The company has to disclose survival / mortality rates and disclose a disease management plan. The company has to publicly disclose mortality / disease rates on its activities. The company must report on the survival rates on previous 12 months. Additionally, the company should have survival / mortality rates on 100% of its operations. The company does not have to have a target or report on progress, but a general system / disease management plan.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company has a target for mortality or survival rates across 100% of its operations and reports progress against its target.</p>	<p>The company has a target for mortality rates across 100% of operations and has reported against these targets. The targets are usually in percent terms and should be forward looking, at earliest 2021/2022. However, there is no requirement for the company to meet this target.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> In 2021 and 2022, the company achieved its target.</p>	<p>The company should have met the targets set out in element c).</p>

## SSI.B11. Animal welfare

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company has a policy that addresses animal welfare issues (in its supply chain where relevant).</p>	<p>Main welfare issues on which the company should report on are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phasing out close confinement</li> <li>- Ending routine mutilations</li> <li>- Ensuring pre-slaughter stunning</li> <li>- Avoiding genetic engineering and cloning</li> <li>- Encouraging natural behaviours through species-specific enrichment</li> <li>- Limiting long-distance live transport to eight hours or under.</li> </ul> <p>Reference to the 'Five Freedoms' as outlined by UK Farm Animal Welfare Committee is considered enough as it includes some of the main welfare issues.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company discloses evidence of processes such as third-party certifications or third-party audits.</p>	<p>The company discloses an external verification and auditing, as well as a clear description of a process. Must be external verification and auditing and the process should be clearly disclosed (not just "we monitor all our suppliers"). Examples: NSF Global Animal Wellness Standards (GAWS); A Greener World (AGW); Global G.A.P; Certified Humane; RSPCS Assured (UK only); RSPCA Approved; See Seafood for full explanation on: Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC), Friend of the Sea (FoS) and Best Aquaculture Practices (BAP).</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company has a target or targets that address animal welfare issues (in its supply chain where relevant) and reports progress against the targets.</p>	<p>The company discloses a time bound target and reports progress against the latter.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The targets are applicable to all species, geographies and products.</p>	<p>The target may be time-bound.</p>
<p><b>e.</b> The company's policies and/or targets address all the following key animal welfare issues for each species: (i) phasing out close confinement, (ii) ending routine mutilations, (iii) ensuring pre-slaughter stunning, (iv) avoiding genetic</p>	<p>Key species and relevant issues for each (non-exhaustive list):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aquaculture/farmed fish: Moving towards ensuring pre-slaughter stunning of fish, non-fin-clipping of fish, avoiding over-crowding in fish farms, promoting stress mitigation, routine health testing, sold or purchased live, water quality management.</li> <li>- Laying hens and broiler chickens: Phasing out battery cages, enriched cages, and all types of cage confinement for laying hens; reducing stocking densities for broiler chickens; ending</li> </ul>

engineering and cloning, (v) encouraging natural behaviours through species-specific enrichment and (vi) limiting long-distance live transport to eight hours or under.

- beak-trimming of laying hens; moving to Controlled Atmosphere Stunning (CAS) for broiler chickens; moving towards broiler chicken breeds with higher welfare outcomes
- Pigs (sows and meat pigs): Phasing out gestation crates for sows; ending teeth-clipping; ending tail-docking of pigs; moving away from high concentration carbon dioxide stunning for pigs
- Dairy cows, beef cattle and calves: Ending tethering of dairy cows and individual confinement of dairy calves; ending tail-docking of dairy cows; moving towards polled breeds (dairy cows), not shot on farm (dairy & beef), to avoid disbudding/de-horning (beef & dairy) or committing to using adequate pain mitigation during disbudding (beef), castration of cattle (beef), providing brushes in housing + bushes and for trees outside (beef & dairy) and pithing of cows (beef)

## SSI.B12. Antibiotic use and growth-promoting substances

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company has a policy on reducing the (prophylactic) use of antibiotics and/or growth-promoting substances (in its supply chain where relevant).</p>	<p><b>Prophylactic:</b> refers to use of antimicrobials in healthy animals considered to be at risk of infection or prior to the onset of clinical infectious disease.</p> <p><b>Growth promotion antimicrobials:</b> use of antimicrobials to increase the rate of weight gain and/or the efficiency of feed utilization in animals by other than purely nutritional means.</p> <p><i>'Antibiotic-free'</i>-products do not count as this is not a commitment to reduce antibiotics but more 'marketing' of products. Under 'antibiotic policy / stewardship', check for "reduce" / "ban" in their statements rather than 'optimise' or 'efficient use' as we really need to see companies commenting that they are <i>reducing use</i>. "Phasing out" will count.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company discloses evidence of processes such as third-party certifications or third-party audits.</p>	<p>Must be external verification and auditing and the process should be clearly disclosed (not just "we monitor all our suppliers"). For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">AENOR</a> certification</li> <li>• <a href="#">NSF</a> certification</li> <li>• <a href="#">ATBF</a> certification</li> </ul>
<p><b>c.</b> The company has targets to phase out the use of growth-promoting substances across all species, geographies and products (in its supply chain where relevant) and reports progress against the targets.</p>	<p>The company has targets to phase out the prophylactic use of antibiotics across all species, geographies and products (in its supply chain where relevant) and reports progress against the targets.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company has targets to phase out the prophylactic use of antibiotics across all species, geographies and products (in its supply chain where relevant) and reports progress against the targets.</p>	<p>The company has targets to phase out the prophylactic use of antibiotics across all species, geographies and products (in its supply chain where relevant) and reports progress against the targets.</p>



- e. The company discloses a reduction in the total use of antibiotics classified as medically important antimicrobials across all species, geographies and products (in its supply chain where relevant).

**Medically important:** Antimicrobial classes used in human medicine and therefore listed on the WHO CIA List where they are categorized according to specified criteria, as "important", "highly important" or "critically important" for human medicine.

## SSI.B13. Medicine use

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses information about medicine use in its operations.</p>	<p>At the minimum, the company should disclose information about medicine use (antibiotics / probiotics). Be careful about the overlap with B12 antibiotics, although the topics are very closely related. For seafood, medicine use is most important for salmon farming companies that are using medicines to combat sea lice. If noted, the company should have a general information on its operations. Also check for vaccination or alternative medicines.</p> <p>Salmon lice are a natural seawater parasite. As a fish farmer, it is our task to make sure that the salmon can coexist with the lice. Salmon lice can impair the quality of the salmon's flesh and can, in the worst cases, lead to disease and death. We therefore work preventively to keep lice numbers down, and implement treatment regimes that are gentle on the fish and the wider environment."</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company discloses its medicine use and medical treatments used across 100% of its operations.</p>	<p>The company must disclose data about medicine use across all its operations.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company discloses a reduction in the total use of medicines across 100% of its operations.</p>	<p>The company should have a quantitative report on the medicine use across 100% of its operations and also discloses a decrease in medicine use.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company discloses it has implemented alternative medicinal treatments and reports on the use of these treatments across 100% of its operations.</p>	<p>What is an alternative to medicine? An overview of alternative, non-medicinal approaches to sea lice can be found <a href="#">here</a>.</p>

# Traceability

## SSI.C1. Commitment to traceable seafood products and aquaculture feed ingredients

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p>a. The company has a general commitment to traceable seafood and marine feed ingredients.</p>	<p>This indicator focuses on traceability commitments companies make, in particular commitments to the Global Dialogue on Seafood Traceability (GDST) a standard that promotes electronic and interoperable traceability across the value chain in the seafood industry (also see C1 indicator rationale in the <a href="#">SSI methodology</a> and <a href="#">GDST website</a>).</p> <p>To meet this element, should make reference of a commitment the traceability of their seafood products and/or aquaculture feed production, without specifying how traceability is implemented or which traceability programmes that are applied, or without reference to GDST.</p> <p>Company statements that refer to traceability as legal compliance are not accepted.</p>
<p>b. The company endorses the GDST standard.</p>	<p>Companies that have endorsed the GDST standard can be found on the <a href="#">GDST website</a>. Distinguish between endorsing and adopting. Only endorsements at level of the parent company are rewarded.</p> <p>In SSI 2021, the <a href="#">endorsement</a> of SeaBOS to GDST was accepted as endorsement of all 10 companies that are part of SeaBOS. This is still accepted; however in 2021 it was rewarded with 1.5p while after revision of the methodology, endorsement of GDST is worth 1p because of shifting expectations (companies that endorsed should take the next step and start implementing the standard).</p> <p>If companies refer to GDST but are not formally listed on the GDST website as endorser or adopter, this element is not met.</p>

