SUPERLIST SOCIAL 2023

Comparative Criteria

SUPER LIST

Comparative Criteria Social 2023

December 2022

Version 1.1 (15 December 2022)
Copyright Questionmark

Authors: Pien Nijpjes, Gustaaf Haan, Willem van Engen - Cocquyt

Content

Background	**3**
This document	**4**
Issues and measures	**5**
Overview of measures and indicators	**8**
Indicators	**12**
References	**62**
Annexes	**64**

Background

Relationship to Oxfam's Behind the Barcodes Rankings.
Superlist Social builds on Oxfam Novib's Behind the Barcodes research. Wherever possible within the framework of Superlist, we have adopted Behind the Barcodes methodology. All adjustments were made in consultation with Oxfam Novib and Solidaridad.

However, we would like to stress that the Behind the Barcodes supermarkets rankings and the Superlist Social are not directly comparable. The adjustments made, include a substantial reduction in the number of indicators, assigning a heavier weighting to indicators that represent a far-reaching change and a tightening of indicators. In particular, indicators on stakeholder engagement and qualitative implementation of previously made commitments, such as action plans that follow from human rights impact assessments, have been tightened. The aim is to properly monitor the improvements that supermarkets have initiated as a result of Behind the Barcodes. In addition, regulations on human rights due diligence are subject to change, with new legislation in Germany taking effect on 1 January 2023 and legislation in preparation in the Netherlands and the European Union.

The indicators represent a selection of key steps that supermarkets should take to better respect human rights in food supply chains, both at home and abroad. However, this is not an exhaustive list and even if a supermarket scored 100%, it would not mean that its human rights policy and practice is fully in order.

Unlike Behind the Barcodes, Superlist puts a lot of emphasis on mutual differences between supermarkets: the score in Superlist Social will illustrate who are relative frontrunners and laggards. In addition, the score gives a good indication of how far a supermarket is in this area. With this, we want to encourage all supermarkets to continuously improve their human rights policy and practice, and especially show the laggards that they can and should do more.

This document

This document describes the comparative criteria for the first edition of Superlist Social 2023 from research project Superlist. The criteria for Superlist Social 2023 are designed to help supermarkets monitor their contribution to a fairer food system and compare themselves with each other in that respect.

Comparative criteria are described at three levels in each case:

- The **issues**: the problems in the food system that call for solutions to which supermarkets can make a substantial contribution.
- The **measures** a supermarket can take to address the issue.
- The **indicators** that measure the extent to which supermarkets take the desired measures. Each indicator has a weighting, reflecting its relative importance to the theme as a whole.

The general methodology for superlist research and comparison is described in the document *'Superlist Research Framework'* (Haan et al., 2022), available at www.superlijst.org. In that document we indicate, among other things, how we collect data and how the results are displayed. That document also indicates how different stakeholders from society have been involved in the development of these comparative criteria.

Supermarkets

The Superlist Social researches in 2023 include the following supermarket chains: Albert Heijn, Jumbo, Lidl, Aldi, Plus, Dirk and Ekoplaza. This selection was chosen because it represents over 80% of the market and is equal to the selection of the previously released Superlists in 2020 and 2021.

Research period

The research period for Superlist Social 2023 runs from **19 December 2022** to the last reference date on **15 February 2023**. Supermarkets that publish significant changes in policy can communicate these changes to Questionmark up to and including the last reference date. This way, supermarkets can ensure that the latest situation is included in the research. Information can be provided at: transparantie@thequestionmark.org.

Issues and measures

The following is an overview of the issues targeted by the comparison Superlist Social. The issues were selected using the *'Research principles'* included in the *'Superlist Research Framework'* (Haan et al., 2022). This sets out how topics are selected for each issue, in consultation with supermarkets, social partners and the Scientific Council. A central condition in this is the following: "The comparative criteria address the main problems that require solutions and to which supermarkets can make a substantial contribution." For other conditions, please refer to the Research Framework.

Structure of the method
For each issue, a number of measures are listed that supermarkets can take. Later in the document, indicators are formulated by which these measures can be measured at supermarkets. Taken individually, these indicators are not exhaustive. The aim is that the indicators taken together give a good indication of a supermarket's commitment to an issue. All measures and indicators belonging to an issue are numbered[1] so that matching parts of this method can be easily identified. An overview of all issues, measures and indicators is given in the next chapter.

Issue 1: Transparency and Accountability

Supermarket shelves contain products from all over the world. Supermarkets bear a responsibility to adopt responsible policies to ensure that human rights violations in these supply chains are prevented and addressed. We therefore ask supermarkets to be transparent about policies and practices. In this way, we seek to encourage practices that protect, respect and observe human rights in global food supply chains.

Indicators under the theme 'Transparency and accountability' compare measures taken by supermarkets to implement transparent policies on human rights due diligence. Crucial to this are public commitments to respect human rights, conducting human rights impact assessments and implementing grievance mechanisms to address and remedy negative impacts.

[1] The letters 'HR-' stand for *human rights*. This is how we distinguish these items from the comparitive criteria for the other Superlist themes: 'HE' (health), 'EN' (environment) and 'AW' (animal welfare).

Issue 2: Workers

Globally, tens of millions of people work in food supply chains. As a result, this sector has the potential to contribute to the fight against poverty and inequality. Unfortunately, conditions in this sector are not always favourable for workers: long hours, little to no pay, dangerous working conditions and poor living conditions are just a few examples of abuses workers face. In addition, some chains use child labour (ILO, 2022a).

Indicators under the 'Workers' theme compare the measures taken by supermarkets to safeguard workers' rights. Crucial to this are fair sourcing practices, supporting living wages and supporting workers' rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining.

Issue 3: Small-scale farmers

Small-scale farmers are food producers who are not structurally dependent on permanent hired labour and carry out their production mainly with family members. This includes small-scale farmers, cattle farmers, fisherfolk and other food producers. Small-scale farmers grow food globally on relatively small plots of land for both local and international markets (Ricciardi et al., 2018). Small-scale farmers are recognised for their crucial role in global food supply, but their rights are inadequately protected and their contribution inadequately rewarded. Examples of abuses faced by small-scale farmers include inadequate protection of land rights, uncertainty about market access and supply conditions, unequal power relations in trade relationships and, as a result, too low prices for their products. Added to this is the enormous challenge of climate change that directly threatens farmers' livelihoods. Millions of small-scale farmers and their families live below the poverty line as a result.

Indicators under the theme 'Small-scale farmers' compare measures taken by supermarkets to respect the rights of small-scale farmers to a
a decent standard of living. Crucial to this is ensuring that supermarkets' own sourcing practices do not harm small-scale agriculture, encouraging small-scale farmers to organise collectively, and pleading with local governments to support small-scale farmers. This chapter aims to bring about an improvement in the conditions of small-scale farmers in current chains, not to completely phase out (intermediate) suppliers.

Issue 4: Gender

Women make up a large proportion of workers and small-scale farmers in the food and agriculture sector. But because of deeply rooted gender norms around the world, women are mostly concentrated in the lowest-paid and least secure roles in

global food supply chains. Workplace violence, discrimination, lower wages and insufficient to no compensation are examples of abuses women face globally. In addition to women, people from the LGBTI+ community also disproportionately face discrimination. The 'Women' issue from the Behind the Barcodes research was therefore changed to the more inclusive term 'Gender'.

Indicators under the 'Gender' theme compare measures taken by supermarkets to address gender inequality in chains. Crucial to this is adherence to the UN Women's Empowerment Principles, tracking and disclosure of key gender-disaggregated data on work and conditions, and encouraging suppliers to address causes of gender inequality.

