



# Response to the Public Consultation on Crustacean Compassion's Benchmark on Decapod Crustacean Welfare

September 2022

## Background

Crustacean Compassion has identified the need to establish a baseline of decapod crustacean welfare standards within the UK seafood industry, following the inclusion of decapods in the Animal Welfare (Sentience) Act 2022. It identified an annual corporate benchmark as an effective tool for engaging companies and wider stakeholders on the issues related to decapod crustacean welfare, and to use this as an effective accountability tool that will help drive improvements in the industry over time. Crustacean Compassion will collaborate with food companies to define key welfare expectations, to strengthen their management and reporting practices and to advance standards in the industry.

Having worked with specialist sustainability advisory company, Chronos Sustainability, which has extensive experience in developing and delivering corporate benchmarks, in drafting and piloting a benchmark tool, Crustacean Compassion decided to share its proposed benchmark and assessment criteria via a public consultation.

## Overview of responses

The consultation was launched on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2022 and ran for four weeks. Alongside an online public survey, a series of interviews was conducted with key stakeholders to gather feedback on the proposed benchmark, scope and criteria. Interviews were held with seven seafood producers and retailers proposed for inclusion in the benchmark, one industry association, one Non-Departmental Public Body, one Certification Scheme and one NGO. The industry associations interviewed represent companies and individuals throughout the seafood value chain.

Crustacean Compassion received fifteen responses to its public consultation on its proposed benchmark of decapod crustacean welfare. These were received from five of the companies proposed for inclusion in the benchmark, three from seafood producers' associations, two from consultants working on animal welfare and five from NGOs working on animal welfare.

We are grateful for the feedback received in response to this consultation, and to the companies and associations who generously participated in the interviews. The feedback received is essential for the development of the benchmark.

There is widespread acknowledgement of the need to effectively manage the welfare of decapod crustaceans, driven in part by legislation, consumer pressure, industry interest and customer expectations. A benchmark can be useful to clarify the expectations of companies on such a nascent issue. It is acknowledged that the industry is currently in the process of developing its own standards on the handling of decapod crustaceans. Therefore, some organisations commented that a benchmark may be too premature when the industry has yet to define its own standards. Some concerns were also raised about the impact of a benchmark on companies, and particularly on small businesses. Feedback was also received on the assessment criteria and company scope, including suggestions that some criteria (for example, related to transport and storage conditions) should be more specific.

Based on the feedback received through the public consultation and interviews, Crustacean Compassion has decided to make a number of modifications to the benchmark criteria and scope. These include changes to the format of the assessment and information published, changes to the company scope and criteria. The planned changes, together with a summary of responses, is outlined below.

## Planned actions in response to the consultation feedback

1. Given concerns expressed about the commercial impact of benchmarking companies on an issue that is immature (relative to the welfare of farmed terrestrial animals) Crustacean Compassion has decided to conduct private assessments of companies against its benchmark methodology in the first iteration. Through this process, the benchmark will enable Crustacean Compassion to collaborate with the industry on its expectations and to learn from the industry about the practical challenges experienced by seafood producers and retailers. **The first benchmark report will therefore not publish individual company rankings or anonymised rankings.** A benchmark report will be published which will outline baseline data on current decapod welfare practices and reporting in the UK seafood industry, highlight good practice examples from industry and identify overall recommendations for improvements. Companies assessed in the benchmark will receive a confidential report with the results of their assessment.
2. **The first benchmark will assess companies on both published and non-published data.** In line with the proposed methodology, companies will initially be assessed on their published information. However, in the first benchmark iteration, companies will also be invited to provide non-published documents, directly to Chronos Sustainability on a confidential basis. This will build a fuller picture of company practice and give companies more time to publish information. Crustacean Compassion is committed to collaborating with companies on decapod crustacean welfare and will use the benchmark primarily as an engagement tool. It will also, through its dialogue with companies, encourage them to improve their disclosure on decapod crustacean welfare.
3. **In line with the proposal, 30 companies will be assessed by the benchmark.** However, based on feedback to the consultation, some changes have been made to the companies included in the benchmark. Two companies, Charoen Pokphand Foods and Associated Seafoods, have been added to the benchmark, on the basis that these are major players in

the UK market. Two companies, G&J Jack and Salmac, have been removed from the benchmark, on the basis of their relative scale and significance to the UK market. The full list of companies to be covered by the benchmark in 2022 can be found in Appendix I.