<p>c. The company has a time-bound target to achieve traceable seafood and marine feed ingredients through chain-of-custody certification.</p>	<p>In addition to commitments to GDST, other commitments to traceability are also rewarded but need to be translated into time-bound targets. Companies can commit to implementing other traceability programmes, or through their time-bound commitments to certified seafood with reference to chain-of-custody certification. Through chain of custody certification, certified seafood can be traced back to the source. The Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) and Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC) have a combined <a href="#">chain of custody certification</a> scheme. The target should clearly apply to 100% of the companies operations and/or supply chain.</p>
<p>d. The company has a time-bound target to adopt the GDST standard.</p>	<p>Companies publicly commit to adopt the GDST and have a time-bound target for implementing the GDST standard. Currently, GDST shows which companies are adopting the standard, but there is no information about time-bound targets. Check if there is information about companies that are partnering as <a href="#">Founder or</a> whether time-bound targets are included.</p>

## SSI.C2. Traceability system for seafood products and aquaculture feed ingredients

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p>a. The company provides a description of systems in place (electronic or paper-based) to trace and verify the origins of seafood products and aquaculture feed ingredients, marine and terrestrial.</p>	<p>Companies provide a description of traceability systems that are in place, which includes at least an explanation of how the company traces the origins of its seafood products.</p> <p>For resources that provide background on traceability look at the reports mentioned under indicator C2 in the <a href="#">SSI methodology</a> and or the <a href="#">GDST website</a>.</p> <p>A company only mentioning that they have a traceability system without a description or explanation is not enough.</p>
<p>b. The company discloses which key data elements are collected and provides an explanation of how these are verified and shared along the supply chain.</p>	<p>To meet this element, in addition to element a) the company mentions key data elements (KDE's) are being collected, as well as insight about verification of these key data elements and sharing along the supply chain. As it is difficult to assess the quality of traceability systems and to provide evidence whether these are implemented across a company's entire operations and supply chain, information about KDE's and verification of data are used as proxy for having a well-functioning traceability system in place.</p> <p>Here is a <a href="#">list</a> of key data elements provided by GDST as reference.</p> <p>The company can also meet this element if it states that it is working towards implementing GDST.</p>
<p>c. The company demonstrates that it has chain-of-custody certification in place for at least 80% of its portfolio.</p>	<p>Next to traceability systems, third-party certification schemes with chain-of-custody requirements like the MSC and ASC <a href="#">chain of custody certification</a> scheme, are used to trace back the origins of seafood products. Companies often state that traceability is covered by certification schemes. While traceability and certification are different topics, in case where a company has at least 80% of its portfolio certified by certification schemes with chain of custody, it is also rewarded under this indicator.</p> <p>When assessing companies against this element, reward companies with a portfolio of at least 80% MSC and/or ASC products. Flag when there is reference of other certification schemes, as chain of custody requirements are not always clearly applied.</p>

d. The company and its supply chain disclose the percentage of their portfolio (by volume) where the GDST standard has been implemented.

Check companies are implementing the GDST standard and supporting evidence (at least an explanation of which products and/or segments are in line with GDST). As the GDST standard is released a few years ago, probably not many companies have started to implement this standard.

### SSI.C3. Risk-based approach to illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p>a. The company provides general information about how it mitigates risks for IUU fisheries across its operations and supply chain but has not conducted an IUU risk assessment.</p>	<p>IUU is a key topic within the seafood industry. Here we are looking how companies are dealing with IUU and IUU risks in their operations and supply chains. How are they assessing IUU risks, how transparent are they about IUU and if a company has fish with a high IUU risk in its operations, what does do to mitigate these risks? Companies describe and explain what they do to mitigate IUU risks in their supply chain. Companies that refer to sourcing seafood that is certified to mitigate IUU risks are also rewarded here.</p>
<p>b. The company demonstrates it has a risk assessment tool in place to conduct IUU risk assessments across 100% of its operations and supply chain.</p>	<p>For this element we want to see if companies have a process or a tool in place to assess IUU risks across their operations and supply chain. Key here is that the process or assessment tool is not in place for only some products or segments (e.g. tuna products), but that it applies to all operations a company's operations.</p>
<p>c. The company discloses the results of the risk assessment.</p>	<p>When element b) is met, and the company also publicly discloses results of its risk assessment, this element is met.</p>
<p>d. The company discloses the steps it has taken to address and mitigate identified high IUU risks, as revealed by its risk assessment.</p>	<p>Companies explain what they are doing to address and mitigate IUU risks, following the outcomes of its risk assessment.</p>



## SSI.C4. Disclosure of the source of seafood products and marine feed ingredients

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p>a. The company discloses a general overview of the source of its seafood products and marine feed ingredients in its operations.</p>	<p>There are also external organisations through which companies disclose the source of their seafood products and/or marine feed ingredients. Most important is the <a href="#">Ocean Disclosure Project</a> FishChoice also offers sourcing profiles for companies, however it's not clear which year's it refers to and whether the profiles are complete (responsibility of the companies).</p>
<p>b. The company discloses an overview, but not for all its products, including information about species and geographic location.</p>	<p>In addition to element a), the company needs to disclose information about the species it fishes and/or sources as well as the geographical location (FAO catch area, sea and/or country).</p>
<p>c. The company discloses an overview, but not for all its products, including information about species, geographic location and management status of each of its sources.</p>	<p>In addition to element b), for this element it is also required to disclose information about the management status. Often, companies refer to management status by stating if the fishery or farm is certified by a certification scheme. To meet this indicator, it's not the case that all seafood that is sourced should be certified, but that a company is transparent about the source of a product, regardless of its status.</p>
<p>d. The company discloses a full overview of the source of all its products, including information about species, geographic location and management status.</p>	<p>Companies should be fully transparent about the source of all its products, i.e. ODP profiles..</p>

# Social responsibility

## SSI.D01-SSI.D18: Core social indicators

### Respect Human Rights

#### SSI.D1. Commitment to respect human rights

Pillar	Respect Human Rights
Indicator	<b>D1. <u>Commitment to respect human rights</u></b> <b>The company publicly commits to respecting all internationally recognised human rights across its activities.</b>
Element a	<b>The company has a publicly available policy statement committing it to respect human rights, which is approved by the highest governance body.</b>
	<p>The company discloses a policy statement on respecting human rights. For example, it can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commit to respect human rights,</li> <li>• Commit to respect the rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,</li> <li>• Commit to respect the rights in the International Bill of Human Rights,</li> <li>• Commit to respect all internationally recognised human rights.</li> </ul> <p>The commitment and the policy should cover all company's activities and should be standard across all locations regardless of law. The commitment has strong wording. Examples of strong wording are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commits to respect XX convention</li> <li>• We adhere to the XX convention</li> <li>• We uphold the XX right/convention, etc.</li> <li>• We are committed to respecting the rights under the XX convention</li> <li>• We recognise our obligation to respect XX</li> <li>• We abide by XX</li> <li>• Comply with</li> <li>• Aligned with</li> </ul> <p>A commitment to the ten principles of the UNGC and a modern slavery statement are not considered sufficient as well as weak wording such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We follow the principles of the XX convention</li> <li>• We support the right to XX</li> </ul>

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consistent with XX</li><li>• In line with</li><li>• Informed by</li><li>• Striving to ensure rights are upheld</li><li>• Recognises the principles of XX (acknowledgement of an obligation is not a commitment)</li><li>• Guided by</li><li>• Based on</li><li>• Comply with</li></ul> |
|--|--|