Overview of measures and indicators

HR-1 Transparency and Accountability

Desired measures		Indicators		Weight
HR-1.1	The supermarket is committed to respecting human rights.	HR-1.1.1	Does the supermarket make an explicit commitment to uphold the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and report annually on progress?	1
HR-1.2	The supermarket implements a robust due diligence framework.	HR-1.2.1	Does the supermarket implement a human rights due diligence process aligned with OECD Guidelines and the UNGPs?	1
		HR-1.2.2	Does the supermarket demonstrate how it ceases, prevents and mitigates human rights risk in food supply chains?	1
		HR-1.2.3	Does the supermarket annually conduct and publish a broad risk scoping?	1
HR-1.3	The supermarket assesses the impacts of its supply chain activities on rightsholders.	HR-1.3.1	Has the supermarket committed to conducting at least three human rights impact assessments per year?	1
		HR-1.3.2	Has the supermarket published at least three human rights impact assessments per year?	1
		HR-1.3.3	Does the supermarket report annually on the actions taken to address the identified human rights impacts?	1,5
HR-1.4	The supermarket traces and discloses information about its supply chains.	HR-1.4.1	Does the supermarket disclose the names and addresses of all first-tier food suppliers?	1
		HR-1.4.2	Does the supermarket disclose the names and addresses of suppliers along all tiers of its high-risk food categories?	1,5
HR-1.5	The supermarket demonstrates that its buying practices align with the company's human rights strategy.	HR-1.5.1	Does the company demonstrate how it eliminates unfair trading practices?	1
		HR-1.5.2	Does the supermarket proactively implement fair trading practices?	1
		HR-1.5.3	Do the supermarket's buying practices actively contribute to a redistribution of power in the supply chain that benefits rightsholders and the environment?	2

HR-1.6	The supermarket ensures that people affected by its supply chain activities have access to grievance mechanisms and remedies.	HR-1.6.1	Does the supermarket have a public policy and time-bound plan for ensuring that rightsholders across all its highest supply chains have access to effective grievance mechanisms and to remedy?	1,5
		HR-1.6.2	Does the supermarket publicly report on progress of implementation of the grievance mechanism, including measures to overcome barriers to access?	1

HR-2 Workers

Desired measures		Indicators		Weight
HR-2.1	The supermarket has robust policies in place to ensure respect for labour rights in its food supply chains.	HR-2.1.1	Does the supermarket publicly recognise the systemic nature of labour rights violations in global supply chains and seek to understand the root causes?	1
		HR-2.1.2	Has the supermarket published labour rights policies for its supply chains in line with the ILO labour standards?	1
		HR-2.1.3	Has the supermarket committed to proactively preventing forced labour in its food supply chains?	1
HR-2.2	The supermarket supports suppliers across all food supply chains to implement labour standards.	HR-2.2.1	Does the supermarket support suppliers to enable respect for human rights and labour standards?	1
		HR-2.2.2	Does the supermarket positively incentivise suppliers that demonstrate continuous improvement in labour conditions?	1,5
		HR-2.2.3	Does the supermarket demonstrate that it engages suppliers to improve when labour exploitations are exposed without a 'cut and run' approach?	1
HR-2.3	The supermarket takes action to enable workers to organise across all food supply chains.	HR-2.3.1	Has the supermarket published action plans and time-bound milestones to remove barriers to freedom of association?	1
		HR-2.3.2	Does the supermarket demonstrate the actions it has taken to remove barriers to freedom of association across its food supply chains and report on progress?	1
HR-2.4	The supermarket takes action to ensure that workers in food supply chains are paid at minimum a living wage.	HR-2.4.1	Has the supermarket made a commitment to close the living wage gap?	1
		HR-2.4.2	Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to close the living wage gap and report on progress in its food supply chains?	1,5
HR-2.5	The supermarket actively involves stakeholders to improve conditions for workers.	HR-2.5.1	Does the supermarket regularly engage relevant stakeholders with the aim of improving conditions for workers in food supply chains?	1,5
HR-2.6	The supermarket advocates for the rights of workers.	HR-2.6.1	Has the supermarket publicly advocated for the rights of workers in food supply chains?	1

HR-3 Small Scale Farmers

Desired measures		Indicators		Weight
HR-3.1	The supermarket supports small-scale farmers in all food supply chains to increase their resilience and prosperity.	HR-3.1.1	Does the supermarket provide support to small-scale farmers in its food supply chains?	1
		HR-3.1.2	Does the supermarket report on progress in supporting small-scale farmers?	1
HR-3.2	The supermarket ensures fair deals for small-scale farmers in all food supply chains.	HR-3.2.1	Has the supermarket committed to ensuring fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing from small-scale farmers?	1
		HR-3.2.2	Does the supermarket demonstrate how its sourcing practices encourage suppliers to provide fair, transparent, stable and long-term deals to small-scale farmers?	1,5
HR-3.3	The supermarket's sourcing practices strengthen the negotiating power of small-scale farmers.	HR-3.3.1	Has the supermarket committed to supporting small-scale farmers to organise collectively?	1
		HR-3.3.2	Does the supermarket demonstrate how it supports small-scale farmers to organise collectively?	1,5
HR-3.4	The supermarket takes action to ensure that small-scale farmers in food supply chains yield at minimum a living income.	HR-3.4.1	Has the supermarket made a commitment to close the living income gap?	1
		HR-3.4.2	Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to close the living income gap and report on progress in its food supply chains?	1,5
HR-3.5	The supermarket promotes a fair distribution of benefits and profits in all food supply chains.	HR-3.5.1	Has the supermarket committed to a fair distribution of value in food supply chains, benefitting small-scale farmers?	1
		HR-3.5.2	Is the supermarket transparent about the current distribution of value and profit in food supply chains?	1,5
		HR-3.5.3	Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to increase the share of value received by small-scale farmers and report on progress?	1,5
HR-3.6	The supermarket actively involves stakeholders to improve conditions for small-scale farmers.	HR-3.6.1	Does the supermarket regularly engage relevant stakeholders with the aim of improving conditions for small-scale farmers in food supply chains?	1,5
HR-3.7	The supermarket advocates for the rights of small-scale farmers.	HR-3.7.1	Has the supermarket publicly advocated for the rights of small-scale farmers in food supply chains?	1

HR-4 Gender

Desired measures		Indicators		Weight
HR-4.1	The supermarket is committed to upholding and implementing the UN Women's Empowerment Principles.	HR-4.1.1	Has the supermarket signed the UN Women's Empowerment Principles?	1
		HR-4.1.2	Does the supermarket demonstrate how it encourages suppliers to sign the UN Women's Empowerment Principles?	1
		HR-4.1.3	Has the supermarket published a gender policy for its operations and supply chains?	1
HR-4.2	The supermarket takes action to understand gender inequality in its food supply chains.	HR-4.2.1	Does the supermarket systematically track and disclose gender-disaggregated data about its food supply chains?	1
		HR-4.2.2	Does the supermarket recognise and disclose the specific challenges that women in food supply chains face and seek to understand and address root causes?	1
HR-4.3	The supermarket takes action to improve the position of women in all food supply chains.	HR-4.3.1	Has the supermarket committed to closing the gender pay gap in its food supply chains?	1
		HR-4.3.2	Has the supermarket committed to implementing an action plan and time-bound milestones to address gender-based violence?	1
		HR-4.3.3	Has the supermarket published action plans and timebound milestones to improve the position of women?	1
		HR-4.3.4	Does the supermarket systematically report progress on improving the position of women in food supply chains?	1,5
HR-4.4	The supermarket takes action to enable respect for women's rights across food supply chains.	HR-4.4.1	Has the company developed strong supply chain partnerships that enable women's rights to be respected?	1
		HR-4.4.2	Does the supermarket positively incentivise suppliers that demonstrate continuous improvement in addressing gender inequality?	1,5
HR-4.5	The supermarket actively involves stakeholders to improve conditions for women.	HR-4.5.1	Does the supermarket regularly engage relevant stakeholders with the aim of improving conditions for women in food supply chains?	1,5
HR-4.6	The supermarket advocates for the rights of women.	HR-4.6.1	Has the supermarket publicly advocated for the rights of women in food supply chains?	1

Indicators

To measure the extent to which supermarkets are already taking the measures mentioned above, we use the following indicators, grouped by measure.
Again, it is not possible to fully cover every measure by indicators. In specific cases, we have explained the choice of indicator below. General considerations for the indicators below are described in the Research Framework.
For this research, we only include documents that are public and findable through the supermarket's own website.

TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY (HR-1)

HR-1.1 Commitment to respect human rights

Explanation
Respecting human rights should be a high priority at every organisation, in every sector. In organisations with many workers, small-scale farmers, women and other stakeholders in multi-country supply chains, such as supermarkets, it is especially important to have a keen eye for human rights.

The United Nations (UN) published the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) in 2011 (UN, 2011a). The UNGPs provide guidance for organisations (such as supermarkets) to report on human rights risks. The UNGPs consist of a set of principles that companies must adhere to. Following the UNGPs is a way for supermarkets to ensure that human rights are respected in all countries where the supermarket operates (in)directly. The supermarket can also use the UNGPs to monitor that it does business with respect for human rights, and to track its progress.

See Annex 2 for more information on guidelines and international standards.

Indicator HR-1.1.1	commitment
Does the company make an explicit commitment to uphold the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and report annually on progress?	

Measurement and weighting
For this indicator, we examine in public publications of the supermarket to what extent the supermarket has made an explicit commitment to apply the UNGPs. The commitment should meet the following conditions:

- The commitment has been endorsed by the supermarket's operational management.
- The commitment indicates who from the operational management is responsible for this.
- The commitment recognises the supermarket's obligation to respect human rights both in its own operations and supply chains and in the operations of companies it does business with.

In addition, we examine whether the supermarket regularly reports on the operational management's involvement in human rights risks, as required by the UNGPs. Here, we look for reporting from the operational management. Reporting should meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket reports at least once a year on the operational management's discussions on human rights risks in its supply chains.
- The report indicates how the operational management secures respect for human rights.
- The report describes the concrete actions taken by operational management over the past year to identify and address human rights violations in supply chains.

Weighting in the rankings
Supermarkets are awarded points according to the table below.

Part of indicator	Points
Commitment to follow the UNGPs	1 point
Reporting on last financial year	4 points

Table 1. Scoring system for indicator HR-1.1.1

The key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. This number is not scaled; 5 points yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

HR-1.2 Due diligence

Explanation
A robust due diligence process helps a supermarket address human rights violations in the supply chain. As a definition of due diligence, we use the UN definition: *"Taking adequate measures to identify, prevent, where possible, and mitigate potential adverse human rights impacts, remediate actual impacts, and account for how these adverse human rights impacts are addressed."* (UN, 2011b)

Several methods are available for establishing a due diligence process. The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) published guidelines for multinational enterprises in 2011 (OECD, 2011). These OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises are recommendations made by governments, including the Dutch government, to multinational companies on international corporate social responsibility. In addition, the OECD has developed guides aimed at the practical application of the OECD Guidelines, with tools for companies to deal with human rights risks.

See Annex 2 for more information on guidelines and international standards.

Indicator HR-1.2.1	policy
Does the supermarket implement a human rights due diligence process aligned with OECD Guidelines and the UNGPs?	

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether the supermarket implements a due diligence process in line with the OECD Guidelines and UNGPs, looking at publicly published policies describing this process. The policy must meet the following conditions:

- The policy explicitly refers to the OECD Guidelines and the UNGPs and cites these guidelines as the basis for its own due diligence process.
- The policy describes the six steps from the OECD Guidance to be followed.
- The policy applies to all supply chains.

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. That key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-1.2.2	report
Does the supermarket demonstrate how it ceases, prevents and mitigates human rights risk in food supply chains?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we are looking at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The supermarket reports at least once a year on the implementation of due diligence, including a description of actions taken to mitigate, address and prevent human rights risks.
- The report shows that stakeholders and Rightsholders, including trade unions and civil society organisations, have been actively involved in the implementation of the policy. It states who are involved, how this was done and how stakeholders' views were taken into account.

Weighting in the rankings
Reporting that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. That key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-1.2.3	report
Does the company annually conduct and publish a broad risk scoping?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we search public publications to see if the supermarket has published a risk analysis that meets the following conditions:

- The risk analysis contains a substantiated inventory of all supply chains with a high risk of human rights violations (high-risk supply chains).
    - This inventory should allow the supermarket to prioritise the most significant risk areas for further investigation. Steps 2.2 to 2.4 in the OECD Guidance can be followed for this purpose.
- The prioritisation of risks the supermarket will address is substantiated in line with the UNGPs and the OECD Guidance (steps 2.2 to 2.4).
- The supermarket publishes an update of the risk analysis at least once a year.

Weighting in the rankings
Publication that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. That key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

HR-1.3 Human rights impact assessment

Explanation
A human rights impact assessment (HRIA)[2] is a tool to investigate and address human rights risks. An HRIA aims to identify the impact that business activities have, have had or could have on human rights, based on which supermarkets can ensure improvement.

Meaningful engagement[3] of stakeholders is essential in HRIAs. Stakeholders here are Rightsholders and the organisations that represent them. They are the individuals and groups affected by business activities and it is their rights that must be respected. Stakeholders may include, for example, formal and informal workers, small-scale farmers and women in supply chains, and Indigenous people and communities in the vicinity of company facilities or activities. Supermarkets should involve these groups in determining how to take action to improve their conditions.

[2] Guidance can be found in the Community Based Human Rights Impact Assessment Initiative by Oxfam.
[3] Meaningful engagement refers to active, regular and constructive communication with stakeholders, including clear feedback to action plans.

Indicator HR-1.3.1 commitment

Has the supermarket committed to conducting at least three human rights impact assessments per year?

Measurement and weighting

We examine whether the supermarket has committed to publish at least three HRIAs per year. Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket promises to publish a minimum of three HRIAs annually.
- The supermarket promises to start this no more than two years after the commitment.

Weighting in the rankings

Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. That key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-1.3.2 report

Has the supermarket published at least three human rights impact assessments per year?

Measurement and weighting

Here, we look in public publications whether the supermarket publishes at least three HRIAs per year. These HRIAs must meet at least the following conditions:

- The HRIA covers all relevant human rights impacts in the supply chain. The human rights in the HRIA correspond to all internationally recognised human rights expressed in:
    - The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN, 1948), and
    - The ILO Declaration (ILO, 2022b).
- The HRIA includes an action plan to address risks. The action plan should:
    - specify which resources have been allocated, and
    - include the roles and responsibilities to implement the proposed measures, and
    - include a timeline to address adverse effects, and
    - show how the supermarket will address the causes, and
    - specify the expected results, and
    - specify how the supermarket will monitor progress.
- The HRIA includes meaningful stakeholder engagement during all phases of research. The HRIA describes how stakeholders have been involved:
    - Detailed explanation of sample selection with gender breakdown, and
    - Engaging Rightsholders with diverse views, with a focus on the most vulnerable groups, and

- How was chosen to sample participants from at least each of the following relevant groups:
    - Farmers in supply chain, small-scale farmers or farmers' cooperatives (if relevant).
    - Workers (including migrant workers) from farms and fisheries, worker families, workers from other stages of the supply chain where relevant (e.g., at factories, transport, distribution centres and retail).
    - Workers' associations, trade unions.
    - Affected communities, including women, minorities and vulnerable groups.
    - Civil society organisations, women's rights organisations and indigenous groups, religious leaders and/or relevant religious organisations.

Bonus points
The supermarket can yield bonus points by publishing at least one HRIA a year that focuses on gender equality. It recognises the intersectionality[4] of impacts. The HRIA on gender equality must meet the following conditions:

- The HRIA identifies elements that affect human rights, such as underlying gender inequality.
- The HRIA includes analysis disaggregated by gender and recognising intersectionality of effects.
- Transparency on data collection and processing:
    - gender considerations in data collection and processing, and
    - detailed explanation of sample selection with gender breakdown and efforts to speak to women individually, and
    - how a gender balance was maintained in the selection of respondents.
- The action plan contains gender-specific recommendations and planned activities that address gender inequality.