4. There was wide support for the benchmark to assess companies on their full supply chains. Therefore, as proposed, **the benchmark will assess companies on imported products, exported products and exports of live decapod crustaceans.** This will ensure the same expectations are placed on imported products as on UK products. As proposed, companies will be assessed at the parent company level.
5. We acknowledge comments highlighting the need for species-specific parameters for transport and holding conditions. **The benchmark will establish baseline data on existing company practices and assess any company efforts to address welfare during transport and storage. The benchmark will aim to set clearer definitions in future iterations as knowledge develops and as best industry practice comes to light.** Crustacean Compassion understands the iterative nature of benchmarking and that the methodology will need to be reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that it remains aligned with and that it reflects current scientific knowledge. Each year, the benchmark will publish a methodology paper as necessary, explaining its assessment approach and commenting on how companies are currently reporting on decapod crustacean welfare. There will also be a regular consultation to ensure that as many stakeholders as possible are given the opportunity to provide inputs to the ongoing development of the benchmark.
6. **Questions 19, 20 and 21 will focus on performance reporting rather than performance impact.** We acknowledge that few companies are currently reporting impact, the challenges in doing so and that any data is more likely to be reported by species. This is understandable given the immaturity of the issue. We have adjusted the focus of the three performance impact questions (Q19, Q20 and Q21) to award points for those companies that are reporting on decapod crustacean welfare. This change aims to encourage companies to begin reporting available data on slaughter, transport and mutilations of any decapod crustacean species. Over time, as company reporting on decapod crustacean welfare increases, we anticipate that the benchmark will also assess companies on the performance impact of their policies.
7. There was widespread cross-sector support for the proposed scope of the benchmark. **Therefore, we will, as proposed, focus on the welfare of farmed and wild-caught decapod crustaceans during capture, storage, transport and slaughter.** Rearing conditions (in the case of farmed decapod crustaceans) are outside the scope of the benchmark for now, but may be considered in future iterations.
8. **Following consultation feedback, some criteria have been clarified.** This includes the addition of clearer guidelines in Q17 on what is meant by industry initiatives and research to improve decapod welfare and clearer guidelines in Q18 on what is meant by communication with consumers. In Questions 6 and 20, clarification has been added on what procedures are considered mutilations. The full assessment criteria, including changes made following the consultation (in red), can be found in Appendix II.

9. **In response to the consultation feedback, the benchmark report and associated briefings will include any examples of good practice, as well as scientific evidence for its recommendations.** Crustacean Compassion will be engaging directly with benchmarked companies and industry stakeholders to offer further support to improve the management and reporting of decapod crustacean welfare.

## Appendix I

### Company scope

	Company	Sector	Ownership	Headquarters (Country)*
1.	Tesco PLC	Retailers & Wholesalers	Public	Welwyn Garden City, England
2.	J Sainsbury PLC	Retailers & Wholesalers	Public	London, England
3.	ASDA Stores Limited	Retailers & Wholesalers	Private	Leeds, England
4.	Wm Morrisons	Retailers & Wholesalers	Private	Bradford, England
5.	ALDI UK (Aldi Süd)	Retailers & Wholesalers	Private	Atherstone, England (HQ in Essen, Germany)
6.	The Co-operative Group Ltd	Retailers & Wholesalers	Cooperative	Manchester, England
7.	Lidl GB	Retailers & Wholesalers	Private	Tolworth, England (HQ in Neckarsulm, Germany)
8.	Marks & Spencer PLC	Retailers & Wholesalers	Public	London, England
9.	Waitrose	Retailers & Wholesalers	Private	Bracknell, England
10.	Iceland	Retailers & Wholesalers	Private	Deeside, Wales
11.	Ocado	Retailers & Wholesalers	Public	Hatfield, England
12.	Amazon	Retailers & Wholesalers	Public	London, England
13.	Brakes (subs. of Sysco)	Retailers & Wholesalers	Public	Ashford, England
14.	MacNeil Shellfish	Distributor/Wholesaler	Private	Larkhall, Scotland
15.	Bidfresh Ltd (subs. of Bidvest)	Producers & Manufacturers	Public	Southport, England