## SSI.D2. Commitment to respect the human rights of workers

Pillar	Respect Human Rights
Indicator	<p><b><u>D2. Commitment to respect the human rights of workers</u></b>  <b>The company publicly commits to respecting the principles concerning fundamental rights at work in the eight ILO core conventions, as set out in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. It also has a publicly available policy statement committing it to respect the human rights of workers in its business relationships.</b></p>
Element a	<p><b>The company has a publicly available policy statement committing it to respecting the human rights that the ILO has declared to be fundamental rights at work, which is approved by the highest governance body.</b></p>
	<p>The company discloses a formal policy commitment covering its operations –either as public document or webpage- which references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the ILO and the fundamental rights at work collectively, also known as the ILO core labour standards or the ILO conventions on the fundamental rights at work</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the individual fundamental rights at work named freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour; abolition of child labour; and elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.</li> </ul> <p>A commitment to collective bargaining ‘as permitted by the law’ or in line ‘with local or national laws’ is not considered sufficient for this element as a company should respect the rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining everywhere regardless of local laws.</p> <p>The commitment has strong wording. Examples of strong wording are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commits to respect XX convention</li> <li>• We adhere to the XX convention</li> <li>• We uphold the XX right/convention, etc.</li> <li>• We are committed to respecting the rights under the XX convention</li> <li>• We recognise our obligation to respect XX</li> <li>• We abide by XX</li> <li>• Comply with</li> <li>• Aligned with</li> </ul> <p>A commitment to the ten principles of the UNGC and a modern slavery statement are not considered sufficient as well as weak wording such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We follow the principles of the XX convention</li> <li>• We support the right to XX</li> <li>• Consistent with XX</li> <li>• In line with</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informed by</li> <li>• Striving to ensure rights are upheld</li> <li>• Recognises the principles of XX (acknowledgement of an obligation is not a commitment)</li> <li>• Guided by</li> <li>• Based on</li> <li>• Comply with</li> </ul>
<b>Element b</b>	<p><b>The company has a publicly available statement of policy that expects its business relationships to commit to respecting the human rights that the ILO has declared to be fundamental rights at work.</b></p>
	<p>The company discloses a formal policy commitment covering its suppliers –either as public document or webpage- which references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the ILO and the fundamental rights at work collectively, also known as the ILO core labour standards or the ILO conventions on the fundamental rights at work.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the individual fundamental rights at work named freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour; abolition of child labour; and elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.</li> </ul> <p>A commitment to collective bargaining ‘as permitted by the law’ or in line ‘with local or national laws’ is not considered sufficient for this element as a company should respect the rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining everywhere regardless of local laws.</p> <p>The commitment has strong wording. Examples of strong wording are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commits to respect XX convention</li> <li>• We adhere to the XX convention</li> <li>• We uphold the XX right/convention, etc.</li> <li>• We are committed to respecting the rights under the XX convention</li> <li>• We recognise our obligation to respect XX</li> <li>• We abide by XX</li> <li>• Comply with</li> <li>• Aligned with</li> </ul> <p>A commitment to the ten principles of the UNGC and a modern slavery statement are not considered sufficient as well as weak wording such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We follow the principles of the XX convention</li> <li>• We support the right to XX</li> <li>• Consistent with XX</li> <li>• In line with</li> <li>• Informed by</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Striving to ensure rights are upheld</li><li>• Recognises the principles of XX (acknowledgement of an obligation is not a commitment)</li><li>• Guided by</li><li>• Based on</li></ul> <p>Comply with</p>
--	---

### SSI.D3. Identifying human rights risks and impacts

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Respect Human Rights</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D3. Identifying human rights risks and impacts</u></b> <b>The company proactively identifies its human rights risks and impacts.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company describes the process(es) to identify its human rights risks and impacts in specific locations or activities covering its own operations.</b>
	<p>The company discloses the first step of a human rights due diligence process for its operations, namely the identification of all its human rights risks and impacts. It should provide evidence of a clear identification process which can include but is not limited to at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk-based research and human rights risk analysis</li> <li>• Using specialist research platforms or databases to identify/assess human rights risks</li> <li>• Engagement with rightsholders to identify human rights risks</li> <li>• Risk analysis of human rights risks across locations, sectors, commodities etc.</li> <li>• Partnership with a human rights expert to conduct risk analysis</li> <li>• Human Rights Impact Assessment (HRIA)</li> <li>• Engagement with internal company functions and/or suppliers to understand human rights risks.</li> </ul> <p>The process covers the company's whole operations and involves identifying risks to people, not risks to business (e.g. reputation or financial).</p> <p>Furthermore, it should not only reference a specific human right risk (e.g. modern slavery or discrimination).</p>
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company describes the process(es) to identify its human rights risks and impacts in specific locations or activities through relevant business relationships.</b>
	<p>The company discloses the first step of a human rights due diligence process for its supply chains, namely the identification of its human rights risks and impacts in its supply chain. It should provide evidence of a clear identification process which can include but is not limited to at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk-based research and human rights risk analysis</li> <li>• Using specialist research platforms or databases to identify/assess human rights risks</li> <li>• Engagement with rightsholders to identify human rights risks</li> <li>• Risk analysis of human rights risks across locations, sectors, commodities etc.</li> <li>• Partnership with a human rights expert to conduct risk analysis</li> <li>• Human Rights Impact Assessment (HRIA)</li> <li>• Engagement with internal company functions and/or suppliers to understand human rights risks.</li> </ul> <p>The process covers the company's whole operations and involves identifying risks to people, not risks to business (e.g. reputation or financial). Furthermore, it should not only reference a specific human right risk (e.g. modern slavery or discrimination).</p>

#### SSI.D4. Assessing human rights risks and impacts

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Respect Human Rights</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D4. Assessing human rights risks and impacts</u></b> Having identified its human rights risks and impacts, the company assesses them and then prioritises its salient human rights risks and impacts.
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company describes its process(es) for assessing its human rights risks and discloses what it considers to be its salient human rights issues. This description includes how relevant factors are taken into account, such as geographical, economic, social and other factors.</b>
	The company discloses an assessment of human rights risks which is the second step of the human rights due diligence process and follows the identification of human rights risks. The assessment should determine and disclose its salient human rights risks meaning the ones with most severe negative impacts on people in the company's activities. The company discloses the process for assessing its human rights risks and impacts by describing how it has determined which of its human rights risks are most salient, including the social, economic, geographical or other factors considered in the assessment. A materiality assessment alone is not sufficient as this is different to a saliency assessment.
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company publicly discloses the results of its assessments, which may be aggregated across its operations and locations.</b>
	The company discloses an actual report or statement which outlines the results of its salient human rights assessment.



### SSI.D5. Integrating and acting on human rights risks and impacts

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Respect Human Rights</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D5. Integrating and acting on human rights risks and impacts</u></b> The company integrates the findings of its assessments of human rights risks and impacts into relevant internal functions and processes by taking appropriate actions to prevent, mitigate or remediate its salient human rights issues.
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company describes its global system to take action to prevent, mitigate or remediate its salient human rights issues, AND this includes a description of how its global system applies to its supply chain.</b>
	The company discloses the third step of the human rights due diligence process which follows the identification and assessment of human rights risks. It refers to a global system across the whole company, not just in particular locations. There is a distinction between corrective action plan (often created a part of audits) which are created to address a specific negative impact that has occurred, and developing a global system for taking action more broadly to prevent and mitigate negative impacts across business activities. This means that having only a corrective action plan alone is not sufficient to meet element.
<b>Note</b>	To score the maximum point of 1, the 'global system' must cover its operations and supply chain; it can score 'partially met' (0.5) if it covers its operations or its supply chain, not both. In order to meet this element, the company must first meet indicator D4a.
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company provides an example of the specific conclusions reached and actions taken or to be taken on at least one of its salient human rights issues as a result of assessment processes in at least one of its activities/operations in the last three years.</b>
	The company describes an example of the specific actions taken or to be taken on at least one of its salient human rights risks and the action is taken as a result of assessment processes in at least one of its activities/operations in the last three years.
<b>Note</b>	The company can meet D5b even if it does not meet D4, but it must be clear that the example is a salient human rights risk (i.e. the company has some sort of disclosure on its salient risks but not necessarily enough to meet D4).

## SSI.D6. Engaging with affected and potentially affected stakeholders

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Respect Human Rights</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D6. Engaging with affected and potentially affected stakeholders</u></b> <b>As part of identifying and assessing its human rights risks and impacts, the company identifies and engages with stakeholders whose human rights have been or may be affected by its activities.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company discloses the categories of stakeholders whose human rights have been or may be affected by its activities.</b>
	The company engaged with stakeholders as part of the identification and assessment of its human rights risks and impacts. Therefore, it must be clear that the stakeholders affected are those identified as part of the due diligence process and not of a materiality assessment.
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company provides at least two examples of its engagement with stakeholders whose human rights have been or may be affected by its activities (or their legitimate representatives or multi-stakeholder initiatives) in the last two years.</b>
	Engaging with potentially and actually affected stakeholders means engaging in a dialogue with the stakeholders who might be, or are, impacted by the company's activities and/or with its legitimate representatives and/or with multi-stakeholder initiatives. Depending on the nature of the company's operations, stakeholders can include (but are not limited to) workers, their families, local communities and any other person or group of people whose life and environment may be impacted.

