



## **RACE TO THE TOP**

*Tracking Supermarket Progress  
Towards a Fairer & Greener Food System*

### **SUPERMARKET QUESTIONNAIRE 2003**

**Circulated to retailers 17 June 2003  
Updated 9 July 2003  
for submission to IIED by 10<sup>th</sup> September 2003**

---

**No scoring**

---

---

## General Guidance Notes for Respondents

---

1. These notes refer to the questionnaire as a whole and to general principles which you are requested to follow when responding to it. They are supplemented by additional notes accompanying particular modules and/or questions. Each module and some sections also have a 'rationale', which is intended to give the respondent some guidance as to why the question is being asked.
2. Please attempt to answer all questions. If you are unable to answer a question please indicate whether this is because:
  - a. the data as requested is not available;
  - b. the data is available but confidential; or
  - c. the data is not available in the requested format. If this is the case, please indicate in what format the data is available.
3. Where the required data is already published in the requested format, for example in web-based reports, you may prefer to provide details of the location rather than duplicating disclosure.
4. We are sending the questionnaire to you in electronic and paper formats. Your responses will likewise be accepted in either format. The response boxes in the electronic version are expandable where necessary. You may submit any supporting documentation that is requested either in electronic or paper copy.
5. Unless otherwise specified, all quantitative questions refer to the last full financial year, i.e. the year from April 2002 to March 2003. Policy questions refer to the situation at the end of that year, i.e. whether there was a policy in place by March 2003. If your responses to any individual questions refer to a different time period, please state where this is the case.
6. For companies with international operations, please provide data only for UK stores. The questions may, however, relate to global sourcing for UK stores.
7. Questions relate to food sales only, unless otherwise specified. Please indicate where you do not have data available for food sales only.
8. The deadline for responses to the questionnaire is 10<sup>th</sup> September 2003. Please send completed questionnaires to IIED at [racetothetop@iied.org](mailto:racetothetop@iied.org) or by post to Race to the Top, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DD. For guidance on specific elements of the questionnaire, retailers are invited to contact IIED to arrange one or more meetings as necessary, either with IIED or other project partners.
9. We propose to hold individual meetings with retailers in the week of 13<sup>th</sup> October, to discuss interpretation and analysis of the questionnaire and other survey instruments. A final report will be sent by IIED, with embargo to project partners including retailers by 28<sup>th</sup> October. Findings will be published on 5<sup>th</sup> November, as described in the document '*Publication and feedback formats*' dated 10<sup>th</sup> June.

## General Data on Supermarket Operations

### Supplementary note

≠ Data requested in this section is requested solely for purposes of normalising data in the responses to certain questions in the RTTT modules, and to provide information to allow the presentation of results to take account of the particular business context of each company.

#### 0.1.1 Turnover, number of stores and shelf space

Please complete the following table. Under individual formats, please specify and provide individual data for each, e.g. 'Kwik Save' and 'Somerfield'.

|                        | Number of stores | Turnover 2002-03 (£'000) |      | Shelf space 2002-03 (m) |      |
|------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|
|                        |                  | Total                    | Food | Total                   | Food |
| Non-UK                 |                  |                          |      |                         |      |
| UK—Group               |                  |                          |      |                         |      |
| UK—Individual formats: |                  |                          |      |                         |      |

#### 0.1.2 Geographical coverage

Please describe the geographical coverage and concentration of your UK stores, giving the number of stores in each region according to the regional classification that you use.

#### 0.1.3 Store profile

Average store size (m<sup>2</sup>):

Average number of food lines per store:

#### 0.1.4 Customer demographics

Please complete the following table to show your company's overall customer demographic profile.

|                         | A | B | C1 | C2 | D | E |
|-------------------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|
| Percentage of customers |   |   |    |    |   |   |

#### 0.1.5 Number of staff

Full time:

Part time:

# Module 1: Environment

**Module co-ordinators:** Rupert Howes and Chloe Alexander, Forum for the Future

**Rationale.** The 2003 Environment Module provides an opportunity to benchmark supermarket performance across the sector around three broad areas: *Corporate Commitment to Environmental Responsibility and Performance*, *Climate Change* and *Waste*. This does not represent a comprehensive list of the key environmental issues and challenges facing the retail sector; in future years, other issues may be added, such as questions concerned with contaminated land, emission of ozone depleting substances, and post-consumer waste.

**Link to BiE and BITC Surveys.** Supermarkets participating in the annual Business in the Environment (BiE) *Index of Corporate Environmental Engagement* and/or the new Business in the Community (BITC) *Corporate Responsibility Index* will have had to address some of the questions detailed in this module in their annual submissions. Consequently, to save time and duplicated effort, we have detailed where there is overlap and degrees of overlap between the questions in both surveys. Those companies completing the BiE/BITC surveys have the option of submitting their responses to the relevant sections as indicated. Questions which are not identified as being covered in the BiE and BITC surveys require a direct response from all retailers.

## INDICATOR 1.1

**Issue: Corporate Commitment to Environmental Responsibility & Performance**  
**Indicator: Board-level responsibility, training and reporting for environmental issues.**

**Rationale:** Commitment at the top is essential to drive through real change. It is also crucial that key employees are made aware of the main environmental challenges facing their company and their role and responsibility to find ways to reduce impacts and improve performance. It is appreciated that some staff have a greater potential role than others to play in helping the company deliver its environmental targets, and that there are degrees of 'training' and 'awareness raising' that can be carried out. However, the proportion of training courses which include some element related to environmental performance should capture some sense of deeper commitment to raising awareness and improving performance throughout the company. Reporting on environmental performance allows a better understanding of the impacts of the company and a framework for setting targets for improvements.

### Supplementary note

**Link to BiE/BITC Surveys.** This indicator is covered in the following sections of the BitC Reports: CRI survey: Section 1.3 *Corporate Values - Leadership*. BiE survey: *Section 1.1 Management – Leadership*. BITC-CRI/BiE reporters can supply this section as an alternative to reporting.

- 1.1.1 Does your company have a named board member (or if no board, an equivalent senior position of responsibility within your organisational executive management structure) with responsibility for operational environmental issues (performance, management and reporting)?

Circle as appropriate: YES / NO

Note: To be eligible to answer YES, you must provide the following information:

1. Details of the nature and scope of this responsibility.
2. The number of times (over the last 12 month accounting period) that environmental issues have been reported to the Board (or equivalent) as formal agenda items?

### Supplementary note

**Link to CRI BitC surveys:** CRI survey: Section 2 Integration – 16. *Training & Development*. BitC reporters may supply these sections (plus additional answers if stating 'all staff receive training through induction process') as an alternative to reporting, but all companies should answer 1.1.3.

- 1.1.2 Have formal training and development programmes (with an environmental component) been implemented throughout the company? Please give details.

NO – no training available

Graduates and fast track staff training

Senior management receive training

Board member(s) receive training

All staff receive training through the induction process

- 1.1.3 **Do you publish an external environmental report?**

Circle as appropriate: YES/NO

Note: To be eligible to answer YES you must also provide the following information.

If YES, please enclose a copy of your most recent report or provide details where this is available if on a website. Please also state the publication dates of your last and next environmental reports:

Date of last report:\_\_\_\_ Date of next report:\_\_\_\_\_

Scores will be based on an assessment of the overall quality of published reports under three broad headings - Completeness, Credibility and Communication. These cover the characteristics that excellent reports should have and are based on the ACCA's Environmental Reporting Award Criteria.

## **ACCA Criteria**

### **Completeness**

- ⊕ Corporate context (major products/and or services; financial performance; geographical location(s); employment information)
- ⊕ Key (direct and indirect) environmental impacts of business considered and explained
- ⊕ Environmental policy and management commitment
- ⊕ Rationale behind choice of EPIs used in report
- ⊕ Environmental targets and objectives
- ⊕ Product or service stewardship (e.g. design, LCA, disposal policies)
- ⊕ Supplier procurement policies and issues
- ⊕ Scope of the report (by entity)
- ⊕ Reporting and accounting policies (e.g. reporting period, consolidation)
- ⊕ Report audience identified
- ⊕ Linkages between environmental reporting and sustainability issues

### **Credibility**

- ⊕ Headline environmental achievements in current period
- ⊕ Named board member responsible for environmental issues
- ⊕ Contact name and details for person in charge of report
- ⊕ EMS and its integration into the business process
- ⊕ Contingency planning and risk management
- ⊕ Internal audit
- ⊕ Compliance/non-compliance record
- ⊕ Environmental impact data (showing absolute, normalised and comparative data with trends over time and within sector), e.g. Inputs (energy use, raw materials, water consumption, packaging); Outputs (emissions to air, water and land, product and waste output); Transport (fleet description and fuel consumption)
- ⊕ Conventional finance related data (environmental investments, provisions, contingent liabilities, fines etc)
- ⊕ Environmental financial statements and full cost accounting

### **External credibility**

- ⊕ ISO/EMAS accreditation/certification
- ⊕ Adoption of reporting best practice (e.g. GRI, DEFRA's CO<sub>2</sub> indicator)
- ⊕ Approaches to stakeholder dialogue
- ⊕ Use of stakeholder feedback
- ⊕ Third party statement

### **Communication**

- ⊕ Layout and appearance
- ⊕ Understandability, readability, accessibility and appropriate length
- ⊕ Frequency
- ⊕ Communication and feedback mechanisms
- ⊕ Innovative approaches
- ⊕ Availability of a summary report and/or executive summary
- ⊕ Comprehensive navigation through report
- ⊕ Use of internet
- ⊕ Reference to website and other reports (e.g. financial, social)
- ⊕ Appropriateness of graphs, illustrations and photos
- ⊕ Integration with financial statements

**INDICATOR 1.2**

**Issue: Climate Change**

**Indicator: Energy Use and Emissions of Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)**

**Rationale:** Companies should be aiming for absolute CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions in accordance with Government targets and obligations. Under the Kyoto protocol, the UK is committed to reduce its emissions of greenhouse gases by 12.5% from 1990 base line emission levels by 2012. The UK Government has set a more ambitious target to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20% from their 1990 base line and is encouraging companies, under its Make a Corporate Commitment Campaign (MACC2) to contribute to meeting this policy goal.