16.	Iceland Seafood	Producers & Manufacturers	Public	Reykjavik, Iceland
17.	Orkney Fishermen's Society	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Orkney, Scotland
18.	Hilton Food Group	Producers & Manufacturers	Public	Huntingdon, England
19.	Andrew Marr International	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Hassle, England
20.	Macduff Shellfish Group (subs. of Clearwater Seafoods)	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Mintlaw, Scotland
21.	Young's Seafood	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Grimsby, England
22.	Whitby Seafoods	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	North Yorkshire, England
23.	The Blue Sea Food Company	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Paignton, England
24.	Lyons Seafoods Ltd (subs. Of Labeyrie Fine Foods Group)	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Warminster, England
25.	The Big Prawn Co.	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Melton Constable, England
26.	Northcoast Seafoods (part of Kangamuit Seafood Group)	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Grimsby, England
27.	Sykes Seafoods (incl. Ruskim Seafoods)	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Knutsford, England
28.	Thai Union	Producers & Manufacturers	Public	Samut Sakhon, Thailand
29.	Charoen Pokphand Foods (CPF)	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Bangkok, Thailand
30.	Associated Seafoods	Producers & Manufacturers	Private	Buckie, Scotland

## Appendix II

### Assessment criteria

Note, changes made following the consultation are shown in red.

Management Commitment and Policy		
<b>Question 1.</b>	<b>Does the company acknowledge the welfare of decapod crustaceans as a business issue?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Acknowledging the welfare of decapod crustaceans as a business issue is an important first step towards implementing a comprehensive approach to the responsible sourcing of Nephrops, shrimps, crabs and lobsters. It is good practice for food companies to identify whether and why the welfare of decapod crustaceans is a relevant issue for the business.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence that the welfare of decapod crustaceans is regarded as a relevant business issue.	0
	The company identifies decapod crustacean welfare as a relevant business issue.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	

<b>Question 2.</b>	<b>Does the company publish an explicit commitment to the welfare of decapod crustaceans within an animal welfare policy or within an overarching corporate sustainable sourcing policy?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	It is good practice for companies to formalise their approach to animal welfare, and specifically to decapod crustacean welfare in a policy (or equivalent document such as a statement of guiding principles, a code of practice or a sourcing charter). While the existence of a policy may not provide a guarantee of implementation, the absence of a policy is a clear sign that the welfare of decapod crustaceans is not on the business agenda.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence of a formal policy statement (or equivalent) on decapod crustacean welfare.	0

	The company has a commitment to decapod crustacean welfare in a policy statement (or equivalent) but no description of how the policy is to be implemented.	5
	The company has a commitment to decapod crustacean welfare within a policy statement (or equivalent) and a description of the processes in place to ensure that the policy is effectively implemented.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	

<b>Question 3.</b>	<b>Does the policy statement provide a clear explanation of geographic, decapod crustacean species and product scope?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Understanding the scope of a policy is important to understand the breadth of a company's commitment to action on decapod crustacean welfare.	
<i>3a. Geographic scope</i>		
	Geographic scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified geographies.	2
	Scope is universal across all geographies.	5
<i>3b. Species scope</i>		
	Species scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified species.	2
	Scope is universal across all relevant species.	5
<i>3c. Product scope</i>		
	Product scope is not specified.	0
	Scope is limited to certain specified products (such as own-brand products).	2
	Scope is universal across own brand and other brand products.	5
	<b>(Max Score 15)</b>	

<b>Question 4.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to reduce the negative effects of capture method on decapod crustacean welfare by adapting equipment, fishing and handling practices during and immediately following capture?</b>
--------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Rationale</b>	The extent of welfare compromise experienced during capture using trawling, pots, creels or gill nets is significantly affected by the method used but can include exposure to shifts in barometric pressure, salinity and temperature as well as physical trauma/injury/crushing, exhaustion, fear and death. Pots and traps can also cause serious problems if lost or discarded as the lost gear may continue to capture aquatic animals. Some of the challenges posed to the animals can be reduced to some extent through adapting equipment, fishing and handling practices during and immediately following capture, for example, by adjusting mesh size, changing the frequency that pots are checked, or adjusting the design of pots to enable escape.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company makes a partial commitment to reduce the negative effects of capture method on decapod crustacean welfare but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company makes a partial commitment to reduce the negative effects of capture method on decapod crustacean welfare and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to reduce the negative effects of capture method on decapod crustacean welfare across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	