## SSI.D7. Grievance mechanisms for workers

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Respect Human Rights</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D7. Grievance mechanisms for workers</u></b> The company has one or more channels/mechanisms (its own, third party or shared) through which workers can raise complaints or concerns, including in relation to human rights issues.
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company indicates that it has one or more channel(s)/mechanism(s), or participates in a shared mechanism, accessible to all workers who may be adversely impacted by the company (or individuals or organisations acting on their behalf or who are otherwise in a position to be aware of adverse impacts), to raise complaints or concerns.</b>
	The company discloses one or more formal channel(s)/mechanism(s) that can be used also to raise human rights complaints or concerns related to the company and which is accessible to all workers. Moreover, the channel must ensure both anonymous and non-anonymous reporting. Grievances can be made via a webpage, phonenumber, online portal, or by mail or email, or a combination. The complainant can report on all aspects of human rights, not only specific rights (e.g. discrimination).
<b>Note</b>	The company can score partially met if one or more of the following parts are met: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The company discloses data about the practical operation of the channel(s)/mechanism(s), including the number of grievances about human rights issues filed, addressed or resolved</li> <li>• The company indicates that the channel(s)/ mechanism(s) is available in all appropriate languages</li> <li>• The workers in its supply chain have access to either: The company's own channel(s)/ mechanism(s) to raise complaints or concerns about human rights issues at the company's suppliers or the company expects its suppliers to establish a channel/mechanism for their workers to raise such complaints or concerns</li> <li>• The company expects its suppliers to convey the same expectation on access to grievance channel(s) / mechanism(s) to their own suppliers.</li> </ul>

## SSI.D8. Grievance mechanisms for external individuals and communities

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Respect Human Rights</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D8. Grievance mechanisms for external individuals and communities</u></b> <b>The company has one or more channels/mechanisms (its own, third party or shared) through which individuals and communities who may be adversely impacted by the company can raise complaints or concerns, including in relation to human rights issues.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company indicates that it has one or more channel(s)/mechanism(s), or participates in a shared mechanism, accessible to all external individuals and communities who may be adversely impacted by the company (or individuals or organisations acting on their behalf or who are otherwise in a position to be aware of adverse impacts), to raise complaints or concerns.</b>
	<p>The company discloses one or more formal channel(s)/mechanism(s) that can be used also to raise human rights complaints or concerns related to the company and which is accessible to all external stakeholders. Moreover, the channel must ensure both anonymous and non-anonymous reporting.</p> <p>Grievances can be made via a webpage, phonenumber, online portal, or by mail or email, or a combination.</p> <p>The complainant can report on all aspects of human rights, not only specific rights (e.g. discrimination).</p> <p>It is sufficient for the company to state that its grievance channel/mechanism(s) are open to 'anyone' or the public. It must be clear it is open to all stakeholders, not only specific groups e.g. suppliers.</p> <p>The mechanism is to be available in all appropriate languages: e.g. if the channel is only available in one language, the company should indicate the reason behind that choice.</p>
<b>Note</b>	<p>The company can still score partially met (0.5) if one or more of the following parts are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The company also describes how it ensures the channel(s)/ mechanism(s) is accessible to all potentially affected external stakeholders at all its own operations, including in local languages</li> <li>• The company describes how it ensures external individuals and communities have access to either: the Company's own channel(s)/ mechanism(s) to raise complaints or concerns about human rights issues at the Company's suppliers</li> <li>• The company expects its suppliers to establish a channel/ mechanism for them to raise such complaints or concerns, and to convey the same expectation on access to grievance channel(s) / mechanism(s) to their suppliers.</li> </ul>

## Provide and promote decent work

### SSI.D9. Health and safety fundamentals

Pillar	Provide and promote decent work
Indicator	<p><b><u>D9. Health and safety fundamentals</u></b>  <b>The company publicly commits to respecting the health and safety of workers and discloses relevant data. It also places health and safety expectations on and monitors the performance of its business relationships.</b></p>
Element a	<p><b>The company has a publicly available policy statement committing it to respect the health and safety of workers.</b></p> <p>The company's policy statement includes a commitment to providing a healthy and safe workplace, respecting the health and safety of its workers or equivalent language. A commitment to comply with health and safety laws is not by itself sufficient to meet the element.</p> <p>The commitment must cover occupational health and safety in a broad sense, not a specific aspect of health and safety e.g. security, discrimination or use of hazardous materials.</p> <p>If the commitment language is weak, it is accepted if it is supported by evidence of the company's process(es) or system(s) for ensuring a healthy and safe work environment. Examples of accepted weak language is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We strive to ensure</li> <li>• We work to ensure</li> <li>• We promote</li> </ul> <p>We encourage</p>
Element b	<p><b>The company discloses quantitative information on health and safety for its workers.</b></p> <p>The company discloses health and safety information in line with GRI 403-9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number and rate of fatalities as a result of work-related injuries</li> <li>• The number and rate of high-consequence work-related injuries (excluding fatalities)</li> <li>• The number and rate of recordable work-related injuries</li> <li>• The main types of work-related injuries</li> <li>- The number of hours worked.</li> </ul>
Element c	<p><b>The company has a publicly available statement of policy that expects its business relationships to commit to respecting the health and safety of their workers.</b></p> <p>The company discloses a policy statement which expects its suppliers to commit to providing a healthy and safe workplace, respecting the health and safety of their workers, or the equivalent. The commitment should be in a policy document (e.g. policy/code of conduct) and the language must be strong e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suppliers should commit to respect</li> <li>• We expect suppliers to respect</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suppliers shall adhere to</li> <li>• Suppliers are expected to abide/comply with</li> </ul> <p>Weak commitment language is not accepted e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suppliers are encouraged to</li> <li>• Suppliers are directed to</li> </ul> <p>A commitment to comply with health and safety laws is not by itself sufficient to meet the element. The commitment must cover occupational health and safety in a broad sense, not a specific aspect of health and safety e.g. security, discrimination or use of hazardous materials.</p>
<b>Element d</b>	<b>The company discloses how it monitors the health and safety performance of its business relationships.</b>
	<p>The company discloses how it monitors its suppliers' performance on health and safety. For instance, it can state in its supplier code of conduct (or another equivalent policy document that includes health and safety expectations) that it audits its suppliers on it. Only 'reserving the right' to conduct an audit or view supplier documents (or similar) is not sufficient.</p>

## SSI.D10. Living wage fundamentals

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Provide and promote decent work</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D10. Living wage fundamentals</u></b> <b>The company is committed to paying its workers a living wage and supports the payment of a living wage by its business relationships.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company discloses a time-bound target for paying all workers a living wage or that it has achieved paying all workers a living wage.</b>
	<p>The company discloses that it pays a living wage to its employees or, where the company does not use the term 'living wage', it must disclose that the wage provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A decent standard of living or basic needs for employees and</li> <li>• The employees' family and/or dependents and</li> <li>• It includes some discretionary income.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The company discloses a target for paying a living wage across its operations which includes the year in which a company intends to achieve the goal.</li> </ul> <p>A commitment to pay wages in line with national legal standards or industry benchmark standards alone is not sufficient.</p>
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company describes how it determines a living wage for the regions where it operates.</b>
	<p>The company should at least disclose how it has determined the living wage in those locations where it already pays living wage or is planning on paying a living wage. It is sufficient to disclose the planned methodology too.</p> <p>The company describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how it works with relevant trade unions (or equivalent worker bodies where the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining is restricted under law) to determine a living wage</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the methodology it uses to determine a living wage (e.g. the Anker Methodology for Estimating a Living Wage, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Living Wage Calculator).</li> </ul> <p>The BSR methodology is accepted but the ETI Base Code is not accepted.</p>
<b>Element c</b>	<b>The company describes how it works to support the payment of a living wage by its business relationships.</b>
	<p>The company either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires its business relationships to pay their workers a living wage i.e. it is a contractual requirement</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expects its business relationships to pay their workers a living wage AND provides a description of how it works with its business relationships.</li> </ul>

	'Working with' goes beyond having a written expectation of a living wage in workers' codes or policy documents and can include interacting with suppliers through training, sharing expertise and collaborative working, as well as other activities.
--	---

### SSI.D11. Working hours fundamentals

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Provide and promote decent work</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D11. Working hours fundamentals</u></b> <b>The company does not require workers to work more than the regular and overtime hours and places equivalent expectations on its business relationships.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	The company publicly states that workers shall not be required to work more than 48 hours in a regular work week or 60 hours including overtime.  The company either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discloses that workers shall not be required to work more than 48 hours in a regular work week</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discloses that workers shall not be required to work more than 48 hours in a regular work week and 60 hours including overtime.</li> </ul> If the company commits to national legislation on working hours, it is only accepted where the national legislation requires workers to work no more than 48 hours in a regular work week in all locations of operation.
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company publicly states that all overtime work must be consensual and be paid at a premium rate.</b>  The company states that all overtime work must be consensual and that all overtime work is paid at a premium rate (or equivalent language).
<b>Element c</b>	<b>The company has a public expectation that its business relationships shall not require workers to work more than 48 hours in a regular work week or 60 hours including overtime.</b>  The company either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that it expects its suppliers to require that their workers shall not be required to work more than 48 hours in a regular work week.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that it expects its suppliers to require that their workers shall not be required to work more than 48 hours in a regular work week and 60 hours including overtime.</li> </ul> An expectation that suppliers commit to national or local laws on working hours is not sufficient.