**Supplementary notes:**

**DEFRA Guidelines.** Companies should calculate their emissions of Greenhouse Gases according to the DEFRA document *Environmental Reporting - Guidelines for Company Reporting on Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, available at [www.defra.gov.uk/environment/envrp/index.htm](http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/envrp/index.htm).

**1.2.1 In-store use of grid-supplied electricity and gas.**

1.2.1a Based on the DEFRA Guidelines, please state the tonnage of total carbon dioxide emissions attributable to your UK Stores over the 12 month period relating to your last accounting period/period covered by your most recent environmental/CSR report.

|   |
|---|
| Period Covered: _____ Total Carbon Dioxide Emissions: _____   |
| Please provide necessary calculations or supporting evidence to show how the figure was calculated. |

1.2.1b Do you have a target for the reduction of in-store emissions? *(Link to BITC/CRI Section 4, E.4 Targets or BiE Section 2, 12.4 Targets)*

|   |
|---|
| Circle as appropriate: YES/NO   |
| If YES, please give details of the target (including units, timescale, use of renewable energy) <i>(Link to BITC/CRI Section 4, E.4 Targets or BiE Section 2, 12.4 Targets)</i> |

1.2.1c Please give details of how this target will be achieved

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

1.2.1d Has your previous target been fully achieved? (Link to BITC/CRI Section 4, E.5 Performance Improvement OR BiE Section 2, 12.5 Performance improvement)

Circle as appropriate: YES/NO

If YES, please give details

**1.2.2 Distribution Fleet - Including Third Party & Contractor Mileage**

1.2.2a Based on the DEFRA Guidelines, please state the tonnage of total carbon dioxide emissions attributable to your Distribution/Freight activities (including third party carriers) and also, including fuel use by home shopping delivery vans.

Period Covered: \_\_\_\_\_ Total Carbon Dioxide Emissions: \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide necessary calculations or supporting evidence to show how the figure was calculated.

1.2.2b Do you have a target for the reduction of transport related emissions? (Link to BITC/CRI Section 4, T.4 Targets, OR BiE Section 2, 13.4 Targets)

Circle as appropriate: YES/NO

If YES, please give details of the target (including units, timescale) (Link to BITC/CRI Section 4, T.4 Targets OR BiE Section 2, 13.4 Targets)

1.2.2c Please give details of how this target will be achieved

1.2.2d Has your previous target been fully achieved? (Link to BITC/CRI Section 4, T.5 Performance Improvement, OR BiE Section 2, 13.5 Performance Improvement)



## INDICATOR 1.3

### Issue: Waste

### Indicator: Waste Management and Minimisation

**Rationale:** Producing more from less - eco-efficiency - is at the heart of many corporate environmental strategies. This requires accurate measurement and recording of all waste flows, in order to set targets for minimising waste. As noted in the DETR Environmental Reporting *Guidelines for Company Reporting on Waste*, most companies should already be aware of the wastes they produce and where they go. The Environment Protection Act 1990 places a *Duty of Care* on anyone who produces commercial or industrial waste. This means that all companies must secure their waste and can only transfer it to an authorised person with a transfer note. This implies waste records and recording should be good, or of a standard, even if this data is not being publicly reported. With the Packaging Regulations, Landfill Directive and likelihood of further legislation around the areas of Producer Responsibility and Integrated Product Policy, companies are going to have to develop comprehensive strategies and policies for managing and reducing all of their waste flows. The DEFRA Guidelines have been produced to help them achieve this. Several innovative waste minimisation initiatives already being implemented by several supermarkets are included in the Guidelines.

#### Supplementary notes:

**Link to BitC Survey:** This section may be partially covered in CRI Survey, *Section 4 Performance, 4. Solid Waste OR BiE Section 2, 14 Solid Waste*. Again, as for the energy/greenhouse gas emission questions, it is unclear whether submissions will provide sufficient detail to enable the required information to be extracted. Responses to this section will be normalised by turnover where appropriate.

#### 1.3.1 In-store and head office waste

1.3.1a What was the total financial cost of waste to landfill? (responses will be normalised by UK store turnover)

1.3.1b How many of your stores are participating in a food composting scheme?

1.3.1c What measures are taken to ensure minimal late expired food waste is sent to landfill? What food recovery initiatives are you involved in?

### 1.3.2 Setting and achieving waste targets

1.3.2a Do you have a target for the reduction of waste? (*Link to BITC -CRI Section 4, SW.4 Targets OR BiE Section 2, 14.4 Targets*)

Circle as appropriate: YES/NO

If Yes, please give details of the target (including units, timescale) (*Link to BITC-CRI Section 4, SW.4 Targets OR BiE Section 2, 14.4 Targets*)

1.3.2b Please give details of how this target will be achieved

1.3.2c Has your previous target been fully achieved? (*Link to BITC-CRI Section 4, SW.5 Performance Improvement, BiE Section 2, 14.5 Performance Improvement*)

### 1.3.3 Post-consumer waste:

1.3.3a What are you doing to encourage 'bio-friendly packaging'? What % of fresh food packaging is biodegradable?

1.3.3b In a proposed extension to their obligation under the Packaging Directive retailers should have to recover a proportion of post consumer waste. An obligation of this sort may encourage 'bring back' schemes. Do you encourage a packaging take-back scheme/bottle re-use scheme for the public? (E.g. Supermarket reward scheme – customers receive points on their loyalty cards or vouchers for products in exchange for recycling materials in bring back schemes).

## Module 2: Producers

**Module coordinator:** Bill Vorley, IIED

**Other organisations in the module working group:**

Small and Family Farms Alliance  
Fairtrade Foundation  
Traidcraft  
British Independent Fruit Growers' Association  
Farmers' Link  
Soil Association

**Rationale.** Supermarkets exert a major influence on the rural economy in the UK and overseas, by setting farming standards and by seeking ever-greater efficiencies for customers, competitiveness and shareholder value. It is important for supermarket companies to have policies and corporate culture in place to ensure that this efficiency is not won at the expense of trading integrity with suppliers and farmers, in the UK and abroad.

### INDICATOR 2.1

**Issue: Corporate commitment to trading integrity with the supply chain**

**Indicator: Board-level responsibility for trading integrity**

**Rationale.** For trading integrity with primary producers to be a reality rather than an aspiration, it has to be driven by top management and ingrained in the parts of the company which deal with suppliers, notably the buyers.

2.1.1 Does your company have a named board member with responsibility for the integrity of trading relationships with your suppliers and primary producers in your supply chains?

Circle as appropriate: YES/NO

If YES, please provide details of the nature and scope of this responsibility.

### INDICATOR 2.2

**Issue: Trading integrity with the supply chain**

**Indicator: Standards and codes of practice**

**Rationale.** Many commentators have pointed to a large gap between corporate statements on trading practices and real-life practices by buyers, caused by inappropriate targets, lack of training, or high staff turnover. While UK competition regulations prohibit supermarkets from dictating terms of trade of their suppliers with farmers, an 'ideal' supermarket would commit via codes of practice, in the training and management of buyers, and in its selection and monitoring of first tier suppliers—to integrity in trading relations and fair pricing for produce, covering cost of

production and a reasonable return on producers' capital and labour. This should apply across the global supply base.

2.2.1 Has your company adopted the DTI Code of Practice on relationships with suppliers?

|  |
|--|
| Circle as appropriate:                      YES / NO |
|--|

2.2.2 Does your company have its own code of practice on relationships with suppliers?

|   |
|---|
| Circle as appropriate:                      YES / NO  |
| If YES, does your Code cover the following:   |
| - Payment of suppliers on time and according to agreed written terms of trade?                      YES/NO  |
| - Forbidding retrospective price reductions?                      YES/NO  |
| - Not obliging suppliers to use preferred third parties (packaging, transport etc.) when suppliers can demonstrate that your standards and specifications can be met elsewhere?                      YES/NO |
| - Seeking listing allowances ('slotting fees') only for promotions or new product launches?                      YES/NO   |
| - Not soliciting gifts, favours or hospitality, and not accepting gifts of money?                      YES/NO   |
| Please provide details and further documentation as necessary.  |
| Does your code apply to UK suppliers only? <input type="checkbox"/>   |
| OR to your global supply base? <input type="checkbox"/>   |
| (tick as appropriate)   |

2.2.3 Are your buyers trained in applying either the DTI or your own code, as applicable?

|  |
|--|
| Circle as appropriate:                      YES / NO |
| If YES, provide details of training provided.        |

2.2.4 Have you informed your suppliers of either the DTI or your own code, as applicable, and how it is implemented?

|   |
|---|
| Circle as appropriate:                      YES / NO  |
| If YES, please provide details of how you have communicated this information to your suppliers: |
|   |

2.2.5 Do you require 1<sup>st</sup> tier suppliers who have direct commercial relationships with farmers to abide either the DTI or your own code, as applicable?

|  |
|--|
| Circle as appropriate:                      YES / NO   |
| If YES, please provide details of how you have communicated this information to your 1 <sup>st</sup> tier suppliers: |
|  |

2.2.6 Has your company implemented FSA Best Practice on Country of Origin Labelling including Avoiding Misleading Labelling, and best practice on product origin and declaration of products and ingredients?