Weighting in the rankings
Each published HRIA that meets all the conditions yields 1 point. Publishing three HRIAs yields 5 bonus points. An HRIA that pays special attention to gender equality yields 1 bonus point. The key figure is the sum of the basic points and the bonus points. To determine the score, this number is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 10, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-1.3.3	report
Does the supermarket report annually on the actions taken to address the identified human rights impacts?	

[4] By intersectionality, we mean the overlapping risks of marginalisation related to intersecting axes of identity, such as ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, skin colour and health.

Measurement and weighting
The HRIA and action plan provide supermarkets with tools to address human rights risks. We examine whether the supermarket takes action and reports on addressing human rights risks in supply chains. Reporting must meet the following requirements:

- The report describes how the supermarket implemented the action plan in practice and what steps were taken.
- The report describes what impact the action plan has had and which goals have been achieved.
- The report describes with which relevant stakeholders the supermarket has consulted on implementation.
- The reporting is repeated annually until an action plan is fully implemented.
- The reporting should start within a year of publication of the HRIA and action plan.

Weighting in the rankings
Reporting that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-1.4 Transparency about the supply chains

Explanation
For an effective due diligence process, transparency is essential. Besides the importance of transparency on the process itself, transparency on supplier relations is also important. It is an important tool to promote active consultation with stakeholders and build the trust of this group and the general public.

Indicator HR-1.4.1	report
Does the supermarket disclose the names and addresses of all first-tier food suppliers?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we are looking at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The supermarket publishes on its website the names and addresses of all first-tier food suppliers. The supermarket may also refer to the specific location on the sourcing organisation's website where this information can be found. On reporting that involves only own brands, the own brand factor applies (see Annex 4).
- The supermarket (or sourcing organisation) updates the overview at least annually and clearly indicates the date on which the last update was.
- The supermarket claims that all first-tier suppliers are included in the list.

Weighting in the rankings
Reporting that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. That key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-1.4.2 report
Does the supermarket disclose the names and addresses of suppliers along all tiers of its high-risk food categories?

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket has made a commitment to disclose the names and addresses of all suppliers at all levels of a supply chain in all high-risk product types within two years.
- The supermarket disclosed the names and addresses of all suppliers at all levels of a supply chain in a high-risk product type.
- For animal product types, this extends to the animal feed layer.
- Relevant information should be published on the supermarket's website.
- When a supermarket has not published all suppliers, part of the points can still be awarded for publishing all own brand suppliers. In this case, the own brand factor applies (see Annex 4).

Some conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket disclosed the names and addresses of all suppliers at all levels of a supply chain in a high-risk product type.	The supermarket publishes all its own brand coffee suppliers.	The supermarket publishes all suppliers of all coffee that is on the shelves.
	The supermarket publishes all direct suppliers of all coffee.	The supermarket publishes all coffee suppliers along all layers of supply chains.
Relevant information should be published on the supermarket's website.	The information is only available through product packaging.	The information has been published on its own website.

Table 2. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-1.4.2

Weighting in the rankings
A commitment yields 3 points. Each product type whose suppliers are known yields 1 point. Disclosing suppliers in five product types yields 2 bonus points. The key figure is the sum of the basic points and the bonus points. To determine the score, this number is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 10, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-1.5 Sourcing practice and human rights policy

Explanation

Translating supermarkets' human rights policies into their sourcing practices is important to ensure that all relevant policies are aligned. Sourcing practices affect the extent to which human rights are respected in supply chains. Sourcing practices include agreements on various aspects, such as price negotiations, delivery terms, production conditions and quality requirements. Rules to make these agreements fair are laid down in both legal and voluntary international standards. Legally, there is the European UTP[5] directive, which in the Netherlands has been transposed into the Unfair Trading Practices Act. A voluntary standard is the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) Guide to Buying Responsibly.

See Annex 2 for more information on guidelines and international standards.

Indicator HR-1.5.1 policy

Does the company demonstrate how it eliminates unfair trading practices?

Measurement and weighting

We examine whether the supermarket demonstrates how it eliminates unfair trading practices[6] . For this, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket describes how it avoids each of the practices from the Unfair Trading Practices Act. The supermarket describes agreements with suppliers, which aim to eliminate the practices from the Unfair Trading Practices Act.
- The supermarket publicly explains how it complies with the minimum requirements of the Unfair Trading Practices Act.

One of the conditions is illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket explains how an unfair trading practice is avoided.	*"We are committed to eliminating unfair trading practices in line with EU Directive 2019/633."*	Publication of standard contract terms showing agreement, or an explanation of the company's contract terms regarding unfair trading practices, such as payment terms (30/60 days), cancellation conditions, etc.

Table 3. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-1.5.1

[5] UTP: Unfair Trading Practices

[6] We define unfair trading practices in line with ETI's Guide to Buying Responsibly.

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-1.5.2	policy
Does the supermarket proactively implement fair trading practices?	

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether a supermarket demonstrates how it implements fair sourcing practices in line with ETI's Guide to Buying Responsibly. In doing so, we look for fair sourcing policies in public publications that include at least the following practices:

- The supermarket never negotiates a price below the cost of production. At a minimum, this should include paying a living wage/income and the costs associated with sustainable production[7] .
- The supermarket supports suppliers in implementing labour standards and human rights as described in a Supplier Code of Conduct. This support consists of material and practical support such as funding and training.
- The supermarket maintains long-term and stable sourcing relationships with the small-scale farmers it buys from. The supermarket publishes the target around duration and volume of these relationships, examines the duration and volume of its current relationships, and ensures that these are aligned with the target and reports on this process.
- When placing orders, the supermarket maintains delivery times that do not lead to excessive working hours or outsourcing.
- The supermarket prevents last-minute order cancellations or changes by focusing on stable and predictable order volumes.
- The supermarket actively considers working conditions and human rights when selecting suppliers and refrains from terminating a supplier relationship purely on the basis of price or quality.
- For policies that involve only own brand products, the own brand factor applies (see Annex 4).

One of the conditions is illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
Support to suppliers to implement labour standards.	Oblige suppliers to sign a Supplier Code of Conduct.	Describe and report how the supermarket supports suppliers to implement labour standards, as defined in a Supplier Code of Conduct, for example by

[7] Costs associated with sustainable food production that uses processes and systems that do not pollute, protect natural resources, are economically efficient, safe and fair for workers, communities and consumers, and do not jeopardise the interests of future generations.

		providing financial support or training.

Table 4. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-1.5.2

Bonus points
A supermarket can yield bonus points by publishing examples of fair sourcing practices in high-risk product types. Each example yields 1 point.

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions yield 5 points. The key figure is the sum of the basic points and the bonus points. To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 10, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-1.5.3 report
Do the supermarket's sourcing practices actively contribute to a redistribution of power in the supply chain that benefits rightsholders and the environment?

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether a supermarket has sourcing practices that actively contribute to a redistribution of power in the supply chain that benefits Rightsholders. In doing so, we look at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The supermarket explains exactly what it does to redistribute power and put people and the environment first.
- The supermarket describes:
  - which stakeholders are being collaborated with (such as trade unions, farmers' cooperatives or women's organisations), and
  - how women are involved, and
  - What steps are being taken in collaboration with relevant stakeholders to achieve a fairer distribution of value and power.
- The report is less than two years old.