## SSI.D12. Bargaining fundamentals

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Provide and promote decent work</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D12. Bargaining fundamentals</u></b> <b>The company discloses information about collective and bargaining agreements covering its workforce and its approach to supporting the practices of its business relationships in relation to freedom of association and collective bargaining.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company discloses the proportion of its total direct operations workforce covered by collective bargaining agreements.</b>
	It is not sufficient for the company to disclose the proportion of its total direct operations workforce that are part of a union or another workers' group as this element refers specifically to collective bargaining agreements - written agreements regarding working conditions and terms of employment concluded between one or more employers or employers' organizations, on the one hand, and one or more representative workers' organizations or duly elected and authorised representatives of the workers (according to national laws and regulations), on the other. The company could also disclose it is not a party to any collective bargaining agreements.
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company describes how it works to support the practices of its business relationships in relation to freedom of association and collective bargaining.</b>
	The company discloses how it supports suppliers to facilitate freedom of association and collective bargaining by, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing training to suppliers</li> <li>• Conducting joint projects to support suppliers</li> <li>• Supporting unionisation, workers' groups or worker empowerment</li> </ul> Doing more than observing or monitoring its business relationships in relation to freedom of association and collective bargaining.

### SSI.D13. Workforce diversity disclosure fundamentals

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Provide and promote decent work</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D13. Workforce diversity disclosure fundamentals</u></b> <b>The company discloses the percentage of employees for each employee category by at least four indicators of diversity.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company discloses the proportion of its total direct operations workforce for each employee category by age group.</b>
	<p>The employee category breakdown can be by level (such as senior management, middle management) and/or function (such as technical, administrative, production).</p> <p>In accordance with GRI 405, the suggested age groups for reporting on this disclosure are: under 30 years old, 30-50 years old and over 50 years old.</p> <p>It is sufficient for the company to disclose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total workforce disclosure breakdown</li> <li>• Two employee categories</li> </ul> <p>The company should include total workforce if it does not include categories that cover the entire total workforce. Reporting on the 90% of total workforce is sufficient.</p>
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company discloses the proportion of its total direct operations workforce for each employee category by gender.</b>
	<p>The employee category breakdown can be by level (such as senior management, middle management) and/or function (such as technical, administrative, production).</p> <p>It is sufficient for the company to disclose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total workforce disclosure breakdown</li> <li>• Two employee categories</li> </ul> <p>The company should include total workforce if it does not include categories that cover the entire total workforce. Reporting on the 90% of total workforce is sufficient.</p>
<b>Element c</b>	<b>The company discloses the proportion of its total direct operations workforce for each employee category by race or ethnicity.</b>
	<p>The employee category breakdown can be by level (such as senior management, middle management) and/or function (such as technical, administrative, production).</p> <p>It is sufficient for the company to disclose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total workforce disclosure breakdown</li> <li>• Two employee categories</li> </ul> <p>The company should include total workforce if it does not include categories that cover the entire total workforce. Reporting on the 90% of total workforce is sufficient.</p>

	It is sufficient to report on one country or region of operation only (not at the group level), if the breakdown by race/ethnicity and employee category covers only one country e.g. US, Latin America, South Africa.
<b>Note</b>	If the company explains it is unable to meet element (c) because of legal restrictions on the collection of ethnic or racial data in certain jurisdictions, it can still fully meet this indicator by satisfying elements (a) (b) and (d).
<b>Element d</b>	<b>The company discloses the proportion of its total direct operations workforce for each employee category by one or more additional indicators of diversity (e.g. disability, sexual identity and marital and family status, etc.).</b>
	<p>The employee category breakdown can be by level (such as senior management, middle management) and/or function (such as technical, administrative, production).</p> <p>It is sufficient for the company to disclose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total workforce disclosure breakdown</li> <li>• Two employee categories</li> </ul> <p>The company should include total workforce if it does not include categories that cover the entire total workforce. Reporting on the 90% of total workforce is sufficient.</p>

## SSI.D14. Gender equality and women's empowerment fundamentals

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Provide and promote decent work</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D14. Gender equality and women's empowerment fundamentals</u></b> <b>Indicator: The company publicly commits to gender equality and women's empowerment and discloses quantitative information on gender equality and women's empowerment.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company has a public commitment to gender equality and women's empowerment.</b>
	<p>The company can provide evidence from any type of public document or webpage belonging to the company.</p> <p>The company either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is a signatory to the UN Women's Empowerment Principles in all locations of operation</li> <li>• Commits to gender equality and women's empowerment in a broad sense not only in a specific setting, location, or function</li> <li>• Discloses at least one programme/initiative/target on gender equality and at least one programme/initiative/target on women's empowerment.</li> </ul> <p>Being a signatory to other external initiatives or programs as well as disclosure related to external gender equality or women's empowerment rankings or scores is not sufficient for this element.</p>
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company discloses one or more time-bound targets on gender equality and women's empowerment.</b>
	<p>The company discloses one or more targets on gender equality or women's empowerment e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation (e.g. gender equality in leadership)</li> <li>• Closing the gender pay gap</li> <li>• Improving women's health and well-being</li> <li>• Preventing violence and harassment.</li> </ul> <p>The target(s) is time-bound, forward-looking or was achieved in the reporting year of the assessment, and can be at the subsidiary level.</p>
<b>Element c</b>	<b>The company has at least 30% women on the highest governance body.</b>
	<p>The company can provide evidence from any type of public document or webpage belonging to the company.</p> <p>The company discloses that it has at least 30% women on its highest governing body. Diagrams and pictures that display the proportion of women are accepted.</p>
<b>Element d</b>	<b>The company discloses the ratio of the basic salary and remuneration of women to men in its total direct operations workforce for each employee category, by significant locations of operation.</b>
	<p>The company discloses the ratio of the basic salary or remuneration of women to men in its total direct operations workforce for each employee category, by locations of operation.</p> <p>The company can refer to 'employees' or 'workers' instead of 'total direct operations workforce'.</p> <p>'Employee category' refers to seniority or function.</p>

	<p>'Function' can be defined in the company's own terms e.g. technician, production, administrative.</p> <p>'Seniority' can be defined in the company's own terms e.g. junior, senior management, middle management.</p> <p>'Locations of operation' must include all countries of operation.</p>
--	---

## Act ethically

### SSI.D15. Personal data protection fundamentals

Pillar	Act ethically
Indicator	<p><b><u>D15. Personal data protection fundamentals</u></b></p> <p><b>Indicator: The company publicly commits to protecting personal data and has a global approach to data privacy.</b></p>
Element a	<p><b>The company has a public commitment to protecting personal data.</b></p> <p>The company discloses a commitment to respecting the right to data privacy, or a commitment to protecting personal data or information. A commitment to protect personal data should relate to all stakeholders whose personal data is being processed by the company which include at a minimum employees and customers.</p> <p>The commitment must be part of a policy document and needs to be global so applicable to all of the group/company activities.</p>
Element b	<p><b>The company has a global publicly available privacy statement in relation to the collection, sharing and access to personal data.</b></p> <p>The commitment must be part of a policy document and needs to be global so applicable to all of the group/company activities. A policy is not global if it has different location-specific privacy laws cited which are not consistently applied to the highest standard across all locations.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should apply at minimum to employees and customers.</p> <p>The company at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discloses the types of user information it collects</li> <li>• Discloses the types of third parties that user information is shared with, and</li> <li>- Allows a user to retrieve a copy of user information collected by the company.</li> </ul>