**Rationale.** High domestic standards for welfare and environment impose an additional cost on primary producers. Meat products, for example, grown elsewhere in the world under very different regulatory regimes compete with home-grown produce on the shelves of the food retailers. UK producers expect their extra costs to be compensated by consumer preference for domestic products, but complain that the presentation of products or the arrangement of the supermarket shelf can in effect mask imports due to misleading labelling. The Food Standards Agency (FSA) has developed best practice guidelines for Country of Origin labelling setting out both the statutory and best practice parameters of origin labelling (see <http://www.foodstandards.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/originlabelling.pdf> ).

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Circle as appropriate:  |          |
| Meat and meat products (own brand)  | YES / NO |
| Dairy (milk, butter and cheese etc. own brand)                                      | YES / NO |
| If you have answered YES to any of these, please provide supplementary information. |          |
|   |          |

2.2.7 Is your company committed to not making higher profit margins on organic and Fairtrade produce compared to conventional produce?

**Rationale.** Commitment to produce with improved sustainability, such as produce from organic production systems or Fairtrade labelled produce, is demonstrated by a commitment to market them with the same or lower profit margins as conventional produce, rather than treating them as high-value niche products.

|                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Circle as appropriate:     |          |
| Organic produce            | YES / NO |
| Fairtrade labelled produce | YES / NO |

### INDICATOR 2.3

**Issue: Fair trading relationships**

**Indicator: Integrity of the trading relationship with UK farmers and suppliers**

**Note:** Data for this indicator will be collected from a survey of suppliers coordinated by the Centre for Food Chain Research at Imperial College at Imperial College, Wye.

**Rationale.** Despite the indirect nature of most trading relationships between farmer/growers and supermarkets, it is clear that some supermarkets have higher reputations than others among primary producers for their fairness and integrity in trading. This is in part a function of supermarkets' trading integrity with the part of the chain which they have direct influence over—the first tier suppliers. A survey instrument has been developed for fruit and vegetable packers, meat processors and dairy companies, who provide the link between farmers and retailers. This instrument was based on extensive qualitative research with the apple and pear, milk, potato, red meat, poultry and pork chains, and has been developed around concepts of *justice in buyer-supplier relationships* (*Distributive justice* and *Procedural justice*) in relation to issues raised in the Competition Commission's report on supermarkets and the resulting Code of Conduct. It may be supplemented by a farmer-level survey.

### INDICATOR 2.4

**Issue: Support for smallholder producers in developing countries**

**Indicator: Availability of and promotion of Fairtrade Marked products**

**Rationale.** In order to arrive at a quantitative indicator to at least partially describe the relationship of retailers with the large number and diversity of Southern producers, we have necessarily to choose a proxy measure. By choosing sales of 'Fairtrade' labelled goods, it is possible to develop an indicator that is both measurable and verifiable. Despite the obvious limitations of fair trade being measured as a niche brand, the Fairtrade label is the only one of the current generation of initiatives on voluntary social standards which is directly visible to consumers in the food sector. The label guarantees that a minimum price has been paid to small-scale producers and that higher social (and, in some cases, environmental) standards are being met through the payment of a 'fair trade premium' to the producer organisation. It is also an indicator over which the supermarket can have a direct influence through its choice of pricing and promotional policies. Certified producers of Fairtrade labelled products are nearly all small-scale, exporting products including coffee, cocoa, bananas, honey and sugar.

2.4.1 Please complete the following table to indicate the percentage of your UK stores in which you sold Fairtrade labelled products from each sub-category in 2002, how many Fairtrade labelled product lines you listed in total in each sub-category, and whether or not you listed any own-brand fair trade products in each sub-category:

| Main Category | Sub-Category           | % stores stocking at least one product | Total products listed | Own Brand products? |
|---------------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Hot Beverages | Instant coffee         |  |                       | YES / NO            |
|               | Ground coffee          |  |                       | YES / NO            |
|               | Tea                    |  |                       | YES / NO            |
|               | Choc Beverages         |  |                       | YES / NO            |
| Confectionery | Choc confectionery     |  |                       | YES / NO            |
|               | Biscuits / snacks      |  |                       | YES / NO            |
| Fresh Produce | Bananas                |  |                       | YES / NO            |
|               | Tropical/exotic fruits |  |                       | YES / NO            |
| Juices        | Fruit Juices           |  |                       | YES / NO            |
| Other         | Other (state)          |  |                       | YES / NO            |

2.4.2 What activities did you undertake to promote consumer awareness of Fair Trade issues and products (e.g. during Fairtrade Fortnight)?

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Please circle as appropriate:  |          |
| Special product displays?  | YES / NO |
| Point of sale advertising?   | YES / NO |
| Allowed Fairtrade supporters to run information/sampling stands in store?  | YES / NO |
| Other communications? (eg staff/consumer magazines)<br>(If YES, please provide details)  | YES / NO |
| Sold fair trade products which carry fair trade labels or brands other than the Fairtrade Mark<br>(If YES, please provide details) | YES / NO |

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Please provide any information you have on the following, which may be used as *case study* material in RTTT communications:

- €# Activities and policies which ensure that primary producers who directly or indirectly supply your company receive an adequate price for their produce, i.e. that covers the cost of production and a reasonable return to producers' capital and labour.

- €# Activities (training, incentive structures etc.) to ensure long-term relationships between specialist supermarket buyers and suppliers.

- €# Activities to encourage supplies from small farms and co-operatives, including technical and organisational support, smallholder-friendly quality assurance schemes



## Module 3: Workers

**Module coordinator:** Julie Smith, labour standards consultant to IIED

**Other organisations in the module working group:** USDAW, TGWU, GMB

**Rationale:** Supermarket employees are a major element in the UK workforce, with the ten largest players employing around 700,000 workers. This module looks at pay and conditions for supermarket employees, the scope of trade union recognition agreements and other systems of employee representation in the UK. It also addresses labour standards and the rights of workers within global supply chains.

**Notes:**

- ⌘ In this context, policy or commitment means any express or implied set of guidelines found in company literature which shape your company's strategy and activities
- ⌘ When data requested is not available, a partial response to questions is still helpful. Please also explain why answers are unavailable.
- ⌘ We have tried to pay attention to the different forms of governance in the different supermarket chains in the phrasing of our questions on Board structure, employee representation etc.

### INDICATOR 3.1

**Issue: Corporate Commitment to Labour Standards within the company and in the supply chain**

**Indicator: Board-level responsibility**

- 3.1.1 Does your company have a named board member with responsibility for labour standards within the company and throughout the supply chain?

Circle as appropriate: YES / NO

To be eligible to answer YES, you must provide the following additional information: the name of the board member and details of the nature and scope of this responsibility including how much human resource time is dedicated to implementing these responsibilities:

Details:

### INDICATOR 3.2

**Issue: Labour Standards within the Company**

**Indicator: Remuneration of Supermarket Employees and Conditions of Employment**

**Rationale:** Checkout operators or the equivalent grade (e.g. general assistants) have been selected to represent hourly rates of pay because they represent a significant category of workers, are very visible to the customer and tend to represent the lower ends of the supermarket

pay scales. Length of service, flexible working, benefit packages and other family-friendly policies are considered as other indicators or variables affecting or supplementing pay rates.

**Supplementary note:** Submission of data provided to the Sunday Times Best Companies to Work for List may be an alternative to answering some of the questions under Indicators 3.2 and 3.3. Please ensure that this information does provide the data required.

3.2.1 What is the average length of employment for checkout operators or equivalent grade eg. General Assistants? Please circle your answer.

|              |              |               |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 1 – 3 months | 3 – 6 months | 6 – 12 months |
| 2 years      | 2 –5 years   | over 5 years  |

3.2.2 What proportion of checkout operators, or equivalent grade, are contracted for each of the following bands of hours on a weekly basis?

|                   |   |               |   |               |   |
|-------------------|---|---------------|---|---------------|---|
| less than 8 hours | % | 8 – 16 hours  | % | 17 – 20 hours | % |
| 21 – 36 hours     | % | over 36 hours | % |               |   |

3.2.3 Is there a mechanism through which checkout operators can change their working hours? Please circle your answer(s). *You must provide details of the arrangements to be eligible to score.*

|   |
|---|
| <p>Staff have a right to change their hours<br/>Detail:</p> <p>Staff have a right to change their hours within limits<br/>Detail:</p> <p>Hours can only be changed with agreement from the Line Manager<br/>Detail:</p> |
|---|

3.2.4 Please supply pay rates for the financial year 2002/03 for experienced checkout operators or equivalent grade (at least 12 months' employment). Where these are regionally differentiated please provide details. Please do not include ESOP additions or any other bonus payments.  
*Scoring is based on National Minimum Wage. (NMW for those over 22 is £4.20 Youth rate was £3.60 from October 2002)*

|   |
|---|
| <p>Minimum hourly rate for experienced checkout operator or equivalent grade:<br/>£</p> <p>Maximum hourly rate for experienced checkout operator or equivalent grade:<br/>£</p> |
|---|

3.2.5 Please indicate the following by circling the appropriate percentage ranges:

|   |        |        |        |         |        |
|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| Annual staff turnover for checkout operators or equivalent grade in financial year 2002/03: |        |        |        |         |        |
| 0-15%   | 15-20% | 20-25% | 25-30% | 30-35%  | 35-40% |
| 40-45%  | 45-50% | 50-60% | 60-80% | 80-100% |        |

|   |        |        |         |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|
| Percentage of checkout operators or equivalent grade on temporary contracts including agency staff in the previous financial year: <i>This is supporting evidence for annual staff turnover and will not be scored.</i> |        |        |         |        |        |
| 0-5%  | 5-10%  | 10-15% | 15-20%  | 20-25% | 25-30% |
| 30-50%  | 50-70% | 70-90% | 90-100% |        |        |

3.2.6 Which, if any, of the following does your company offer to its retail staff? Please circle your answer and indicate length of service / number of contracted hours per week required for employees to qualify where appropriate.

|   |     |                                       |
|---|-----|---------------------------------------|
| To be eligible to answer YES to these questions you must provide details of length of service and number of hours worked to qualify |     |                                       |
|   |     | <i>Hours</i> <i>Length of Service</i> |
| Child care facilities/subsidy   | YES | NO                                    |
| Other family-friendly policies (please detail)  | YES | NO                                    |
| Lifelong learning/employability   | YES | NO                                    |
| Bonus payments  | YES | NO                                    |
| Company pension (with company contributions)  | YES | NO                                    |

**INDICATOR 3.3**

**Issue: Core Labour Rights and Employee Representation**

**Indicator: UK company employee representation**

**Rationale:** This indicator looks at systems of employee representation, recognising different systems due to company structure and form of ownership. It asks for information on trade union recognition agreements and the scope of these agreements. It also asks for information on alternative systems of employee representation which offer mechanisms for consultation and dialogue with supermarket staff over pay and conditions. How companies communicate their policies on labour rights and procedures to check and remedy non-compliance are also taken into account.