Some conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	**Meets**
The supermarket explains exactly what it does to redistribute power and put people and the environment first.	Commitments to living income without clarifying how this contributes to stakeholder-centred redistribution of power.	*"We are aware that our current business model hardly empowers workers and small-scale farmers in our supply chains. Therefore, we are analysing our business model on the basis*

		of handouts from the Wellbeing Economy Alliance[8] , Economy of the Common Good[9] or Doughnut Economy Action Lab[10] . We will report on the results by 2024 at the latest. "
The supermarket explains the steps being taken in collaboration with relevant stakeholders to achieve a fairer distribution of value and power.	Action plans to increase power and share of value of small-scale farmers without specific objectives or where farmers themselves do not play an active, equal role in the implementation of these activities.	*"In the cocoa chain, small-scale farmers receive X per cent on average, but the supermarket receives X per cent of the profits. For a healthy and fair value chain, it is vital to better distribute these profits, where small-scale farmers not only yield a living income, but an income that allows them and their communities to make a good living and invest in climate-proof food production. To this end, from 2023 we will distribute X part of our profit margin on chocolate sales to small-scale farmers, on top of the price required for a living income. To this end, we are collaborating with organisation X and farmers' cooperative Y."*

Table 5. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-1.5.3

Weighting in the rankings
Any supply chain where the supermarket can demonstrate a fair distribution of power yields 1 point. Three supply chains that comply yields 5 bonus points. The key figure is the sum of all points. To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 10, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 2.

HR-1.6 Access to grievance mechanism

Explanation
To address negative impacts in supply chains, supermarkets need to know when things are not going well. Workers, small-scale farmers, women and communities whose rights are not respected should be able to report it. A grievance mechanism helps the supermarket identify problems so that the supermarket can take action to stop negative impacts and contribute to redress and compensation. This grievance

[8] https://weall.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/The-Business-of-Wellbeing-guide-Web.pdf
[9] https://www.ecogood.org/apply-ecg/companies/
[10] DEAL's *Doughnut Design for Business* tool on November 7

mechanism should be accessible to all potentially disadvantaged Rightsholders, including workers and small-scale farmers, at all points in its supply chains. This is the supermarket's responsibility.

The supermarket can organise a grievance mechanism itself or in cooperation with other companies (e.g., through a trade association) or by a third party supported by the supermarket (e.g., a trade union). This can be one grievance mechanism that everyone can go to, or different grievance mechanisms for different supply chains.

See Annex 2 for more information on guidelines and international standards.

Indicator HR-1.6.1	policy
Does the supermarket have a public policy and time-bound plan for ensuring that rightsholders across all its highest risk supply chains have access to effective grievance mechanisms and to remedy?	

Measurement and weighting

We examine whether the supermarket has publicly published policies to provide potentially disadvantaged rightsholders in all high-risk supply chains with access to a grievance mechanism. In doing so, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The policy describes how workers and small-scale farmers in all high-risk supply chains can file grievances, <u>or</u>
- For high-risk supply chains where such a grievance mechanism is not yet organised, the policy describes the steps the supermarket will take to do so in the next two years.
- All potentially aggrieved rightsholders in all high-risk supply chains have access to a grievance mechanism.
- The grievance mechanisms comply with the requirements laid down in the UNGPs:
    - Legitimate: ensuring that the target group trusts the mechanism, being responsible for a fair grievance handling procedure.
    - Accessible: ensuring that the mechanism is known to the target group, and providing appropriate assistance to those who may face certain access barriers.
    - Predictable: provide a clear and known procedure including a timetable for each phase, clarity on possible follow-up steps and outcome, clarity on follow-up.
    - Equal: ensuring that aggrieved parties have reasonable access to sources of information, advice and expertise necessary to initiate a grievance procedure in a fair, informed and respectful manner.
    - Transparent: informing parties to a complaint of progress, providing sufficient information on the performance of the mechanism to build

confidence in its effectiveness, and meeting any public interest at stake.

Weighting in the rankings
A commitment yields 1 point. A supermarket that has already realised grievance mechanisms that meet the conditions yields 3 points. This key figure is not scaled; 4 points yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

Indicator HR-1.6.2 report
Does the supermarket publicly report on progress of implementation of the grievance mechanism, including measures to overcome barriers to access?

Measurement and weighting
In doing so, we look at publicly published annual reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The supermarket evaluates the functioning of grievance mechanisms for all high-risk supply chains and the results are published.
- When different groups of potentially disadvantaged Rightsholders access the grievance mechanism and they experience obstacles, the supermarket addresses them and identifies solutions.
- The supermarket pays particular attention to the barriers faced by women within these different groups of workers and small-scale farmers.
- The supermarket reports annually on the effectiveness of its grievance mechanism(s), including:
    - How many grievances were received by category (e.g., grouping by human rights, environment, corruption, etc) and what follow-up actions were taken.
    - An explanation showing that the supermarket knows the extent to which people with grievances trust and use the grievance mechanism.
    - A framework showing how the supermarket assesses the grievances process and the effectiveness of the outcomes.
    - An analysis of trends and patterns in the reporting period around concerns or grievances, outcomes related to salient issues, and lessons learned.
    - Examples of grievances related to salient problems in the reporting period (if any).
- Annual reporting shows that the supermarket contributes to timely remedial action when grievances are found to be justified.

Some conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket has	The supermarket lists	The risk analysis looks at

published a risk analysis for grievance mechanisms for all high-risk supply chains.	standard problems facing grievance mechanisms.	fundamental barriers to access or trust in grievance mechanisms, or target groups that experience additional barriers (women, migrants), focusing where necessary on specific barriers in particular chains.
The supermarket pays specific attention to the obstacles women face.	Women are not specifically mentioned in the grievance mechanism.	There is a balanced representation of men/women in the mechanism.
		The supermarket takes gender relations into account in its research.
		The supermarket accounts for higher proportion of low literacy among women.

Table 6. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-1.6.2

Weighting in the rankings

Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

WORKERS (HR-2)

HR-2.1 Labour rights policy

Explanation
Respecting and enforcing labour rights should be a focus of every organisation. Supermarkets work with many suppliers from all over the world, where it is important to check whether workers are treated well in all countries where a supermarket (in)directly operates or purchases. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) has drafted a declaration setting out the fundamental requirements for organisations to respect labour rights (ILO, 2022b). Following the standards in this declaration (or ILO standards) is a way for supermarkets to ensure that labour rights are respected, in all countries where the supermarket (in)directly purchases.

See Annex 2 for more information on guidelines and international standards.

Indicator HR-2.1.1 commitment
Does the supermarket publicly recognise the systemic nature of labour rights violations in global supply chains and seek to understand the root causes?

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether a supermarket publicly acknowledges (through a statement on its website) the systemic nature of labour rights violations in global supply chains as well as the need to understand their root causes. In doing so, we look for in public publications whether the supermarket acknowledges that:

- the worst abuses, including forced and child labour, often occur when governments fail to protect workers' rights and when the work of trade unions is obstructed, and
- in-work poverty can occur even when minimum legal standards are met, and
- decent work is often less attainable for women than for men, due to unequal gender norms and because women often have more unpaid care work, and
- supermarket business decisions can contribute to poor conditions in the supply chain, but also to their solutions.

Weighting in the rankings
A published document in which the supermarket acknowledges all the above points yields 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-2.1.2 policy
Has the supermarket published labour rights policies for its supply chains in line with the ILO labour standards?

Measurement and weighting

We examine whether a supermarket has published labour rights policies in line with ILO standards. Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The policy applies to all supply chains.
- The policy is based on ILO standards.
- The policy includes at least the following commitments[11] :
    1. No forced or child labour; if children are found working, their interests are protected.
    2. Freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining are maintained.
    3. No violent or degrading treatment, harassment or disciplinary practices that harm workers and protection against gender-based violence.
    4. No discrimination in recruitment, remuneration or promotion (based on gender, belonging to minority groups, having a disability, among others) and equal treatment of temporary workers and migrants.
    5. A safe healthy workplace with adequate rest periods, sufficient toilet breaks and access to drinking water, dignified and hygienic conditions for women.
- In addition, the policy contains at least three of the following commitments:
    6. Wages that ensure that workers and their families have a living income. Wages should be paid on time (at least once a month) and compensation should be provided for overtime.
    7. Decent living conditions for workers housed by the company (based on a recognised standard).
    8. No use of repeated temporary or zero-hours contracts to escape employment law responsibilities.
    9. Access to social protection, including paid sick leave and maternity leave, as well as protection in case of accidents or injuries.
    10. Working hours are not excessive.
    11. Effective remediation, including for child labour issues.
    12. Access to an effective grievance mechanism.