<b>Question 5.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear commitment to reduce bycatch associated with decapod crustacean fishing?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	High levels of bycatch can be associated with decapod crustacean fishing, including undersized individuals of the target species and other non-target species of decapod crustacean. Even when returned to the sea alive, many unintentionally caught animals suffer morbidity and mortality as a result of the stressors experienced during the catching and sorting processes. Changes to fishing practices and equipment, for example retrieval of lost pots or the design and materials used for nets and pots, can facilitate a reduction in the level of bycatch. Refinement - and reduced duration - of on-board handling and sorting practices can also help improve the ability of discarded bycatch to survive and thrive on return to the sea.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company makes a partial commitment to reducing bycatch associated with decapod crustacean fishing but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1



	The company makes a partial commitment to reducing bycatch associated with decapod crustacean fishing and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to reducing bycatch associated with decapod crustacean fishing across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	

<b>Question 6.</b>	<p><b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of non-therapeutic* mutilation of decapod crustaceans, which, in the case of wild-caught decapods, includes prohibiting their subsequent return to the ocean?</b></p> <p>*Defined as not having a direct welfare benefit for the animal</p>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Decapod crustaceans are subjected to mutilation procedures in farmed/ brood stocks and post-capture that alter their bodies, causing unnecessary pain and distress. <b>These include eyestalk ablation, claw nicking and de-clawing.</b> Mutilation of decapod crustaceans is only permitted if undertaken by a veterinary surgeon for direct benefit to the welfare of the animal.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of mutilations but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company has made a partial commitment to the avoidance of mutilations and the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to the avoidance of mutilations across all relevant species, own-brand and other branded products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	

<b>Question 7.</b>	<p><b>Does the company have a clear position on appropriate species-specific holding conditions (during post-capture, holding for processing and retail stage), that take account of each species' physical, physiological and behavioural needs?</b></p>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Large numbers of decapod crustaceans are subjected to some form of holding or storage at various stages from the time they are captured in the wild or 'harvested'	

	<p>on farms until they are killed. This includes on-board storage post-capture, during pre-and post-transport periods, prior to killing/processing</p> <p>and while on live display in retail outlets, restaurants and live markets. The duration of storage can vary, sometimes being for several months. The conditions - and associated welfare challenges - are hugely variable. Depending on the species and duration of storage, the animals may be held in water tanks with or without water recirculation, in air at various levels of humidity/moisture and sometimes directly on ice. Hence, the welfare risks to which the animals are exposed during holding/storage include inappropriate and fluctuating temperature, poor water quality (including salinity), exposure to air, light and noise, food deprivation/starvation, overcrowding, mixing with conspecifics and other species, behavioural restrictions (including through claw banding), inability to hide and rough/careless handling, including when 'graded' for size and quality. As a result, the animals can suffer significant stress, physiological and immunological disturbances, hunger, muscle depletion, injury, morbidity and mortality.</p>	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company makes a partial commitment to ensuring appropriate species-specific holding conditions but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company makes a partial commitment to ensuring appropriate species-specific holding conditions and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to ensuring appropriate species-specific holding conditions across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	

<b>Question 8.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on appropriate species-specific conditions during transport, that take account of each species' physical, physiological and behavioural needs?</b>
<b>Rationale</b>	Decapod crustaceans are subjected to a broad range of conditions on journeys of widely differing duration, some lasting several days. Common transport practices expose decapod crustaceans to multiple stressors, including inappropriate and/or fluctuating temperatures and other environmental conditions (e.g. water quality), unsuitable packaging/containment, overcrowding, stacking, air exposure, vibration, noise, light and manual handling. Confinement in close proximity to others of the same or sometimes different species also poses welfare challenges. The loading and the unloading processes also involve exposure to stressors such as

	temperature change, and air and sun exposure. Transport is defined as including loading and unloading.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company makes a partial commitment to ensuring appropriate species-specific transport conditions but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company makes a partial commitment to ensuring appropriate species-specific transport conditions and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to ensuring appropriate species-specific transport conditions across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	

<b>Question 9.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of long-duration live transportation of decapod crustaceans?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	When being transported, animals can experience hunger, discomfort, pain, frustration, fear and distress, as well as physical welfare problems including injury, disease, and death. For these reasons, transport of live decapod crustaceans should be minimised wherever possible and journeys should be kept as short as possible.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company makes a partial commitment to avoid/reduce the duration of live transport of decapod crustaceans but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1
	The company makes a partial commitment to avoid/reduce the duration of live transport of decapod crustaceans and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to avoid/reduce the duration of live transport of decapod crustaceans across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max Score 5)</b>	