3.3.1 Does your company communicate its policies on labour rights and procedures?  
*To be eligible to answer YES you must supply details of how these mechanisms work.*

|                 |    |
|-----------------|----|
| YES<br>Details: | NO |
|-----------------|----|

3.3.2 Are there formal structures in place for the company to consult with retail staff over pay and working conditions?  
*To be eligible to answer YES you must supply details of how staff views are taken forward..*

|                 |    |
|-----------------|----|
| YES<br>Details: | NO |
|-----------------|----|

3.3.3 How are retail staff represented? Please circle any that apply and circle percentage of staff covered by collective agreements negotiated by the following forms of staff representation:  
*This part of the question is not scored but you must answer it to be eligible for scoring on the **Role of Staff Representatives***

|  |        |        |        |        |        |         |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Independent trade unions recognised for collective bargaining purposes |        |        |        |        |        |         |
| 0%   | 1 -20% | 20-30% | 30-40% | 40-50% | 50-75% | 75-100% |

|  |        |        |        |        |        |         |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Staff Forum/ Works Council or equivalent |        |        |        |        |        |         |
| 0%                                       | 1 -20% | 20-30% | 30-40% | 40-50% | 50-75% | 75-100% |

|   |        |        |        |        |        |         |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Other form of representation (please specify) |        |        |        |        |        |         |
| 0%  | 1 -20% | 20-30% | 30-40% | 40-50% | 50-75% | 75-100% |

What company provision is there for the staff representative? Please tick any of the following that apply

|  |   |
|--|---|
| The staff representative is allowed time off :                     |   |
| - to attend meetings of negotiating bodies, works councils etc.    | œ |
| - to attend meetings with line managers about workplace issues     | œ |
| - to attend meetings with other staff representatives (a) with pay | œ |
| (b) without pay  | œ |
| - to attend trade union / other training courses (a) with pay      | œ |
| (b) without pay  | œ |
| - for representatives to meet with staff (a) with pay              | œ |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| (b) without pay  | œ |
| Staff representatives are able to use company facilities such as email, notice boards, photocopiers, computers and have administrative support | œ |

### 3.3.4 How are pay increases negotiated?

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| On a store by store basis  | YES / NO |
| At national level  | YES / NO |
| Other  | YES / NO |
| If you have answered YES to 'Other', please provide further details. |          |

## INDICATOR 3.4

### Issue: Labour Standards in the Supply Chain

#### Indicator: Existence and Application of Labour Standards Code of Conduct

**Rationale:** Company policy based on core labour standards is taken as the benchmark for this indicator. The adoption of the ETI base code (or equivalent) demonstrates commitment to decent wages and labour standards throughout the supply chain by *implementing* core ILO conventions. The indicator also takes into account the application of the code (i.e. the range of food products it is applied to and how far up the supply chain this reaches), training provided for key staff responsible for implementation, and monitoring and verification systems. Credit will also be given where third party inspection schemes, such as SA8000, are being applied within supply chains.

#### Supplementary notes:

- œ# Submission of your company's ETI report may be an alternative to responding to section 3.4. However, information may need to be broken down to distinguish between food and non-food for this questionnaire, which applies to the supply chains of food products.
- œ# This section relates to all food products – not just own-brand. The intention is to increase information available in this area and to encourage retailers to ask for more information from their branded suppliers.
- œ# The following questions have been adapted from the EIRIS Sourcing Standards Survey (2000): (3.4.1), (3.4.2), (3.4.3), (3.4.5), (3.4.7).
- œ# Information on relevant minimum standards required by International Labour Organisation (ILO) conventions is available at <http://www.ilo.org/>.

3.4.1 Does your company have a Code of Conduct which stipulates minimum standards on labour rights and employment conditions as covered by the ILO core labour standards?

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Circle as appropriate:   | YES / NO |
| To be eligible to answer YES, you must indicate which of the areas below are covered by the code, then move on to 3.4.2. |          |
| If NO, please move on to 3.4.7:  |          |
| Freedom of association & collective bargaining?  | œ        |

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Forced or bonded labour?             | œ |
| Exploitative child labour?           | œ |
| Discrimination?                      | œ |
| A living wage?                       | œ |
| Healthy and safe working conditions? | œ |
| Maximum hours of work?               | œ |
| Disciplinary practices?              | œ |

3.4.2 Is your Company Code:

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Based on the ETI base code (or equivalent) | YES / NO |
| Applied to all suppliers worldwide?        | YES / NO |
| Applied to all sub-contractors worldwide?  | YES / NO |

3.4.3 Do you train buyers and your technical team to implement your Code/policy and to take ethical considerations into account?

|                               |          |
|-------------------------------|----------|
| Please circle as appropriate: | YES / NO |
|-------------------------------|----------|

3.4.4 Do you provide support to any companies within your supply chain to help them meet the ethical standards required by your Code/policy, either financial or otherwise?

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Financial:  | YES / NO |
| Other:  | YES / NO |
| To be eligible to answer YES, you must provide details. |          |

3.4.5 How does your company monitor the implementation of the Code/Policy?

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Internally?   | YES / NO |
| Externally by a legally recognised third party auditor? | YES / NO |
| With assistance from trade unions and NGOs?             | YES / NO |

3.4.6 Please circle as appropriate to indicate the level of implementation of your Company Code within your global supply base of food products sold in the UK.

|  |        |         |         |        |         |          |
|--|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|----------|
| What percentage of 1 <sup>st</sup> tier own brand suppliers are currently covered by the Code? |        |         |         |        |         |          |
| 0-20%  | 20-50% | 50-75%  | 75-100% |        |         |          |
| Second tier suppliers?   |        |         |         |        |         |          |
| 0-20%  | 20-50% | 50-75%) | 75-100% |        |         |          |
| Primary producers?   |        |         |         |        |         |          |
| 0-20%  | 20-50% | >50%    |         |        |         |          |
| How many significant corrective actions have been taken ?                                      |        |         |         |        |         |          |
| 0  | 1-10   | 10-30   | 30-50   | 50-100 | 100-150 | Over 150 |

3.4.7 Does your company have any aspects of its supplier inspections/ corporate social reports/audits verified by third parties?

|  |
|--|
| Circle as appropriate:            YES / NO   |
| To be eligible to answer YES, you must provide details of which aspects are verified, by whom and how often: |
|  |

3.4.8 Does your company have procedures to check and remedy non-compliance on labour rights (best practice) with suppliers in the UK?

|   |
|---|
| Circle as appropriate:            YES / NO              |
| To be eligible to answer YES, you must provide details: |
|   |

3.4.9 Does your company try to ensure that only UK 'Gangmasters' operating with at least minimum labour standards are used in the UK supply base? Please provide details.  
*(please note this is supporting evidence and will not be scored)*

|  |
|--|
| Circle as appropriate:            YES / NO |
| Detail:                                    |
|  |

## Module 4: Local Economies

**Module coordinators:** Vicki Hird and Merav Shub,  
Sustain: the alliance for better food and farming

**Other organisations in the module working group:**

Countryside Agency, Transport 2000, Foundation for local Food Initiatives, NEF, CPRE, Soil Association

**Rationale.** The underlying rationale for this module is that supermarkets should contribute to, rather than detract from, the local farming and food economy and the local community. This can be achieved through greater emphasis on local and regional rather than national and international sourcing of goods and services where appropriate and feasible, thus redefining the role of the store as one which assists wealth to circulate and multiply within communities and regions. The link between local sourcing and sustainability is one of the multiplier effect of money circulating round the local economy. The New Economics Foundation has stated that local food sourcing is a good indicator of economic multipliers associated with supermarket purchasing policies.

This module does not address the environmental impacts of transport related with supermarket distribution systems (see transportation element of Module 1).

In 2002 The Policy Commission for the Future of Food and Farming (“The Curry Commission”) concluded that local food will be the next major development in food retailing, and that the supermarket sector should re-examine its supply chains accordingly.

**Notes:**

- €# Elements of the data collected in this section may be cross-checked or assessed against data from sample store shelf surveys.
- €# Absolute figures given in responses will be normalised by turnover for comparison and assessment.
- €# This section asks supermarkets to compare their definitions of ‘local’ and ‘locality’ or ‘regional’ food with a definition that we propose. The following criteria could be used to describe how local/regional the produce is:

Source: Identification (with verification) of the farmer/supplier from within a defined locality.

Distance: Description of the distance the food has travelled (e.g. farmers markets’ definition of within a 30mile radius).