## SSI.D16. Responsible tax fundamentals

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Act ethically</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D16. Responsible tax fundamentals</u></b> <b>Indicator: The company has a public global tax approach and discloses its corporate income tax payments on a country-by-country basis.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company has a publicly available global tax strategy, which is approved by the highest governance body.</b>
	<p>The company discloses a global tax strategy which can include details on, among other things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tax oversight/governance</li> <li>• Tax risk management</li> <li>• Financial/tax auditing processes</li> <li>• Approach to dealing with tax authorities</li> </ul> <p>The policy applies to the whole company at the global level, not to a specific subsidiary, region or jurisdiction</p>
<b>Element b</b>	<b>A governance body or executive-level position is tasked with accountability for compliance with the company's global tax strategy.</b>
	The company discloses that a governance body or executive-level position is tasked with accountability for compliance with the company's global tax strategy.
<b>Element c</b>	<b>The company clearly discloses the amount of corporate income tax paid for each tax jurisdiction where the company is a resident for tax purposes.</b>
	<p>The company should report 100% taxes paid in each jurisdiction they are resident for taxes purposes and if the disclosure contains an 'other' category, the company should disclose the tax jurisdictions and taxes paid per jurisdiction, even if the tax paid is zero. Disclosure of taxes per region instead of per tax jurisdictions (countries) is not accepted. Tax jurisdictions are identified according to where the entities included in the organization's audited consolidated financial statements or in the financial information filed on public record, are resident for tax purposes.</p>

## SSI.D17. Anti-bribery and anti-corruption fundamentals

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Act ethically</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D17. Anti-bribery and anti-corruption fundamentals</u></b> <b>The company publicly prohibits bribery and corruption and takes steps to identify and address bribery and corruption risks and incidents.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company has a publicly available policy statement prohibiting bribery and corruption.</b>
	The company discloses a policy commitment on prohibiting bribery or corruption, or it states that it has 'zero tolerance for bribery and corruption'. The policy applies to the whole company at the global level, not to a specific subsidiary, region or jurisdiction. If the company only discloses that it complies with national legislation on anti-bribery and anti-corruption, this is not sufficient because it is not clear then if all locations of operation have such legislation and the same standard applies globally. However, if companies include reference to compliance with legislation alongside a statement prohibiting bribery or corruption, then is sufficient.
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company describes the process(es) to identify its bribery and corruption risks and impacts in specific locations or activities covering its own operations.</b>
	The company describes the process(es) to identify its bribery and/or corruption risks and impacts in specific locations or activities covering its own operations. A 'process to identify risks' must include an explanation and details of how the company identifies risks of bribery and/or corruption.
<b>Element c</b>	<b>The company includes anti-bribery and anti-corruption clauses in its contracts with business relationships.</b>
	The company either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discloses a contract it has with its suppliers which includes anti-bribery and anti-corruption clause(s)</li> <li>• Discloses in any kind of public document belonging to the company that its suppliers must sign and/or agree to a contract that includes anti-corruption and anti-bribery clause(s)</li> <li>• Discloses that it prohibits bribery and/or corruption in a policy document that outlines its requirements of its supplier (e.g. supplier code of conduct), and that the relationship with the supplier will be subject to review or terminated if the supplier is in breach of the same policy document.</li> </ul>
<b>Element d</b>	<b>The company indicates that it has a confidential and anonymous channel/mechanism accessible to all stakeholders to raise bribery and corruption concerns and complaints without fear of reprisals.</b>
	The company provides evidence of a grievance mechanism(s) in which stakeholders can report bribery and/or corruption concerns against the company via a webpage, phoneline, online portal, or by mail or email, or a combination. The complainant can report on all aspects of bribery and/or corruption with the option to make reports anonymously. Anyone internal and external to the company can access and make reports through the grievance mechanism and reports can be made against the company itself. The channel must enforce a "non-retaliation" principle whereby individuals can report without fear of reprisals.

## SSI.D18. Responsible lobbying and political engagement fundamentals

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Act ethically</b>
<b>Indicator</b>	<b><u>D18. Responsible lobbying and political engagement fundamentals</u></b> <b>The company has an approach to lobbying and political engagement and has related controls in place.</b>
<b>Element a</b>	<b>The company has a publicly available policy statement(s) (or policy(ies) setting out its lobbying and political engagement approach.</b>
	<p>The company discloses a policy on lobbying and political engagement which applies to the whole company in all locations of operation, not to a specific subsidiary, region or jurisdiction.</p> <p>The company describes its political engagement and lobbying approach by including at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The types or ways the company engages politically</li> <li>• The topics/issues covered in the company's political engagement</li> <li>• The basis or intention of the company's political engagement</li> <li>• The internal authorisation process or policies that must be followed to engage politically</li> <li>• Whether personal political engagement is prohibited/restricted</li> <li>• The types of stakeholders who the company engages with politically</li> <li>• Internal management or oversight of political engagement</li> <li>• Legal and reporting compliance around political engagement</li> <li>• Political contributions and exceptions to it</li> <li>– Political affiliation or neutrality.</li> </ul>
<b>Element b</b>	<b>The company has a publicly available policy statement that specifies that it does not make political contributions.</b>
	<p>The company discloses a policy statement that it does not make political contributions which applies to the whole company in all locations of operation, not to a specific subsidiary, region or jurisdiction. Moreover, it must be clear that it prohibits all political contributions, not just specific types of political contributions e.g. unlawful/improper payments.</p> <p>It is not sufficient if the company only has a statement that its workers may not make political contributions.</p> <p>Where a company allows political contributions, it must only allow them by exception and clearly state the criteria for making them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not an exception if the company allows political contributions where the law allows or where there is approval from internal department e.g. Public Affairs or senior management</li> <li>• An exception must be an exceptional circumstance e.g. a one off scenario</li> <li>- An exception must include expressions of corporate responsibility and/or support of the genuine democratic process.</li> </ul>
<b>Element c</b>	<b>The company discloses its expenditures on lobbying activities.</b>
	<p>The company either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discloses its expenditures on lobbying activities covering all locations of operation</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discloses its expenditure on lobbying activities in some locations of operation where it lobbies and explains that it only lobbies in these specific locations</li> <li>- Discloses that it does not engage in any lobbying activities.</li> </ul>
<b>Element d</b>	<b>The company requires third-party lobbyists to comply with its lobbying and political engagement policy (or policies).</b>
	<p>The company either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discloses that it requires third-party lobbyists to comply with its lobbying and political engagement policy (or policies)</li> <li>• Disclose that it does not use third party lobbyists.</li> <li>• Discloses that it does not engage in any lobbying activities.</li> </ul> <p>'Third party lobbyists' refers to any third party which may lobby on the company's behalf.</p>

## SSI.D19. Child labour

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company provides evidence that it verifies the age of workers recruited in its own operations to ensure that they are not engaged in child labour.</p>	<p>The company discloses an age verification process through government issued documents or, where unavailable, a medical exam or school certificate.</p> <p>The company could also demonstrate that it verifies the age of worker recruited by means of internal or third part audits.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> If a case of child labour is found in its operations, the company describes how it develops, participates in or contributes to remediation programmes for transition from employment to education, enabling children to attend and remain in education, or it describes how it improves working conditions for young workers.</p>	<p>The company provides examples of concrete actions which address the issue of child labour in its operation.</p> <p>Examples of remediation programmes can be aligned with the Child Labour Monitoring and Remediation Systems or the SMETA requirements.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> In its contractual arrangements with suppliers or supplier code of conduct, the company includes child labour requirements, including a prohibition on using child labour and verifying the age of workers recruited.</p>	<p>The company discloses a requirement for suppliers to prohibit child labour and to have an age verification system for the workers recruited in a policy document.</p> <p>Wording linked to expectations are not considered synonyms for requirements.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company describes how it works with its supply chain to eliminate child labour and to improve working conditions for young workers, where relevant.</p>	<p>The company indicates how it is building the capacity of the supplier to prevent child labour impacts, for example, through trainings, joint projects and awareness raising programs. It also should provide some details on the topics covered and on how the capacity building has been carried out.</p> <p>Capacity building goes beyond monitoring suppliers on child labour requirements.</p>

- e. The company provides an analysis of trends demonstrating progress in relation to eliminating child labour from its supply chain.

The company provides quantitative data on how it has improved over the years on decreasing the incidence of child labour in its supply chain. The company should disclose the analysis of trends in one reporting framework (e.g. SR 2022) and not across different years of reporting (e.g. SR 2020, 2021 and 2022).

Trends: it is a monitored change and not just one-off observations.