<b>Question 10.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on requiring all decapod crustaceans to be humanely stunned and slaughtered, using methods that result in</b>
---------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<b>instantaneous insensibility to pain and distress or where insensibility is induced without causing pain and distress and is maintained until death occurs?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>Decapod crustaceans should only be stunned using electrical stunning, resulting in instantaneous* insensibility to pain and distress or where insensibility is induced without causing pain and distress. This insensible state must be maintained until death occurs. Stunning methods that are not supported include: chilling, wet/ice chilling, chemical anaesthetics, CO2 gassing.</p> <p><u>Following effective stunning, slaughter/killing should be performed immediately and using a method where the insensible state persists until death occurs, without pain or distress.</u></p> <p><i>*within one second</i></p>	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company makes a partial commitment to requiring all decapod crustaceans to be humanely stunned and slaughtered but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	2
	The company makes a partial commitment to requiring all decapod crustaceans to be humanely stunned and slaughtered and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	6
	The company makes a universal commitment to requiring all decapod crustaceans to be humanely stunned and slaughtered across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	10
	<b>(Max Score 10)</b>	

<b>Question 11.</b>	<b>Does the company have a clear position on the avoidance of live sale of decapod crustaceans to the public or untrained handlers?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>The displaying of live decapod crustaceans in retailer outlets and restaurants presents significant welfare and ethical issues. The welfare concerns are further exacerbated by uncertainties about the competency and methodology surrounding the subsequent killing of the animals in such outlets or in consumer homes (in the case of retail outlets).</p>	
<b>Scoring</b>	No stated position.	0
	The company makes a partial commitment to avoid live sale of decapod crustaceans to the public or untrained handlers but the scope (in terms of geography, species or products) is not clearly defined.	1

	The company makes a partial commitment to avoid live sale of decapod crustaceans to the public or untrained handlers and the scope of the commitment (in terms of geography, species or products) is clearly defined.	3
	The company makes a universal commitment to avoid live sale of decapod crustaceans to the public or untrained handlers across all relevant species, own-brand and other brand products and geographies.	5
	<b>(Max score 5)</b>	

Governance and Management		
<b>Question 12.</b>	<b>Has the company assigned management responsibility for the welfare of decapod crustaceans to an individual or specified committee?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	When looking at the management of decapod crustacean welfare, both oversight and implementation responsibilities are important. Oversight is necessary to ensure that senior management is aware of the business implications of animal welfare and is prepared to intervene when needed (e.g. if there are tensions between the organisation’s animal welfare policy and other business objectives). However, it is often the case that those charged with oversight know relatively little about the specific details of how to effectively manage animal welfare. It is, therefore, important that there are individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the animal welfare policy is implemented and that animal welfare is effectively managed.	
<b>Scoring</b>		
<i>12a. Management responsibility</i>		
	No clearly defined management responsibility.	0
	The company has published details of the management position with responsibility for decapod welfare on a day-to-day basis.	5
<i>12b. Board or senior management responsibility</i>		
	No clearly defined board or senior management responsibility	0

	The company has published details of how the board or senior management oversees the implementation of the company's decapod crustacean welfare policy.	5
	<b>(Max score 10)</b>	

<b>Question 13.</b>	<b>Has the company set objectives and targets for the management of decapod crustacean welfare?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Objectives and targets are the point where policy commitments are translated into substantive action, and where resources and responsibilities are allocated for the delivery of these objectives and targets.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No published objectives and targets.	0
	The company has published objectives and targets but with no or limited information on how these are to be achieved.	5
	The company has published objectives and targets together with information on the actions to be taken to achieve these, the resources allocated and the schedule for the delivery of these objectives and targets.	10
	<b>(Max score 10)</b>	

<b>Question 14.</b>	<b>Does the company report on its progress against its improvement objectives or targets linked to improving the welfare of decapod crustaceans?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies should provide an explanation of progress against their objectives and targets	
<b>Scoring</b>	The company does not provide an explanation of progress against its objectives and targets.	0
	The company provides an explanation of progress against at least one objective or target.	3
	The company provides an explanation of progress on how it has performed against its multiple objectives and targets.	5
	<b>(Max score 5)</b>	