Distribution: Description of the degree to which the product is stocked across your store network, say a region or county.

Season: Seasonal and locally distinctive products at appropriate times.

### INDICATOR 4.1

**Issue: Support for the local economy**

**Indicator: Company policy on sourcing food ‘locally’ and ‘locality’ foods, and on promotion**

**Supplementary notes:**

- €# The CPRE defines **local food** as one in which the “main ingredient is grown, and most of the processing takes place, within 30 miles of the store in which it is sold.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Down Your Way? A CPRE briefing on supermarkets and local food.

[http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/documents/campaign\\_material/down-your-way.pdf](http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/documents/campaign_material/down-your-way.pdf)



≠# **Locality foods**, on the other hand, may be distributed regionally (eg Southwest) or nationwide but be differentiated from mainstream or commodity products through exploiting *regional identity*, often in combination with a manufacturing process (e.g. hand-crafted). It is implicit that the enterprise concerned is small scale but no particular definition is given to the term “small”.<sup>2</sup>

4.1.1 In defining “local” and “locality” food products, do you use equivalent definitions to those given in the supplementary notes above?

|  |                  |              |                 |
|--|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Please circle as appropriate:  |                  | YES / NO     |                 |
| If NO, please provide your definitions of ‘local’ and ‘locality’ food according to source, distance from source, degree of distribution across your network of stores, and season. |                  |              |                 |
|  | <b>Criterion</b> | <b>Local</b> | <b>Locality</b> |
|  | Source           |              |                 |
|  | Distance         |              |                 |
|  | Distribution     |              |                 |
|  | Season           |              |                 |

4.1.2 Does your company have a written corporate policy of sourcing *local* foods, where possible (using our 30-mile definition)?

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Circle as appropriate:   | YES / NO |
| If YES, please provide details and further documentation as necessary.                 |          |
| If NO but you have a similar policy using a different definition, please give details. |          |

4.1.3 Does your company have a written corporate policy of using *locality* foods, where possible (using our definition)?

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Circle as appropriate:   | YES / NO |
| If YES, please provide details and further documentation as necessary.                 |          |
| If NO but you have a similar policy using a different definition, please give details. |          |

<sup>2</sup> Modified from Food From Britain and MAFF, 1999. UK Speciality Food and Drink Sector, 1999.

- 4.1.4 Does your company have a target of supplying its stores with a specific percentage of *local foods* (using our definition)?

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Circle as appropriate:   | YES / NO         |
| If YES, what is the target?  | % of total sales |
| If NO but you have a similar target using a different definition, please give details. |                  |

- 4.1.5 Does your company have a target of supplying its stores with a specific percentage of *locality foods* (using our definition)?

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Circle as appropriate:   | YES/NO           |
| If YES, what is the target?  | % of total sales |
| If NO but you have a similar target using a different definition, please give details. |                  |

- 4.1.6 Do you allocate a proportion of your overall food promotions budget to 'promote' the sale of local and locality foods? (For example, through special product displays, point of sale advertising, sampling stands in store, staff/consumer magazines, etc)

|                          |          |
|--------------------------|----------|
| Circle as appropriate:   | YES / NO |
| If YES, what proportion? |          |

- 4.1.7 Do your store managers have discretion to identify and recommend sourcing of local food products?

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Circle as appropriate:                                | YES / NO |
| If YES <u>or</u> NO, please provide details/rationale |          |

- 4.1.8 Do you have a 'UK First' buying policy? (*more points are awarded the more detail is provided, e.g. timetables for action, policies, examples of good practice*)

|   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| Please circle where appropriate, and if YES, provide details and additional documentation as necessary: |     |    |
| Red meat  | YES | NO |
| Apples  | YES | NO |
| Pears   | YES | NO |
| Dairy   | YES | NO |
| Organics  | YES | NO |

## INDICATOR 4.2

### Issue: Support for the local economy

#### Indicator: Extent of local and regional sourcing and promotion

**Rationale.** It is clear there are major issues relating to quality control in sourcing from local suppliers and getting produce direct to store from suppliers, but for some products, these can be overcome and the benefits could include more of the food pound being spent locally (leading to a 'multiplier effect'). This indicator will be used to assess current practice and new developments in this area and how supermarkets could be investigating new ways of local and regional sourcing direct to store.

#### Supplementary note.

⚡ Unless otherwise stated, please use the definitions of 'local' and 'locality' foods that we provided above in your responses to this section. If you do not have data according to these definitions but you do have data using alternative definitions, please provide details.

4.2.1 In the financial year 2002/03, what percentage of all food lines were sourced as 'local' to the store in which they were sold?

%

4.2.2 In the financial year 2002/03, what percentage of all food lines were sourced as 'locality' food lines and sold in stores within the source region?

%

4.2.3 In the financial year 2002/03, what percentage of all food lines were sourced and sold as 'locality' foods in all stores?

%

4.2.4 Did you 'promote' local and locality foods in the 2002/03 financial year? (For example, through special product displays, point of sale advertising, sampling stands in store, staff/consumer magazines, etc)

Circle as appropriate:

Local: YES / NO

Locality YES / NO

If yes, which of the following methods did you use:

Special product displays YES / NO

Point of sale advertising YES / NO

Sampling stands in-store YES / NO

Staff/consumer magazines YES / NO

Other (please give details) YES / NO

4.2.5 Do you have staff, based in your company headquarters or elsewhere, who have a dedicated responsibility for helping the company and individual stores to source 'local' and/or 'locality' food?

|                               |                            |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Circle as appropriate:        | YES / NO                   |
| If yes, please indicate       |                            |
| In company headquarters:      | full-time post equivalents |
| Outside company headquarters: | full-time post equivalents |

**INDICATOR 4.3**

**Issue: Support for the local economy**

**Indicator: Extent of local and regional sourcing and promotion**

**Note:** Data for this indicator will be collected from a store survey that will assess the number of food lines sourced locally for a selection of products (e.g. apples, potatoes, cheese, fresh beef), the number of stores with local and/or locality food promotions, and by 'mystery shoppers' seeking information about local products.

## Module 5: Nature

**Module co-ordinator:** Hannah Bartram, RSPB

**Other organisations in the module working group:**

Countryside Agency, English Nature, WWF-UK, Marine Stewardship Council, Marine Conservation Society, British Independent Fruit Growers' Association, IIED

**Rationale:** The impact of food production on the environment in general, and on biodiversity and countryside character in particular, is highly significant. With the majority of the UK landscape farmed, it follows that how this agricultural production is managed can make a huge difference to biodiversity and landscapes. Although farmed for 1000s of years, from the mid-20th century onwards the drive for food production has become ever more intensive. As farming has changed, wildlife has been squeezed from the land and landscapes have been lost; the variety of crops and livestock ('genetic diversity') has also diminished.

Meanwhile, forty of the sixty main commercial fish stocks in the North East Atlantic, including all nine species listed for the North Sea, are either seriously depleted or in danger of becoming so. Current fishing practices can also have a significant impact on other wildlife such as albatross, sea turtle and dolphin. The sheer scale and intensity of fish farming, including shellfisheries, can not only cause welfare problems but have environmental implications too.

Although farming and fishing practices are defined by a wide range of constraints, regulations and incentives, many of which are beyond the control of supermarkets, there is "*substantial potential for producers and retailers to provide consumers with a choice of produce which has been produced in a biodiversity friendly way*" (DETR, 1998).

### INDICATOR 5.1

**Issue: Environmental issues within the supply chain**

**Indicator: Corporate commitment to addressing nature conservation issues within the supply chain**

5.1.1 Do you have a policy of training your primary produce<sup>3</sup> buyers in environmental and land management issues?

**Rationale.** A measure of the retailer's commitment towards environmental issues is the raising of buyers' awareness of the issues facing the environment in relation to food production, which can encourage better delivery of the retailer's own corporate environmental aspirations, improve relations with primary produce suppliers and contribute towards environmental delivery on the ground.

Delete as appropriate: YES / NO

If YES, please provide details. (More points are awarded the more detail is provided, such as timetables for action, training schedules, copies of policies, examples of good practice, etc.)

<sup>3</sup> This question applies to both organic and non-organic primary produce, including fresh horticultural produce, meat and dairy products, and all wild and farmed, organic and non-organic, fresh, chilled, frozen and smoked fish or fillets and shellfish sold.

5.1.2 Do you have a policy of ensuring consumer choice on GM / GM-free foods?

**Rationale.** There are serious concerns that the growing of genetically modified (GM) crops could be damaging to wildlife. At the present time, there is a moratorium on the commercial growing of GM crops in the UK to allow time for research to investigate their potential effects on wildlife. The results of the farm-scale trials will be available by Autumn 2003. There is also a public debate going on throughout Summer 2003. The Government will have to take a decision as to whether or not it allows GM crops to be grown in the UK by the end of the year. There is inconclusive data from elsewhere on the environmental impacts. The potential environmental impacts of growing GM crops (either in the UK or elsewhere) is a significant issue for some consumers.

Delete as appropriate: YES / NO

If YES, please provide details. (More points are awarded the more detail is provided, such as timetables for action, copies of policies, and examples of good practice)

## INDICATOR 5.2

**Issue: Environmental issues within the food chain**

**Indicator: Producer suppliers with retailer-supported farm environment audits and/or plans**

**Rationale:** With 75% of the UK countryside farmed, it follows that any widespread changes in land management will have far-reaching implications. Over the past 50 years, there have been unprecedented changes in farming practice. As a result, there have been dramatic losses of farmland wildlife and landscape features such as hedgerows in the UK over the past 30 years. Although farming practices are defined by a wide range of constraints, regulations and incentives, UK supermarkets can help to ensure the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity and countryside character by encouraging and helping suppliers to assess and change their farming practices.