## SSI.D20. Forced labour

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company indicates that jobseekers and workers do not pay any recruitment fees or related costs to secure a job (<u>Employer Pays Principle</u>), and that it does not retain workers' personal documents or restrict workers' freedom of movement.</p>	<p>The company discloses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A policy requirement for its operations prohibiting the use of recruitment fees. A prohibition of giving deposit is not a synonyms of recruitment fees OR the company adheres to the Employer Pays Principle (EPP).</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A policy requirement for its operations prohibiting the holding of workers' personal documents.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A policy requirement for its operations prohibiting workers' restriction of movement.</li> </ul> <p>Wording linked to expectations are not considered synonyms for requirements.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company requires its suppliers not to use forced labour by codifying this requirement in a supplier code of conduct, or similar document.</p>	<p>The company discloses a requirement for suppliers to prohibit forced labour in a policy document.</p> <p>Wording linked to expectations are not considered synonyms for requirements.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> In its contractual arrangements with suppliers or supplier code of conduct, the company prohibits suppliers and any third-party recruitment intermediaries from imposing financial burdens on jobseekers and workers by collecting recruitment fees or related costs, and from retaining workers' personal documents or restricting workers' freedom of movement.</p>	<p>The company discloses for its suppliers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A policy requirement prohibiting them from using recruitment fees. A prohibition of giving deposit is not a synonyms of recruitment fees OR the company requires its suppliers to adhere to the Employer Pays Principle (EPP)</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A policy requirement prohibiting them from retaining workers' personal documents.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A policy requirement prohibiting them from restricting workers' freedom of movement.</li> </ul> <p>Wording linked to expectations are not considered synonyms for requirements.</p>

<p><b>d.</b> The company discloses how it works with its supply chain to eliminate at least one of the following: imposing recruitment fees, retaining personal documents or restricting workers' freedom of movement.</p>	<p>The company indicates how it is building the capacity of the supplier to prevent forced labour impacts, for example, through worker training, human resource training, pre-qualification process of private recruitment and employment agencies, and formalisation of worker contracts.</p> <p>The capacity building can also be part of case studies or programs addressing these issues.</p>
<p><b>e.</b> The company provides an analysis of trends demonstrating progress in relation to eliminating forced labour in its supply chain.</p>	<p>The company provides quantitative data on how it has improved over the years on decreasing the incidence of forced labour in its supply chain. The company should disclose the analysis of trends in one reporting framework (e.g. SR 2022) and not across different years of reporting (e.g. SR 2020, 2021 and 2022).</p> <p>Trends: it is a monitored change and not just one-off observations.</p>

## SSI.D21. Living wage

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company discloses a target for paying a living wage across its direct suppliers.</p>	<p>The company discloses either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A time-bound target that covers all its direct (Tier 1) suppliers</li> <li>- A requirement for its suppliers to pay living wage in a policy document</li> <li>- The company demonstrates it has already achieved the paying living wage across its direct suppliers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Living wage:</b> There are numerous definitions of living wage, but the core concept is to provide a decent standard of living for a worker and his or her family. A living wage is sufficient to cover food, water, clothing, transport, education, health care and other essential needs for workers and their family based on a regular work week not including overtime hours.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company describes how it determines a living wage for the regions where it sources.</p>	<p>This element focuses on regions where the company sources (supply chain). It is sufficient to disclose the process for some regions only. For operations, see indicator D10.</p> <p>The company discloses either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The methodology it uses to determine a living wage, (e.g. the Anker Methodology for Estimating a Living Wage, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Living Wage Calculator)</li> <li>- The platform it pulls living wage data from (e.g. Fair Wage Network (FWN), Global Living Wage Coalition (GLWC), Wage Indicator)</li> </ul> <p>How it works with trade unions or equivalent bodies to determine a living wage.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company discloses the percentage of workers across its own operations or direct suppliers that are paid a living wage.</p>	<p>The company shows how it tracks its progress on paying living wages.</p> <p>Examples of accepted disclosure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The percentage of workers/suppliers in different regions that are paid a living wage</li> <li>- The percentage of workers/suppliers that are paid a living wage (aggregated data across regions)</li> <li>- The number of workers/suppliers that are paid a living wage, if the company discloses the total number of workers/suppliers</li> </ul> <p>The regions where workers/suppliers are paid a living wage, if the company discloses its operating/sourcing regions.</p>

<p><b>d.</b> The company indicates that it has achieved paying a living wage for all its workers across its own operations.</p>	<p>The company provides evidence that it has achieved paying a living wage, e.g. through assessments or audits.</p>
<p><b>e.</b> The company indicates that it has achieved paying a living wage across its direct suppliers.</p>	<p>The company provides evidence that it has achieved paying a living wage, e.g. through assessments or audits.</p>

## SSI.D22. Health and safety of vulnerable groups

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company recognises the specific health and safety risks to vulnerable groups.</p>	<p>The company discloses a commitment or statement recognizing there are groups which have specific health and safety risks. The disclosure can be found at the operational and/or supply chain level and has to be linked to vulnerable workers and health and safety risks linked to the company's operations.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company identifies vulnerable groups in relation to health and safety.</p>	<p>The company provides an understanding of vulnerable groups within its operations and/or supply chain.</p> <p>Vulnerable groups in the food and agriculture sector are particularly at risk of occupational injury and illness and might include migrant and temporary labourers, women workers, and young farmers. Elderly groups or disabled persons may also be considered.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company assesses the health and safety risks to vulnerable groups.</p>	<p>The company conducts and discloses a health and safety risk assessment or risk mapping of vulnerable groups within its own operations and/or supply chain. The assessment can be part of a broader due diligence process.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company provides evidence of support activities that improve the health and safety of vulnerable groups.</p>	<p>The company discloses how it protects or improves the health and safety of vulnerable workers by means of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Activities or initiatives aimed at supporting vulnerable workers;</li> <li>- Tailored training on health and safety of vulnerable workers;</li> <li>- Technical or financial assistance to vulnerable workers;</li> <li>- Adequate housing and clean water for vulnerable workers (especially migrant and temporary workers)</li> </ul>



## SSI.D23. Farmer and fisher livelihoods

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company demonstrates that it has identified living income benchmarks for some commodities and/or regions.</p>	<p>The company discloses the regions and/or commodities for which it has identified living income benchmarks. It also discloses the source of these benchmarks, for example Living Income Community of Practice, Anker methodology, ELIGN, Heifer International. For some regions there are no benchmarks available, and in these cases the company can describe how it determines the benchmarks.</p> <p>Living income: The net annual income required for a household in a particular place to afford a decent standard of living for all members of that household. Elements of a decent standard of living include: food, water, housing, education, healthcare, transport, clothing, and other essential needs including provision for unexpected events</p> <p>How is it different from living wage? The concept of a living wage is applicable in the context of hired workers, such as farm or factory workers, who receive a salary for their labour. Living income, on the other hand, refers to situations of self-employment and is applicable to farmers, fishermen and -women and small-scale producers.</p> <p>Living income benchmark: An estimate of the cost of a basic and decent standard of living for a household in the area. It answers the question: 'how much does a typical household in a particular place need to earn, from all income sources, in order to live a decent standard of living?'</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company discloses how it assesses living income gaps.</p>	<p>The company describes how it calculates the difference between the living income benchmark and current income of a typical farming/ fishing household in a particular location.</p> <p>Examples of accepted disclosure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The company describes how it gathers data on income drivers of farmer/fisher households to understand actual income</li> <li>– The company discloses the proportion of total sourcing for which assessments are undertaken/ completed</li> <li>– The company discloses how it gathers income data</li> </ul>

		<p>Living income gap: The difference between the living income benchmark and current income of a typical farming household in a certain location.</p>
<p><b>c.</b></p>	<p>The company demonstrates activities to improve farmer resilience through its procurement practices and supply chain relationships for some commodities and/or regions.</p>	<p>Rather than looking for actual increase in pay from the buyer, this element considers how companies can positively influence the income prospects and stability of farmers and fishers through negotiating favourable terms of exchange.</p> <p>Examples of accepted disclosure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The company demonstrates more direct and long-term trading relationships with farmers</li> <li>– The company demonstrates how it improves the stability of farmers’ income through contracts (contract length, price guarantees and premiums)</li> <li>– The company demonstrates how it is sourcing more types of products from a farmer</li> <li>– The company demonstrates how it creates new products that increase farmers’ income (for example, a supermarket creates a new consumer facing dairy product from which the dairy farmer that provided the milk, also receives a percentage of all the sales)</li> <li>– In case the company doesn’t have farmers directly in its supply chain, it can include requirements for its suppliers in its Supplier Code of Conduct etc. to require them to have in place practices that support farmers’ income resilience.</li> </ul> <p>Activities that aim to improve the productivity or sustainability of the farms are by themselves not considered sufficient to meet the element, if the link to procurement is not clear. In these cases, the company has to demonstrate that the initiatives help farmers to meet the expectations the company places on its suppliers (for example obtaining a certificate or achieving a specific volume), and thus contribute to longer trading relationship.</p>
<p><b>d.</b></p>	<p>The company demonstrates that it adopts pricing practices that contribute to a living income for some commodities and/or regions.</p>	<p>The company discloses how it pays premiums towards living income for some commodities, for example by paying the Living Income Reference Price or Living Income Differential.</p>