<b>Question 15.</b>	<b>Does the company describe its internal processes for ensuring that its policy on decapod crustacean welfare is effectively implemented?</b>	
---------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<b>Rationale</b>	The effective implementation of an animal welfare policy relies on employees who are competent to oversee the implementation of the policy, and on controls that allow the company to respond quickly and effectively in the event of non-compliance with the policy. Evidence-based training of employees and refresher training of crew/staff on decapod crustacean welfare, based on the latest knowledge of species-specific needs is important in ensuring knowledge transfer and implementation of the company's policies.	
<i>15a. Employee training</i>		
<b>Scoring</b>	No information provided on employee training in decapod crustacean welfare.	0
	The company provides specific training to employees in decapod crustacean welfare.	5
<i>15b. Actions taken in the event of non-compliance</i>		
<b>Scoring</b>	The company provides no information on the actions to be taken in the event of non-compliance with its policy on decapod crustacean welfare.	0
	The company describes the actions it takes in the event of non-compliance with its policy on decapod crustacean welfare.	5
	<b>(Max score 10)</b>	

<b>Question 16.</b>	<b>Does the company describe how it implements its policy on decapod crustacean welfare (or equivalent) through its supply chain?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Many of the business risks and opportunities associated with animal welfare relate to companies' supply chains. Companies have the ability to influence their suppliers' performance both formally (e.g. through contracts, auditing processes) and informally (e.g. through capacity building and education).	
<i>16a. Does the company describe how it implements its policy (or equivalent) on decapod crustacean welfare through its supply chain via supplier contracts?</i>		
<b>Scoring</b>	No information on how decapod crustacean welfare is included in supplier contracts.	0
	The company incorporates decapod crustacean welfare into contractual obligations for suppliers, but this is limited by geography and/or certain products or species.	3
	The company incorporates decapod crustacean welfare into contractual obligations for suppliers across all species, products and geographies.	5

<i>16b. Does the company describe how it implements its policy (or equivalent) on decapod crustacean welfare through its supply chain via monitoring, auditing or certification?</i>		
<b>Scoring</b>	No information provided on how supplier compliance with contract conditions is monitored.	0
	The company specifies decapod crustacean welfare as part of supplier auditing or certification programme.	5
<i>16c. Does the company describe how it implements its policy (or equivalent) on decapod crustacean welfare through its supply chain via education and support?</i>		
<b>Scoring</b>	No information on support and/or education provided to suppliers on decapod crustacean welfare	0
	The company provides specific support and/or education to suppliers on decapod crustacean welfare policy/issues.	5
	<b>(Max score 15)</b>	

**Innovation and Leadership**

<b>Question 17.</b>	<b>Is the company currently investing in projects dedicated to advancing the welfare of decapod crustaceans within the industry?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>Decapod crustacean welfare is a collective issue for the food industry as well as being an individual issue for each company in the industry. Making progress and raising standards across the industry requires individual companies to support research and development programmes to improve decapod crustacean welfare, to share their knowledge and expertise with their suppliers and with their industry peers, to play a supportive role in public policy debates, and to support industry and stakeholder initiatives directed at improving decapod crustacean welfare.</p> <p><b>Only those industry initiatives and research that are explicitly related to improving decapod crustacean welfare and that the company has played a significant role in are eligible to be scored. Industry initiatives can include roundtables or working groups dedicated to decapod crustacean welfare.</b></p>	

*17a – Involvement in research and development*

<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence of company involvement in research and development programmes to improve the welfare of decapod crustaceans.	0
	Evidence of current company involvement in research and development programmes to improve the welfare of decapod crustaceans.	5



17b involvement in industry or other initiatives

<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence of active company involvement in industry or other initiatives directed at improving the welfare of decapod crustaceans.	0
	Evidence of active company involvement in industry or other initiatives (e.g. working groups, supporting NGO activities, responding to government consultations) directed at improving the welfare of decapod crustaceans.	5
	<b>(Max score 10)</b>	

<b>Question 18.</b>	<b>Does the company promote decapod crustacean welfare to consumers through education and/or awareness-raising activities?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>Companies have an important role to play in raising awareness of decapod crustacean welfare among their customers and clients. This, in turn, should contribute to increases in demand for higher welfare products.</p> <p>In order to receive a score of 5 or 10, the focus of activities should be on decapod crustacean welfare. The activities that can be considered in this question include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of information about decapod crustacean welfare on the company’s website (as an integral part of customer communications and engagement).</li> <li>• On-pack or on-shelf labelling – provided this is evidenced on the company’s website, in its published reports or on social media platforms. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information leaflets or information packs.</li> <li>• Media promotions.</li> <li>• Supporting third party campaigns or programmes on decapod crustacean welfare.</li> <li>• Social media campaigns.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>Scoring</b>	No evidence of promoting decapod crustacean welfare to consumers.	0
	At least one example of promoting decapod crustacean welfare to consumers.	5
	<b>(Max score 5)</b>	