### Supplementary notes:

- ⌘ All questions apply to both organic and non-organic primary produce (including fresh horticultural produce, meat and dairy products but excluding all fish), sourced from the UK and where applicable overseas, and sold under own brand labelling.
- ⌘ 'Producer suppliers' includes primary growers and packer suppliers. In this questionnaire, the indicator refers to producer suppliers in the UK only.
- ⌘ This indicator is measuring policy not practice. Recognising it would be unrealistic and unreasonable to expect retailers to have information on all their producer suppliers (Q5.2.4), retailers are asked to verify the principles / criteria behind any initiative to maintain and/or enhance on-farm biodiversity and countryside character.
- ⌘ This information will be verified (where possible) using data from farm conservation advisory bodies (e.g. FWAG); accreditation bodies (e.g. Checkmate International, EUREP), by consultation with farmers/farmer representatives (e.g. NFU) and by co-ordinating members of conservation organisations in approaching the retailers directly (e.g. via electronic & conventional correspondence).
- ⌘ In the future, retailers sourcing primary produce from approved producers operating under the jurisdiction of the British Farm Standard (BFS) will be able to cite this as an alternative to completing all the questions under Section 5.2. This option is, however, dependent on all the

farm assurance schemes operating under the BFS adopting meaningful baseline conservation standards (section 5.2.1a) and a requirement for Crop Protection Management Plans (CPMPs, a key component of the Voluntary Initiative, Section 5.2.1b). The BFS schemes currently address some environmental protection issues, but by and large do not deal with nature conservation issues. Retailers have a key role to play in lobbying for the adoption of baseline conservation standards and CPMPs. Schemes such as EUREP-GAP and the LEAF Marque may also be included, dependent on a requirement for a farm environment audit and/or plan.

5.2.1 Environmental standards required of your producer suppliers.

5.2.1a Do you require your producer suppliers to have a **farm environment audit** as specified in your Code of Practice or contract with the wholesaler / integrator / co-operative?

**Background Note:** In order to avoid the risk of environmental damage and deterioration, producer suppliers should be able to demonstrate an awareness of the distribution of the key wildlife habitats and other valuable environmental features on their farm, via the preparation of a whole farm environment audit. Each producer should also have a clearly defined policy (preferably a whole farm conservation management plan, map and text-based) for the conservation and management of wildlife habitats and biodiversity on their farm. Please note: this indicator is measuring policy not practice. It is attempting to assess the principles / criteria behind any initiative to maintain and/or enhance on-farm biodiversity and countryside character.

|   |     |    |            |
|---|-----|----|------------|
| Delete as appropriate:  | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| If YES, please provide details, including how verified. (More points are awarded the more detail is provided, such as timetables for action, copies of policies, examples of good practice, etc.) |     |    |            |

5.2.1b Do you require your UK producer suppliers to be able to demonstrate compliance with the '**Voluntary Initiative**'<sup>4</sup> on pesticides, in particular the requirement for a Crop Protection Management Plan? Do you require your international producer suppliers to be able to demonstrate compliance with the principles of the 'Voluntary Initiative'?

|   |     |    |            |
|---|-----|----|------------|
| <b>UK producer suppliers</b>  |     |    |            |
| Delete as appropriate:  | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| If YES, please provide details, including how this is verified. (More points are awarded the more detail is provided, such as timetables for action, copies of policies, examples of good practice, etc.) |     |    |            |

<sup>4</sup> The Voluntary Initiative on Pesticides includes a range of measures on pesticide use, some (e.g. competency of spray operators, recording pesticide applications) are already included as standards in BFS schemes (but only for the arable sector), others (e.g. crop protection management plans) are not. It is important that all UK producers, irrespective of the sector, comply with the VI's principles. More information is available at [www.voluntaryinitiative.org.uk](http://www.voluntaryinitiative.org.uk)

|   |     |    |            |
|---|-----|----|------------|
| <b>International producer suppliers</b>   |     |    |            |
| Delete as appropriate:  | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| <p>If YES, please provide details, including how verified.<br/>           (More points are awarded the more detail is provided, such as timetables for action, copies of policies, examples of good practice, etc.)</p> |     |    |            |

5.2.1c Do you require your producer suppliers to include **specific environmental criteria** as specified in your Code of Practice or contract with the wholesaler / co-operative?

**Background Note:** These criteria should focus on two key elements - the conservation of biodiversity and countryside character (1), and the protection of natural resources (2). Examples for (1) include: no hedgerow cutting or ditch dredging between March and July and management must be on a rotational basis (except for H&S reasons); all fields must retain a one metre undisturbed (but managed for wildlife) margin; set-aside must be managed for wildlife; and ploughing under the canopy of in-field trees must be avoided. Examples for (2) include a requirement for management plans for waste, nutrients, grazing and crop protection; using environmentally sustainable sources of water and compliance with licensing requirements; and improving energy efficiency.

|  |     |    |            |
|--|-----|----|------------|
| Delete as appropriate:   | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| <p>If YES, please provide details and how verified.<br/>           (More points are awarded the more detail is provided, such as timetables for action, copies of policies, examples of good practice, etc.)</p> |     |    |            |

5.2.2 What proportion of all sales of primary produce is sourced from producer suppliers that have farm environment audits and/or plans? This information should be available either from contract producers or from the first tier suppliers / wholesalers / co-operatives.

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Dairy         | % |
| Fresh produce | % |
| Red meats     | % |

5.2.3 Do you provide any support to these producer suppliers to help them to develop and implement the farm environment audits (and plans), financial or otherwise?

|                              |     |    |            |
|------------------------------|-----|----|------------|
| <b>UK producer suppliers</b> |     |    |            |
| Financial:                   | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |



|  |     |    |            |
|--|-----|----|------------|
| Other:   | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| <p>If you have answered YES to either question, please provide further details.<br/>         (More points are awarded the more detail is provided, such as timetables for action, copies of policies, examples of good practice, etc.)</p> |     |    |            |
| <p><b>International producer suppliers</b></p>   |     |    |            |
| Financial:   | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| Other:   | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| <p>If you have answered YES to either question, please provide further details.<br/>         (More points are awarded the more detail is provided).</p>  |     |    |            |

**INDICATOR 5.3**

**Issue: Sustainable fisheries**

**Indicator: Wild and farmed fish from sustainable sources**

**Rationale:** Many marine fisheries are on the brink of collapse from overfishing, whilst fish farming can have welfare and environmental implications. However, there are also many fisheries which are well managed and sustainable. 80% of all retail sales of fresh fish and shellfish in the UK are through the supermarket chains. Retailers currently source seafood products from all over the world and it is a major challenge to establish whether the species they are sourcing and the fisheries which supply these species are sustainable and well managed. Considerable resources and expertise would be required to ensure that every species sourced met community expectations for sustainability. One approach is to focus in the short term on some urgent issues for which there are well known solutions. This would help ascertain the practicality of the system being developed and enable retailers to provide some feedback to help design a more comprehensive system in the future. The focus is therefore on fish stocks in the North East Atlantic and the issue of long-lining and seabird bycatch.

**Supporting notes:**

- # All questions apply to all wild and farmed (organic and non-organic) fresh, chilled, canned, frozen and smoked fish or fillets and shellfish sold (own label and branded).
- # Where data are not available, please indicate.
- # Questions 5.4.1 to 5.4.7 relate to wild fisheries, whereas questions 5.4.8 to 5.4.12 refer to farmed fisheries.
- # Elements of these data will be cross-checked via correspondence with fisheries conservation bodies (e.g. WWF, BirdLife International, Earth Island Institute) and accreditation bodies (e.g. Marine Stewardship Council, Soil Association).

## Wild fisheries

5.3.1 Do you have a specific policy for sourcing from sustainable fisheries?

|  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| Please delete as appropriate:  | YES | NO |
| <p>If YES, please provide details and additional documentation as necessary.<br/>           (More points are awarded the more detail is provided, such as timetables for action, copies of policies, examples of good practice.)</p> |     |    |

5.3.2 Do you take any measures to ensure that the fish you sell is sourced from legal sources<sup>5</sup>?

|  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| Please delete as appropriate:  | YES | NO |
| <p>If YES, please provide details and additional documentation as necessary.<br/>           (More points are awarded the more detail is provided, such as timetables for action, copies of policies, examples of good practice.)</p> |     |    |

5.3.3 To help us evaluate the sustainability of the wild fish stocks that you source, and the availability of data, please list the top five wild fish species that you sell (by volume), using their scientific names<sup>6</sup>, and which region you source each from<sup>7</sup>:

| Species: | Regions: |
|----------|----------|
| 1.       |          |
| 2.       |          |
| 3.       |          |
| 4.       |          |
| 5.       |          |

<sup>5</sup> In this context, 'legal' refers to fish caught in accordance with laws pertaining to the fishery.

<sup>6</sup> Common names for fish are often misleading. For example, the name cod is applied throughout the world to families of fish that are not even closely related – so too for snapper. In addition, many fish masquerade under different names. As of 1<sup>st</sup> January 2002, it became a legal requirement (EC/2065/2001) that all fisheries products on sale at retail outlets are appropriately labelled with: the commercial name of the species; the production methods (whether the product comes from wild fisheries or aquaculture); and the area where the fish was caught.

<sup>7</sup> If possible, please differentiate between sub-regions. For example, cod caught in the north-east Atlantic could imply that it was caught in Icelandic waters, where stocks are currently above safe biological limits and managed sustainably, or in the North Sea where stocks are on the point of collapse.