Weighting in the rankings

Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-2.1.3	commitment
Has the supermarket committed to proactively preventing forced labour in its supply chains?	

[11] These rights have been identified by the ILO as fundamental rights (*core conventions*). To score, a supermarket must make these fundamental rights explicit in its labour rights policy.

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The policy describes how the supermarket combats forced labour in supply chains, including in the recruitment of workers.
- The labour rights policy applies to all supply chains.

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

HR-2.2 Respecting labour standards

Explanation
A due diligence process aims to ensure that supermarkets support their suppliers and business relations in preventing and reducing negative impacts or risks. This can be done, for example, through training, improving facilities and strengthening their management systems, seeking continuous improvement.

Indicator HR-2.2.1 policy
Does the supermarket support suppliers to enable respect for human rights and labour standards?

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether a supermarket supports suppliers in respecting human rights and labour standards. This could include programmes or financial support to train suppliers and workers on human and/or labour rights, or facilitating access to trade unions.
Here, we are looking at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- For each product type, the supermarket explains how it supports suppliers to implement respect for human and labour rights.
- The supermarket makes this support available for the entire product type. For policies that cover only own brand products, the own brand factor applies (see Annex 4).

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
For each product type, the supermarket explains how it supports suppliers to implement respect for human and labour rights.	The supermarket, through a Supplier Code of Conduct, requires suppliers to comply with standards on health and safety in the workplace, but does not describe actions the supermarket takes to support suppliers to	The supermarket describes the approach to support measures that help suppliers improve and protect the health and safety of workers in factories and land-based workers, for example through financial

	implement these standards where necessary.	support, training and active monitoring.
The supermarket makes this support available for the entire product type.	The supermarket offers support to suppliers and producers of mangoes in Brazil, but not to suppliers and producers in the other countries where the supermarket buys mangoes.	The supermarket offers support for suppliers and products from all countries where mangoes are purchased. If all mangoes are purchased from one country, then that is enough. If mangoes come from several countries, then this is about the suppliers in all those countries.

Table 7. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-2.2.1

Weighting in the rankings
Each high-risk product type where support is available yields 1 point. Making support available in three high-risk product types yields 5 bonus points. The key figure is the sum of the base points and the bonus points.
Thus, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 10, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-2.2.2report
Does the supermarket positively incentivise suppliers that demonstrate continuous improvement in labour conditions?

Measurement and weighting
Here, we are looking at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The report contains examples of continuous improvements in working conditions and labour standards in supply chains based on dialogue, cooperation and trust between the supermarket and its supplier(s).
- The supermarket supports and rewards suppliers who show progress. Ways in which this can be done include:
    - joint business plans/long-term contracts incorporating mutual expectations on improving labour standards, or
    - agreements to (largely) absorb an increase to the living wage, or
    - price premiums that contribute to further improving working conditions, or
    - preferential purchase, more favourable lead time, larger order quantities and preferential payment terms, or
    - the supermarket contributes to solutions during peak seasons and when suppliers face problems.

- The supermarket demonstrates how these rewards contribute to better working conditions and reports on progress.

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The report includes examples of continuous improvements.	Report on a one-off initiative with a supplier.	The supermarket reports on the long-term improvement it is making with suppliers, reflects the steps that are being taken and will continue to be taken.
The supermarket rewards suppliers who show progress.	The supermarket asks suppliers for continuous improvement through a Supplier Code of Conduct, but imposes it as a requirement without support or reward.	The supermarket enters into a long-term contract with a supplier with a proven commitment to continuous improvement in working conditions.
The supermarket demonstrates how these rewards contribute to better working conditions and reports on progress.	Report on the use of a Supplier Scorecard or KPIs without publishing how they contribute to improvements in working conditions.	The supermarket reports on improvements expected from suppliers on working conditions and reports annually on support to and rewards for suppliers who make efforts on these issues.

Table 8. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-2.2.2

Weighting in the rankings
Each example that meets the conditions yields 1 point. Key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. Thus, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 5 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

Indicator HR-2.2.3 commitment
Does the company demonstrate that it engages suppliers to improve when labour exploitations are exposed without a 'cut and run' approach?

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether a supermarket makes a public commitment not to immediately drop its suppliers when worker exploitation is found, as well as whether the supermarket also shows how it supports suppliers. In doing so, we look in public publications whether the supermarket:

- has published a public commitment not to immediately drop suppliers when labour rights have been violated but will first try to improve the situation, and
- shows that it supports suppliers and other business relations in improving working conditions, for example through training, improving facilities and strengthening their management systems.

Weighting in the rankings
Each condition met yields 1 point. The key figure is the sum of all points. This key figure is not scaled; 2 points gives a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0. The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

HR-2.3 Possibility to organise collectively

Explanation
On issues such as income, working conditions and facilities, workers should be able to bargain collectively. In the EU, workers have the right to bargain collectively (EU, 2015). Supermarkets purchase through various supply chains, including from countries outside the EU. It is important that in all countries where the supermarket operates (in)directly, workers are supported by the supermarket to organise collectively.

Indicator HR-2.3.1	policy
Has the supermarket published action plans and time-bound milestones to remove barriers to freedom of association?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:
- The supermarket has published action plans with time-bound milestones to remove barriers to freedom of association in high-risk supply chains.
- The milestones are less than two years in the future.

Weighting in the rankings
Each supply chain in which the conditions are met yields 1 point. Publishing action plans and milestones for three supply chains, yields 5 bonus points. To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 10, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-2.3.2	report
Does the supermarket demonstrate the actions it has taken to remove barriers to freedom of association across its food supply chains and report on progress?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we are looking at public reporting that meets the following conditions:
- The report describes the actions the supermarket has taken to remove barriers to freedom of association in supply chains, for example by urging

certifiers to give unions a role in audits or by involving unions in creating and implementing action plans.
- The report describes the results achieved.

Weighting in the rankings
Each example yields 1 point. One example per supply chain counts. A supermarket with three examples from three supply chains, receives 5 bonus points. Key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. In theory, this key figure therefore has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 10 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

HR-2.4 Living wage

Explanation
Many countries have a statutory minimum wage. However, this minimum wage is often not sufficient to meet workers' basic needs. This is why we speak of a living wage as a minimum for workers in supply chains: the income workers should yield to achieve a decent standard of living for themselves and their families. Supermarkets should ensure that everyone employed in the supply chain receives a living wage. It is important that trade unions are involved in steps taken in this area.

Indicator HR-2.4.1	commitment
Has the supermarket made a commitment to close the living wage gap?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:
- The supermarket publicly acknowledges that legal minimum wages are often not enough to enable workers and their families to cover their basic living expenses and cope with emergencies.
- The supermarket is committed to working with workers, trade unions (if any) and/or civil society organisations and other stakeholders to:
    - develop living wage benchmarks (where these have not yet been developed), and
    - publish examples within its supply chains of the gap between prevailing wages and living wage benchmarks.
- The supermarket will report on its action on this within two years.

Weighting in the rankings
Each condition met by the supermarket yields 1 point. The key figure is the sum of all points. This number is not scaled; 4 points gives a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-2.4.2 policy

Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to close the living wage gap and report on progress in its food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting

Here, we look at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- For each product type, the supermarket publishes time-bound, elaborate actions showing progress on living wage.
    - For policies that involve only own brands, the own brand factor applies (see Annex 4).
- The supermarket publishes how workers, trade unions (if any) and/or with civil society organisations and other stakeholders are involved.

Weighting in the rankings

Each product type yields 1 point. A supermarket with three product types with elaborate plans, receives 5 bonus points. Key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. So, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 10 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.