Performance Reporting and Impact		
<b>Question 19.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of decapod crustaceans in the company’s supply chain that are humanely stunned and slaughtered?</b>	

<b>Rationale</b>	<p>Companies making public commitments to humane stunning and slaughter of decapod crustaceans should report on the proportion that are humanely stunned and slaughtered.</p> <p>Decapod crustaceans should only be stunned using electrical stunning, resulting in instantaneous* insensibility to pain and distress or where insensibility is induced without causing pain and distress. This insensible state must be maintained until death occurs. Stunning methods that are not supported include: chilling, wet/ice chilling, chemical anaesthetics, CO2 gassing.</p> <p><u>Following effective stunning, slaughter/killing should be performed immediately and using a method where the insensible state persists until death occurs, without pain or distress.</u></p> <p>*within one second</p>	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on the proportion of decapod crustaceans that are humanely stunned and slaughtered	0
	The company reports on the proportion of decapod crustaceans that are humanely stunned and slaughtered, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of decapod crustaceans that are humanely stunned and slaughtered, covering all relevant geographies, species and products	5
	<b>(Max score 5)</b>	

<b>Question 20.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of decapod crustaceans in the company's supply chain that are free from non-therapeutic mutilations?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	Companies making public commitments to avoidance of mutilations of decapod crustaceans should report on the proportion that are free from non-therapeutic mutilations. Non-therapeutic mutilations include eyestalk ablation, claw nicking and de-clawing	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on the proportion of decapod crustaceans that are free from non-therapeutic mutilations	0
	The company reports on the proportion of decapod crustaceans that are free from non-therapeutic mutilations, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of decapod crustaceans that are free from non-therapeutic mutilations, covering all relevant geographies, species and products	5

	<b>(Max score 5)</b>	
--	----------------------	--

<b>Question 21.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of decapod crustaceans in the company's supply chain transported within specified transport times?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain strict measurement criteria for animals in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the live transportation of decapod crustaceans in their supply chains.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on the proportion of decapod crustaceans transported within specified transport times	0
	The company reports on the proportion of decapod crustaceans transported within specified transport times, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3
	The company reports fully on the proportion of decapod crustaceans transported within specified transport times, covering all relevant geographies, species and products	5
	<b>(Max score 5)</b>	

<b>Question 22.</b>	<b>Does the company report on the proportion of decapod crustaceans captured using specified capture methods?</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	In addition to having clear policy commitments and management practices, companies are expected to maintain measurement criteria for decapod crustaceans in their supply chain. This question is looking specifically at measures linked to the capture method used for different species of decapod crustaceans. The many, often severe challenges faced by decapod crustaceans during capture or harvesting are the cause of very significant welfare issues. These are suffered both at the time and also in the longer term, having an impact on the welfare and survival during onward travel and storage. Measuring and reporting on capture method is an important step in addressing welfare during capture and moving to less harmful methods of capture.	
<b>Scoring</b>	No reporting on the proportion of decapod crustaceans captured using specified capture methods	0
	The company reports on the proportion of decapod crustaceans captured using specified capture methods, but this reporting is limited to certain geographies, species or products.	3

	The company reports fully on the proportion of decapod crustaceans captured using specified capture methods, covering all relevant geographies, species and products	5
	<b>(Max score 5)</b>	

## Benchmark Timeline 2022

### September - October 2022

- Publication of finalised Benchmark methodology (27<sup>th</sup> September)
- Independent evaluation of companies against the published methodology (27<sup>th</sup> September – 3<sup>rd</sup> October)
- Preliminary assessments shared with companies for review (11<sup>th</sup> October – 31<sup>st</sup> October).  
Review of preliminary assessments by companies, addition of unpublished information to the assessment.

### January 2023

- Final assessments shared with companies
- Publication of Benchmark report by Crustacean Compassion

Crustacean Compassion would like to thank the organisations that took the time to respond to the public consultation, and we look forward to continued engagement with stakeholders as we further develop the benchmark in the years to come.

If you have any questions about the benchmark, please contact Jane Bush:

[j.bush@crustaceancompassion.org](mailto:j.bush@crustaceancompassion.org)