5.3.4 In 2003 this questionnaire is focusing on fish stocks in the North East Atlantic region. For any species listed in your response to the last question which are caught in the North East Atlantic, please complete the following table to indicate the proportion of these species from this region that you are sourcing from fisheries that are within their safe biological limits, according to the best available statistics<sup>8</sup>.

| Species | % from sustainable sources |
|---------|----------------------------|
| 1.      |                            |
| 2.      |                            |
| 3.      |                            |
| 4.      |                            |
| 5.      |                            |

5.3.5 To identify measures that you are taking to ensuring that fish that you sell are caught by methods which minimise the negative impact on other wildlife, this question focuses on the use of longlining and measures which can be taken to minimise the bycatch of albatrosses.<sup>9</sup> Please name three fish species by their scientific names that you sell and that are caught by longlining.

|    |
|----|
| 1. |
| 2. |
| 3. |

5.3.6 For each of these three species and for each of the areas in which they are caught by longlining methods, please give an example of at least one mitigation measure (i.e. management rule, fishing practise or technological tool) which is in place to ensure that the bycatch of albatross is minimised<sup>10</sup>:

<sup>8</sup> To assess whether a particular species is within its safe biological limits in particular areas, refer to the table available at [www.wwf.org.uk/wwfmap/wwfish/1024.asp](http://www.wwf.org.uk/wwfmap/wwfish/1024.asp) . Additional information is available at the website of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea ([www.ices.dk](http://www.ices.dk)) for information on fisheries within EU jurisdiction.

<sup>9</sup> Longlining is an increasingly common fishing method used around the world to target a wide variety of species. As the name suggests it involves setting a long fishing line (sometimes up to several tens of kilometres) which has attached to it hundreds to thousands of hooks. Longlining is a relatively selective fishing method for the target species, but like all fishing methods longlining may take species that are of either no economic value or may be of conservation significance. Various species of seabirds take the longline hooks while attempting to snatch bait and some, such as albatrosses, are globally threatened (according to IUCN criteria). Technically speaking, reducing or even eliminating seabird bycatch is relatively easy, so this is a good indicator.

<sup>10</sup> Examples of measures which minimise the bycatch of albatross in longlining fisheries include closed areas (seasonal, area based), on board fish handling practices (better disposal of waste products) and technical solutions (underwater setting devices, bird scaring devices).

| Species | Area(s) where longlining is used | Example of a mitigating measure in place |
|---------|----------------------------------|--|
|         |                                  |  |

**Farmed fisheries**

5.3.7 Do you require your UK supplier fish farms to be signed up to industry environmental standards such as the Scottish Quality Salmon Environmental Management System, the Soil Association Accreditation for Organic Fish Farms and/or your own set of standards?

|  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| Please delete as appropriate:  | YES | NO |
| <p>If YES, please provide details.<br/> (More points are awarded the more detail is provided, such as timetables for action, copies of policies, examples of good practice.)</p> |     |    |

## Module 6: Animals

**Module coordinator:** Philip Lybery, World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA)

**Other organisations in the module working group:**

Compassion in World Farming; Sustain: the alliance for better food and farming; Farm Animal Welfare Network

**Note:**

≠# With the exception of questions 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.3.3, the data requested in this module is the same as that requested in the Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) questionnaire issued to retailers in 2003. If your company's data for the financial year 2002/03 is the same as that provided in response to the 2003 CIWF questionnaire, you may submit the completed CIWF questionnaire and only answer 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.3.3. However, please submit any new or updated information in the appropriate sections below. Please note that, even where data may be covered by supplying the completed CIWF questionnaire, supplementary information may be required by RTTT in order to satisfy eligibility criteria for each question. This is clearly stated for each question and the relevant information must be supplied.

### INDICATOR 6.1

**Issue: Corporate commitment to farm animal welfare standards**

**Indicator: Board-level responsibility for and policy on farm animal welfare standards, and promotion**

6.1.1 Does your company have a named board member with responsibility for farm animal welfare?

Circle as appropriate: YES / NO

To be eligible to answer 'YES', you must provide details of the nature and scope of this responsibility.

6.1.2 Does your company have a written corporate farm animal welfare policy with objectives?

Circle as appropriate: YES / NO

To be eligible to answer 'YES', you must provide a copy of the relevant policy.

6.1.3 What proportion of your company's total expenditure on promoting the sale of eggs in the 2002/03 financial year was spent on promoting non-cage eggs?

%

- 6.1.4 What proportion of your company's total expenditure on promoting the sale of broiler (meat) chickens in the 2002/03 financial year was spent on promoting free range and organic broiler chickens?

|   |
|---|
| % |
|---|

**INDICATOR 6.2**

**Issue: The Welfare of Breeding Pigs – Pregnant Sows**

**Indicator: Sales of pigmeat from progeny of breeding sows kept in stall or tether systems**

**Rationale.** Sow tethers will be prohibited in the EU by 2006, whilst the use of individual sow stalls for pregnant pigs for all but the first 4 weeks after service will be banned from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2013. Several EU countries have already banned sow stalls and tethers on a unilateral basis ahead of EU-wide bans. These include Finland, Sweden, and the UK. Supermarkets selling imported pigmeat produced using these methods can undermine animal welfare progress on this issue. Supermarkets can help by selling only pigmeat produced without the use of sow stalls or tethers during the breeding phase. Supermarket procurement policies for pigmeat should be clear that meat and processed products produced from the progeny of sows kept in stalls and tethers is not acceptable. This policy should be fully enforced at all times throughout company product ranges, and should cover both own label and branded products.

- 6.2.1 What proportion of your company's total pigmeat sales volume in each of the following product categories is produced from the progeny of breeding sows kept in stall or tether systems?

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Own label fresh pigmeat?  | % |
| Branded fresh pigmeat?  | % |
| Own label bacon and ham?  | % |
| Branded bacon and ham?  | % |
| Own label processed pigmeat?  | % |
| Branded processed pigmeat?  | % |
| Own label ready-made meals containing pigmeat ingredient?   | % |
| Branded ready made meals containing pigmeat ingredient?   | % |
| To be eligible to answer this question, you must provide details of the traceability system used by your company to verify its animal welfare specifications for pigmeat. |   |

- 6.2.2 What proportion of your company's total sales volume of each pigmeat category is sold as own label/own brand product?

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Fresh pigmeat?                                  | % |
| Bacon and ham?                                  | % |
| Processed pigmeat?                              | % |
| Ready made meals containing pigmeat ingredient? | % |

### INDICATOR 6.3

#### Issue: The Welfare of Laying Hens

#### Indicator: Sales of shell eggs by production system

**Rationale.** Opinion polls in the UK and elsewhere have shown that the majority (over 80%) of the public believe battery cages are cruel. Supermarkets can help by facilitating consumer choice, prioritising the sale of high value and high welfare non-cage eggs, and by moving to a position where they no longer sell battery eggs. Race to the Top encourages all supermarkets to increase the proportion of non-cage egg sales volume to 100%. In addition, supermarkets should insist on non-cage egg ingredient in ready-made meals and processed egg products throughout their product range.

- 6.3.1 Of the total sales volume of shell eggs sold by your company (own label & branded) in the UK each year, what percentage is made up of:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Battery cage produced eggs (Own label & branded)?         | % |
| Eggs from non-cage alternatives (barn, free range, etc.)? | % |

- 6.3.2 Of your company's total sales volume of alternative shell eggs, what proportion is produced using the following non-cage production systems:

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Free Range?              | % |
| Barn/Perchery?           | % |
| Others (please specify)? | % |

- 6.3.3 Of your company's total sales volume of processed and ready-made meal products containing egg ingredient (both own label and branded), what proportion currently uses egg ingredient from non-cage alternatives (barn, free range, etc.)?

|   |
|---|
| % |
|---|

- 6.3.4 Has your company set a target date by which it intends to cease selling both own label and branded battery eggs?

|  |
|--|
| Circle as appropriate:            YES / NO |
| If YES, what is the target date?           |

### INDICATOR 6.4

#### Issue: The Welfare of Broiler (Meat) Chickens

#### Indicator: Sales of fresh and frozen chicken by production system

**Rationale.** Race to the Top encourages supermarkets to increase the proportion of free range and organic chicken sales volume to 100%. Race to the Top recognises that differences in demographic customer profile mean that the proportion of customers with a propensity to buy high-welfare products will vary between companies. For this reason, the promotional effort needed to make similar progress on, for example, increased sales of free range poultry will differ between companies. To attempt to reflect this tendency, an indicator of promotional 'effort' has been included.

- 6.4.1 Of the total sales volume (both own label & branded) of fresh and frozen chicken sold by your company (both whole birds and chicken joints), what proportion is made up of:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Standard intensive broiler chickens?                       | % |
| Free range broiler chickens?                               | % |
| Organically reared broiler chickens?                       | % |
| Other non-intensively reared chickens (e.g. Freedom Food)? | % |

## INDICATOR 6.5

### Issue: Transport of Farm Animals

#### Indicator: Policy on transport of farm animals

**Rationale.** There is concern that supermarkets may be causing unnecessarily long journeys for animals travelling to abattoirs within the UK due to centralised slaughter facilities. Supermarkets are encouraged to help reduce journey times by specifying maximum journey times for animals destined for their stores, whether in the UK or abroad. A total maximum journey time of 8 hours from farm to abattoir should be imposed for all red meat animals travelling from farm to slaughter. Of course, maximums that improve on this welfare requirement are to be welcomed. In addition, steps should be taken to ensure that *average* journey times remain well below these maximums. Ensuring that animals are slaughtered as near to the farm of rearing as is practically possible will achieve this aim.