The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-2.5 Engaging stakeholders

Explanation

To improve conditions for workers in their supply chains, supermarkets should engage stakeholders in their approach.

Indicator HR-2.5.1 report

Does the supermarket regularly engage relevant stakeholders with the aim of improving conditions for workers in food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting

Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket provides evidence that stakeholders are meaningfully engaged[12] as part of the strategy to respect labour rights in supply chains. Stakeholders include, for example, workers, trade unions or civil society organisations.
- Local organisations are represented among stakeholders.

[12] Meaningful engagement refers to active, regular and constructive communication with stakeholders, including clear feedback to action plans.

- The supermarket reports annually on stakeholder engagement, including lessons learned and next steps.

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket meaningfully engages stakeholders in its strategy to improve working conditions.	Membership to a Multi-stakeholder Initiative (MSI) without specific examples of active dialogue with stakeholders.	*"In 2022, we held several talks with union X about improving working conditions at Y. Based on these talks, our contract terms were adjusted."*

Table 9. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-2.5.1

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-2.6 Advocating for labour rights

Explanation
Supermarkets can publicly recognise the important role that governments and companies play in ensuring that labour rights are respected. They can urge governments to improve workers' rights in their own and other supply chains.

Indicator HR-2.6.1 commitment
Has the supermarket publicly advocated for the rights of workers in food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting
Here, we examine whether the supermarket publicly stands up for labour rights in supply chains. Here, we look at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- It involves actively contributing to public or political debate.
- In the appeal, the supermarket stands up for workers' rights, such as a call for legislation to better protect workers, initiatives to achieve a living income, or public recognition of the need for freedom of association.
- The content of the contribution has been made public.
- The contribution was expressed recently (less than two years ago) through a public platform.

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
It involves actively contributing to public or political debate.	Commitments in its own policy or website.	Recent press releases, media publications, endorsement of open letters or actions advocating for workers' rights.
The content of the contribution has been made public.	Contribution to behind-the-scenes political or administrative decision-making.	

Table 10. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-2.6.1

Weighting in the rankings

Publication that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

SMALL-SCALE FARMERS (HR-3)

HR-3.1 Support

Explanation
Some of the produce found in supermarkets comes from small-scale farmers. These include individuals who alone or as a community produce food for market and livelihood on a small scale, often using family labour[13]. The interests of these small-scale farmers need to be well represented throughout the chain to ensure that they can be resilient and prosperous and to prevent exploitation.

Indicator HR-3.1.1 policy
Does the supermarket provide support to small-scale farmers in its food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look for examples that show that the supermarket supports small-scale farmers in high-risk supply chains to become resilient and prosperous. Here, we look for publicly published policies including reporting that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket recognises the need to support small-scale farmers and identifies and selects relevant high-risk supply chains for direct or indirect support.
- The supermarket provides direct or indirect support to small-scale farmers through active projects and partnerships. The initiative supports small-scale farmers to become resilient and prosperous.
- The supermarket's main goal in the project is to improve the conditions of small-scale farmers.
- The supermarket provides recent (no more than two years ago) examples from three high-risk supply chains.

Some conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket provides direct or indirect support to small-scale farmers through active projects and partnerships.	Membership of a multi-stakeholder initiative (MSI).	Projects in which the supermarket plays an active role, whether or not in the context of an MSI and in collaboration with chain partners and stakeholders.

[13] We adopt a definition of small-scale farmers in line with Fairtrade, namely: Small-scale farmers are food producers who are not structurally dependent on permanent hired labour and carry out their production mainly with family members. This includes small-scale farmers, cattle farmers, fisherfolk and other food producers.

The supermarket's main goal in the project is to improve the conditions of small-scale farmers.	Projects that have a different primary focus than small-scale farmers, such as projects targeting large-scale plantations, workers or (intermediate) suppliers.	*"The goal of Project X is to achieve a living income for cocoa farmers in Ghana."*
The supermarket supports small-scale farmers to become resilient and prosperous.	Philanthropic donations that are not directly linked to small-scale farmers in a specific chain, such as cash donations to local hospitals or schools.	Projects in collaboration with chain partners and farmer cooperatives aimed at resilience and prosperity, such as living income, reducing dependence on agrochemicals, access to sustainable irrigation, crop diversification, or support in achieving certification.

Table 11. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-3.1.1

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions yield 3 points. Each example from a high-risk chain yields 1 point. In theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 6 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-3.1.2 report
Does the supermarket report on progress in supporting small-scale farmers?

Measurement and weighting
Here, we are looking at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The supermarket reports annually on measures taken to support small-scale farmers.
- The supermarket reflects on the progress of initiatives or projects and shares possible next steps based on the experiences and lessons learned.

One of the conditions is illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	**Meets**
The supermarket shares lessons learned and next steps.	*"In 2021, we started Project X, in which good progress was made in 2022. In 2025, we will report on the results."*	*"Participants in Project X reported that the English-language trainings were not accessible. This is why we use a local interpreter at follow-up trainings."*

Table 12. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-3.1.2

Weighting in the rankings
Reporting that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

HR-3.2 Fair agreements

Explanation
Supermarkets everywhere can enter into fair, transparent, stable and long-term agreements with small-scale farmers. In addition, supermarkets can support their suppliers to do the same.

Indicator HR-3.2.1 commitment
Has the supermarket committed to ensuring fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing from small-scale farmers?

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether a supermarket has committed to ensuring a fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing relationship (chain relationship) with small-scale food producers. Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket makes a company-wide commitment to ensure fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing in all supply chains[14] from small-scale farmers. This includes at least:
    - Long-term agreements with small-scale farmers and/or farmer cooperatives with stable and secure order volumes.
    - Fair prices that allow small-scale farmers to achieve at least a living income and cover the costs of sustainable production.

One of the conditions is illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
Company-wide commitment to ensure fair, transparent, stable and long-term supplies to small-scale food producers.	General description of the importance of a good relationship with small-scale farmers without specific commitments.	*"We pledge to adopt fair and transparent sourcing practices that ensure small-scale farmers receive a fair price for their produce, which allows them to yield at least a living income. We therefore enter into long-term contracts of at least X years with farmers'*

[14] Fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing refers to those practices that enable small-scale farmers to take self-determination over their lives, businesses and communities through trade.

		cooperatives in which we pay a living income premium on top of the market price. We do this in all chains, starting in those where small-scale farmers provide a significant share of production."

Table 13. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-3.2.1

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-3.2.2 report
Does the supermarket demonstrate how its sourcing practices encourage suppliers to provide fair, transparent, stable and long-term deals to small-scale farmers?

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether the supermarket supports its suppliers to enter into fair, transparent, stable and long-term agreements with small-scale farmers. For this, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket demonstrates how it ensures fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing[15] from small-scale farmers, including by supporting and encouraging suppliers to achieve this. This includes at least:
    - Long-term agreements with small-scale farmers and/or farmer cooperatives with stable and secure order volumes.
    - Fair prices that allow small-scale farmers to achieve at least a living income and cover the costs of sustainable production [16]
- The supermarket provides recent (maximum two years ago) examples of implemented policies from high-risk supply chains. To score, a supermarket should provide at least three examples from three high-risk supply chains.

One of the conditions is illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
Initiatives that support suppliers to enter into fair,	The supermarket is a member of MSIs. (Does not	Projects (whether in collaboration with third

[15] Fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing refers to those practices that enable small-scale farmers to take self-determination over their lives, businesses and communities through trade.
[16] Costs associated with sustainable food production using processes and systems that are non-polluting, protect natural resources, are economically efficient, safe and fair for workers, communities and consumers, and safeguard the interests of future generations.

transparent, stable and long-term agreements with small-scale farmers.	necessarily demonstrate an active role)	parties or not) working with suppliers to enter into fair agreements with small-scale farmers involving, as a minimum, long-term agreements and fair prices that cover at least a living income and sustainable production.
	Sourcing Fairtrade[17] products without active collaboration with suppliers, farmer cooperatives, civil society organisations and/or other stakeholders.	Active sourcing policy working with chain partners to achieve long-term fair price agreements with small-scale farmers (cooperatives).