<p><b>e.</b></p>	<p>The company demonstrates that it supports increasing farmers' and fishers' bargaining power</p>	<p>The company discloses how it works to enable individual and groups of farmers/ fishers to exert more influence and act strategically in their relationships with buyers (improving power balance between farmers and buyers).</p> <p>Examples of accepted disclosure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The company demonstrates how it supports strengthening farmer organizations and cooperatives, for example by providing them support in professionalising their operations, business management, or access to markets</li> <li>– The company demonstrates how it fosters the active participation and leadership of farmers and their representative organizations in the design and implementation of living income strategies OR how it makes robust farmer feedback loops and grievance mechanisms central to assessing the progress and success of living income strategies</li> <li>– The company demonstrates how it supports farm diversification and on-farm improvements, such as storage facilities, to increase farmer bargaining power and their ability to act strategically (e.g. not sell when prices are at lowest)</li> </ul> <p>The company demonstrates how it supports farmers' ability to upgrade into higher value-added activities e.g. through facilitating access to finance.</p>
<p><b>f.</b></p>	<p>The company reports on the impact of some of its activities to improve income</p>	<p>The company discloses the results of the activities aimed at improving living income. The reporting must go beyond reporting on the outputs or outcomes of programmes. For example, reporting on the scope of the programs (i.e. number of farmers reached) is not sufficient unless the company also includes data on the impacts on their income.</p>

## SSI.D24. Working and living conditions on board fishing vessels

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company commits (policy, Code of Conduct) to ensure decent working and living conditions on board fishing vessels.</p>	<p>At a minimum, the company must have a policy or a code of conduct that ensures safe, healthy and hygienic conditions on board fishing vessels with working and resting hours and freedom from violence and harassment. The policy or code of conduct can be developed by the company itself or based on industry initiatives, like the Seafood Task Force.</p> <p>Look for references to the Responsible Fishing Vessel Standard and Seafood Task Force Code of Conduct.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company demonstrates that it monitors for compliance and discloses monitoring results.</p>	<p>The company should demonstrate that it has systems to monitor for compliance with its policy, and also discloses monitoring results. It should be a continuous process and we would like to see results over their monitoring programme over the last year. Results of third-party audits are also sufficient to meet this element.</p> <p>This element is not met if the company does not disclose results.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> Based on the monitoring results, the company demonstrates how improvements are implemented.</p>	<p>Building upon element b), the company should have developed an improvement programme or the company should have provided evidence that improvements are being implemented through either engaging with suppliers or direct operations.</p> <p>A target for improvement would be enough to meet this element if they have demonstrated that the target is based on results from element b). For instance, if a company has a target of an improvement plan implemented in by 2025.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company provides evidence that improvements have been implemented across 100% of its operations and/or supply chain and discloses progress reporting.</p>	<p>To meet this element, using the monitoring and implementation of element c), the company should have disclosed progress reporting for the improvement systems / programmes for 100% of its operations (or supply chain) and have evidence of improvements in all operations. We have to have a clear understanding on what they are doing in regards to all vessels.</p> <p>Implementation is necessary for meeting this element rather than targets to address the issues.</p>

## SSI.D25. Indigenous peoples' rights

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company has a commitment to respect Indigenous Peoples' rights or references the relevant part(s) of ILO Convention No. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples or the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.</p>	<p>The company must explicitly state that it is committed, or it respects the Indigenous People's rights, or the UNDRIP or the ILO Convention 169.</p> <p>Expressing concern about these groups or observing and recognising the importance of rights is not enough to be considered a commitment.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company discloses its processes to identify and recognise the rights of Indigenous Peoples when activities in its own operations may impact their rights AND describes how it obtains Indigenous Peoples' free, prior and informed consent regarding whether and how to carry out projects.</p>	<p>Engagement must include carrying out assessment with Indigenous communities, not simply sharing the results with them. The company also needs evidence of a process whereby the company identifies with whom they should engage. The company must disclose their commitments in their own policies. If company does have a process to identify Indigenous People in their own operation, they must also show that they recognise their rights and are ready to obtain FPIC if it is necessary.</p> <p>The indicator does not accept ICMM membership because the ICMM has no monitoring mechanism to track whether members are upholding these commitments, and the ICMM does not have to report back.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company requires its business relationships to identify and recognise affected Indigenous Peoples and to obtain their free, prior and informed consent regarding whether and how to carry out projects.</p>	<p>Forest protection policies (FPP) will also be accepted if it includes clear language on requirements in regards to identifying and recognising Indigenous People and to obtain FPIC.</p>

**d.** The company describes how it works with its business relationships to improve their practices in respecting the rights of Indigenous Peoples.

The company should indicate how it is building the capacity of the supplier to improve their practices in respecting the rights of Indigenous Peoples. This can be, for example, through training, tools, resources, or awareness programmes.

## SSI.D26. Engagement with and support for local communities

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company demonstrates examples of engagement with communities in its own operations and supply chains.</p>	<p>The company must show examples of engaging with local communities in its own operations / supply chain. Many companies share at least some examples of how they have engaged and/or supported local communities. Besides examples where local communities are being mentioned specifically, also other activities at community level (schools, sport events, local events etc) are accepted here. Subsidiary examples of engagement are not enough to meet. We should look for examples of engagement at parent company level.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company demonstrates that it has implemented activities to support local communities and tracks the results and impacts of these activities.</p>	<p>In addition to element a), to meet this element the company should disclose an overview of activities implemented and be able to track the results and impacts of these activities.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company discloses its processes to identify and engage with local communities when activities in its own operations and supply chain may impact local communities.</p>	<p>To meet this element, a company should address negative impacts on local communities, according to a robust engagement process with the affected communities, including grievance and remediation mechanisms.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company discloses the outcomes of its engagement with local communities and describes what actions it has taken when local communities are impacted by company activities.</p>	<p>Based on meeting element c), the findings of the company's engagement process should be followed by concrete actions to address the identified impacts.</p>

## SSI.D27. Gender equality and women’s empowerment in the supply chain

Scoring guidelines	Research guidance
<p><b>a.</b> The company has a commitment to drive gender equality and women's empowerment within its supply chain.</p>	<p>The company has a commitment to gender equality and women’s empowerment usually through a code of conduct or a policy (or statement in annual report if it is taken from a policy document or code of conduct) that requires suppliers to have the same commitment.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company requires its suppliers to undertake a gender needs assessment.</p>	<p>The company has a process or a tool in place to assess gender equality and empowerment with its suppliers.</p> <p>What is a gender needs assessment?</p> <p>It is a tool or a process which helps to understand relationships between men and women, their access to resources, their activities, and the constraints they face. Therefore, it looks at the different roles, rights, needs, and opportunities of women and men, boys and girls in a given context/geography/sector.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company has targets for gender equality and women's empowerment in its supply chain.</p>	<p>To meet element (c), the company needs to have a time-bound target focused on the companies’ suppliers. For example: A target for the share of seafood sourced from women owned businesses.</p>
<p><b>d.</b> The company discloses progress against its targets for gender equality and women's empowerment in its supply chain.</p>	<p>Using element c’s targets, the company must report both targets and its progress against these targets on gender equality and women’s empowerment.</p> <p>For example: Target for percent of seafood sourced from women owned businesses AND progress on these targets in percent terms (e.g. target of 100% seafood sourced from women owned businesses – 50% progress in 2022.)</p>





climate arc



generation  
foundation



IKEA Foundation

Laudes  
Foundation



MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF DENMARK  
DANIDA INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION



PORTICUS

the David &  
Lucile Packard  
FOUNDATION

GRANT  
RECIPIENT  
TIPPING POINT  
FUND ON IMPACT INVESTING

WALTON FAMILY  
FOUNDATION

**COPYRIGHT**

This work is the product of the World Benchmarking Alliance. Our work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit: [www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/](http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

**DISCLAIMER**

Information available on our website, visit: [www.worldbenchmarkingalliance.org/disclaimer](http://www.worldbenchmarkingalliance.org/disclaimer)

**WORLD BENCHMARKING ALLIANCE**

Prins Hendrikkade 25, 1021 TM Amsterdam The Netherlands. [www.worldbenchmarkingalliance.org](http://www.worldbenchmarkingalliance.org)