6.5.1 What is the total maximum journey time from farm to slaughter allowed by your company for:

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Complete and delete as appropriate. To be eligible to answer this question, you must provide a copy of the relevant policy document. |                    |
| Cattle?  | hours / no maximum |
| Sheep?   | hours / no maximum |
| Pigs?  | hours / no maximum |

6.5.2 What is the average journey time per species that an animal travels from farm to slaughter for your company?

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| Cattle?  | hours |
| Sheep?   | hours |
| Pigs?  | Hours |
| To be eligible to answer this question, you must provide details of the verification system used by your company to verify average and maximum journey times to slaughter. |       |

6.5.3 What is the maximum number of movements for beef cattle that your company will allow, using cattle passports as a means of verifying this?

|  |
|--|
| Complete and delete as appropriate:  |
| movements / no maximum   |
| To be eligible to answer this question, you must provide a copy of the relevant policy document. |



## Module 7: Health

**Module coordinators:** Tim Lang and Lindy Sharpe,  
Department of Health Management and Food Policy, City University

**Rationale:** Food is fundamental to health. In the UK today, we enjoy a varied and abundant diet. Recent, high-profile health concerns have centred on food safety (eg, BSE, microbial contamination, chemical residues, GM foods). This module focuses instead on two aspects of diet which have lower-profile but extensive implications for public health:

- €# *Nutritional quality.* The consumption of excessive or disproportionate amounts of key foods contributes to a range of serious health problems, including coronary heart disease, some cancers, diabetes, high blood pressure and stroke. These conditions are leading causes of chronic illness and premature death in our society. Changes in eating patterns (for example, an increase in snacking and higher consumption of sugared drinks), in combination with reduced levels of physical exercise, are thought to account for rising levels of obesity, which increases the risk of many serious diseases. Inappropriate nutrition also contributes to low birthweight and poor growth, as well as tooth decay. All of these conditions occur more often in the most disadvantaged socio-economic groups, resulting in so-called social inequalities in patterns of ill health.
- €# *Access.* In spite of our abundant food supply, some people have difficulty obtaining an adequate, nutritious or culturally acceptable diet. These difficulties, which may have financial, physical or social origins, are collectively known as problems of access. Those affected include people on limited incomes, and people whose mobility is limited – for example by age, or by disability, or by having to shop with young children, or by lack of access to a car. As a result of their particular circumstances, these people may have to eat a less than optimally varied or nourishing diet. In addition to causing hardship to individuals, these problems exacerbate the health inequalities referred to above.

Diet is only one of several factors contributing to the so-called “lifestyle” diseases, and the interaction between diet and health is complex and controversial. However, research suggests that diet-related degenerative diseases account for at least one tenth of the budget of the National Health Service. Research has also found strategies to promote healthy eating and dietary change to be among the most cost-effective methods of preventing cardiovascular disease.

It is widely accepted that by improving diet, both the overall incidence of chronic disease and the current social inequalities in patterns of ill-health could be reduced. These are central concerns of public health policy. The Food Standards Agency summarises the core dietary recommendations as follows:

- €# Eat more fruit and vegetables
- €# Eat more bread, cereals and potatoes
- €# Eat less fat, salt and sugar

Several government reports and policies (for example, the Acheson Inquiry into *Inequalities in Health*, the White Paper *Saving Lives: Our Healthier Nation*, the NHS Plan and the Social Exclusion Unit's *Bringing Britain Together: A strategy for neighbourhood*) have noted the need to change the nation's diet for the better, both by improving nutritional balance overall and by improving access to healthy, affordable foods for disadvantaged groups. These reports, as well as the more recent *Report of the Policy Commission on the Future of Farming and Food* and the Chief Medical Officer's *Annual Report for 2002*, also highlighted the importance of government and industry working in partnership towards these goals. Various initiatives already exist to implement some of the policy recommendations.

The objective of this module is to track the ways in which supermarkets' policies and actions support public policies on diet and access, helping consumers to find, choose and afford the foods that make up a healthy diet.

**The indicators** chosen to measure progress in this area are:

- # Corporate commitment to public health
- # Action on food poverty and health inequalities
- # Commitment to widening access
- # Nutrition and healthy eating

Clearly, any attempt to "measure" such a complex area will be fraught with difficulty, and the science of defining and quantifying impacts of this type is in its infancy. The questions have been devised to give an indication of retailers' level of commitment and action. Part of the objective (and achievement) of this module has been the consensual development of a set of workable indicators, which can be improved and refined in future phases of the project.

**INDICATOR 7.1**

**Issue: Corporate commitment to public health**

**Indicator: Responsibility for and action on food and public health**

**7.1.1** Does your company have a commitment to support public health policy in the following areas:

a) Action on food poverty/access and health inequalities YES / NO

b) Commitment to widening access YES / NO

c) Nutrition and healthy eating YES / NO

If you have answered YES to any of the above, please provide details, for corroboration only.

**7.1.2** Does your company have policies (published or otherwise) on the above issues, and persons responsible for their implementation? Is this at board level?

|   | Policy? | Published? | Person responsible for implementing? | Board level? |
|---|---------|------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Action on food poverty/ access and health inequalities |         |            |                                      |              |
| b) Commitment to widening access                          |         |            |                                      |              |
| c) Nutrition and healthy eating                           |         |            |                                      |              |

**Comments:** (Please use this space to provide any information which you feel explains or qualifies your answers to the above questions, or may help to refine the questions in the next phase. This information will not be scored.)

**INDICATOR 7.2****Issue: Action on food poverty and health inequalities****Indicator: Store location and pricing policy**

**7.2.1** During the last financial year, how many branches did your company open, close or refurbish? Of these, how many had a catchment area with a proportion of people in socio-economic groups C2DE *the same as or greater than* in your overall customer demographic profile, as provided in answer to question 0.1.4?

|                 | Total | Same or more C2DEs than in your overall customer demographic profile? |
|-----------------|-------|---|
| (a) Opened      |       |   |
| (b) Closed      |       |   |
| (c) Refurbished |       |   |

*(The goal is to maintain or improve provision for C2DEs. So, for example, for (a) and (c), marks will be awarded if the second column is 90% or more of total in first column; for (b), more marks will be awarded if the second column is 10% or less of total in first column.)*

**7.2.2** Does your company include health impact criteria when preparing impact assessments for new or reformatted stores:

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| a) Rarely?    |  |
| b) Routinely? |  |
| c) Never?     |  |

**7.2.3** Does your company have a policy of incentivising healthy eating, either by offering healthier options (such as lower fat) across all ranges, or by offering a specific healthy eating range, or both? YES/NO

Are these options subsidised (tick one):

|  |  |
|--|--|
| a) Throughout the year?                            |  |
| b) For limited periods while on promotional offer? |  |
| c) Not at all?                                     |  |

**Comments:** (Please use this space to provide any information which you feel explains or qualifies your answers to the above questions, or may help to refine the questions in the next phase. This information will not be scored.)

**INDICATOR 7.3****Issue: Access to and within stores****Indicator: Commitment to widening access**

7.3.1 In the past year, what percentage of your customers left your stores by the following means?

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| a) private car        | % |
| b) public transport   | % |
| c) subsidised bus     | % |
| d) taxi               | % |
| e) walking or bicycle | % |

**NOTE:** Please provide a brief explanation of how you compiled this data.

7.3.2 Does your company provide a home delivery service OTHER than as part of internet shopping? Is this available to everyone, or to designated groups only? Is it free (that is, NOT conditional on paying a fee or making a minimum purchase)?

|  | YES/NO | Free? (ie, no fee or minimum purchase ) |
|--|--------|---|
| a) For everyone?   |        |   |
| b) For designated groups only (eg pensioners, disabled?) |        |   |

7.3.3 Does your company have a written policy which includes provision for customers with special needs related to access to and within your stores? YES/NO  
How is this made available to the public?

**Comments:** (Please use this space to provide any information which you feel explains or qualifies your answers to the above questions, or may help to refine the questions in the next phase. This information will not be scored.)

**INDICATOR 7.4****Issue: Nutrition and healthy eating****Indicator: Extent to which sales support dietary guidelines**

7.4.1 Over the past year, what proportion of your total food sales by value comprised the following categories?

| Category  | Proportion |
|---|------------|
| a) Fresh, canned and frozen fruit and vegetables ( <i>excluding</i> juices and dried fruit) | %          |
| c) Potato crisps  | %          |
| d) Canned, carbonated soft drinks ( <i>excluding</i> mineral water)                         | %          |

7.4.2 Over the past year, has your company taken steps to reduce the overall amount of the specified constituents in the following own-brand categories?

| Constituent   | Own-brand product              | Reduced? |
|---------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Salt          | Potato crisps                  |          |
| Sugar         | Canned, carbonated soft drinks |          |
| Fat           | Chilled/frozen ready meals     |          |
| Saturated fat | Chilled/frozen ready meals     |          |

7.4.3 Does your company provide full nutritional labelling (including the so called “big eight”, or energy, fat, protein, carbohydrate, saturated fat, sugars, sodium and fibre) on all own-label packaged food products? YES/NO

7.4.4 Do you have IT systems in place that would enable you to calculate the overall proportion of dietary components such as salt or saturated fat in itemised bills provided to customers? YES/NO

Have you ever provided this information to customers? YES/NO  
(If yes, please provide examples, for corroboration only.)

7.4.5 Does your company hold a licence to use the Department of Health five-a-day logo? If not, do you have your own scheme, and if so, does it meet DoH criteria? Does your company provide point-of-sale nutrition information to support a balanced diet?

| Licence to use DoH 5-a-day logo? | Have company 5-a-day scheme? | Does it meet DoH criteria? | Point-of-sale material supporting balanced diet? |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
|                                  |                              |                            |  |

**Comments:** (Please use this space to provide any information which you feel explains or qualifies your answers to the above questions, or may help to refine the questions in the next phase. This information will not be scored.)