Table 14. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-3.2.2

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions, including three examples, yield 5 points. Each additional example from high-risk supply chains, yields 1 point. Points are valid starting from three examples. In theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 10 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-3.3 Possibility of organising collectively

Explanation
Most small-scale farmers are self-employed. Forming farmer cooperatives can help small-scale farmers take a stronger position in negotiating for better conditions.

For the topic of farmers' rights, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas (UNDROP) can be used as guidance by supermarkets (UN, 2018).

Indicator HR-3.3.1 commitment
Has the supermarket committed to supporting small-scale farmers to organise collectively?

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether the supermarket has made a commitment to support the collective association of small-scale farmers. Here we look at public policies in which the supermarket endorses the rights of small-scale farmers to collectively associate and describes intended activities to support this. A commitment to respect the

[17] See Annex 3 for more information on the role of certification.

rights of small-scale farmers as defined in the UNDROP, including the right to collective association, also satisfies[18] .

Weighting in the rankings
Publications showing that the supermarket fulfils all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0. The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-3.3.2 report
Does the supermarket demonstrate how it supports small-scale farmers to organise collectively?

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether the supermarket supports the collective association of small-scale farmers. In doing so, we look at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The supermarket publishes examples of actions taken to support small-scale farmers to unite collectively. Examples of specific activities that comply are:
    - Supporting suppliers to respect the rights of small-scale farmers as defined in the UNDROP, including the right to collective association.
    - Purchasing from democratic small-scale farmers' cooperatives, farmers' unions or social enterprises owned by farmers' groups.
    - Offering fair and transparent contract terms to small-scale farmer cooperatives[19] and/or social enterprises.
    - Providing assistance to cooperatives or trade unions to enable them to acquire technical and organisational expertise, thereby increasing members' resilience and bargaining power.
    - Providing facilities and engage local governments, NGOs, suppliers, processors or other stakeholders in supporting small-scale farmers to organise.
- The supermarket provides specific examples in high-risk product types.
- The supermarket reports annually on progress on this issue.

One of the conditions is illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
Offer fair and transparent contract terms to small-scale farmer cooperatives and/or social enterprises.	The supermarket buys Fairtrade products without explaining how the supermarket supports small-scale farmers[20] .	The supermarket supports small-scale farmers to organise themselves into farmer groups/ associations so that they meet the

[18] Guidance can be found in Articles 8, 9, and 10 of UNDROP.
[19] This includes farmers' unions.
[20] See Annex 3 for more information on the role of certification.

		standards of certain sustainable certification bodies, such as Fairtrade and describes what this support consists of.

Table 15. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-3.3.2

Weighting in the rankings
Each example that meets all conditions will yield 1 point. Publishing three examples that meet all conditions yields 5 bonus points. Key figure for this indicator is the sum of the base points and the bonus points. Thus, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 10 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-3.4 Living income

Explanation
Small-scale farmers are independent entrepreneurs and are not protected by a statutory minimum wage. We therefore speak of a living income as a minimum for small-scale farmers in supply chains: the income that small-scale farmers should yield to achieve a decent standard of living for themselves and their families. Moreover, their income should enable them to build up a buffer against setbacks, and to make the necessary investments in making their production sustainable for the future. Supermarkets should ensure that everyone in the supply chain receives at least a living income.

Indicator HR-3.4.1	commitment
Has the supermarket made a commitment to close the living income gap?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket publicly acknowledges that small-scale farmers often do not yield enough to cover their basic living costs and emergency situations.
- The supermarket is committed to working with stakeholders to achieve a living income. Stakeholders include small-scale farmers, farmer cooperatives and/or civil society organisations.
- The supermarket commits to measure and publish the gap between actual income and living income. This commitment applies to a minimum of three high-risk product types and is less than two years in the future.

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket publicly acknowledges that small-scale farmers often do not yield enough to cover their basic living costs and emergencies.	*"By sourcing Fairtrade-certified products[21] , we ensure that farmers earn a fair income."*	*"Market prices are often insufficient for small-scale farmers to support themselves and their families to reasonable living standards. We are therefore committed to providing a living income from which farmers can cover their basic costs as well as unexpected expenses. To this end, we ensure that small-scale farmers receive at least a Living Income Reference Price."*
The supermarket is committed to working with stakeholders to achieve a living income. Stakeholders include small-scale farmers, farmer cooperatives and/or civil society organisations.	*"We will source Fairtrade-certified products as much as possible."*	*"We will start a project in 2023 together with Fairtrade and a local farmers' cooperative to establish and implement a living income price."*
The supermarket commits to measure and publish the gap between actual income and living income. This commitment applies to a minimum of three high-risk product types and is less than two years in the future.	*"We will set a premium to achieve a living income."*	*"We will conduct and publish a survey in 2023 to measure the gap between current income and living income based on the XYZ method in our coffee, cocoa and tea. Based on these measurements, we will set a premium to close the gap between current and living income. We aim to close the gap within two years."*

Table 16. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-3.4.1

Weighting in the rankings

Each of the three conditions met by the supermarket yields 1 point. The key figure is the sum of all points. This key figure is not scaled; 3 points gives a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-3.4.2 report

Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to close the living income gap and report on progress in its food supply chains?

[21] See Annex 3 for more information on the role of certification.

Measurement and weighting
Here, we are looking at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The supermarket publishes measured data on the gap between actual income and living income. This measurement should include at least the following information:
    - the average income of small-scale farmers in a specific supply chain, and
    - the living income according to an accepted standard, and
    - an assessment of the extent to which unpaid, cooperating family members, especially women, have disposal of earned income.
- The supermarket reports on progress in closing the living income gap in a specific supply chain, including specific activities, partnerships and measured progress.
- The supermarket shows how stakeholders (such as farmers' cooperatives and unions, civil society organisations) are involved.

Weighting in the rankings
Each supply chain whose reporting fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. Key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. Thus, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 5 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-3.5 Fair distribution of value

Explanation
Producers should receive fair compensation for their sold products, so that production costs are covered and labour is rewarded. Moreover, profits on a sold product should be shared fairly along the chain, and not go to one or a few party(parties). Small-scale producers do not always have the means to demand fair compensation for their products. Large-scale buyers, such as supermarkets, must ensure that they too receive fair compensation and their share of the profits. Supermarkets can contribute to fair value distribution throughout the chain.

Indicator HR-3.5.1	commitment
Has the supermarket committed to a fair distribution of value in food supply chains, benefitting small-scale farmers?	

Measurement and weighting
For this indicator, we examine whether the supermarket has made a commitment to fair value distribution in its supply chains in favour of small-scale farmers. The commitment must meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket has committed to pursue fair value distribution for small-scale farmers.

- Supermarket names what a fairer distribution of value means[22] .
- The supermarket gives examples of planned actions to achieve this fair value distribution.

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket has committed to fair value distribution for small-scale farmers.	Lack of a commitment or one that does not explicitly speak of fair value distribution.	*"We are committed to a fairer distribution of value in our chain, where small-scale farmers in particular should benefit more from their crops."*
The supermarket names what a fairer distribution of value means.	*"Small-scale farmers should receive a fair price for their produce."*	*"Farmers should receive a fair price for their produce from which they can at least cover all their living costs, production costs and sustainable investments, even if it comes at the expense of the profit margins of big companies in the chain."*
The supermarket gives examples of planned actions to achieve this fair value distribution.	Commitment to fair value distribution without explaining what the supermarket's own role or initiatives are in this.	*"To contribute to a fairer distribution, we will transfer part of our profit margin to small-scale farmers."*

Table 17. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-3.5.1

Weighting in the rankings
Publication that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-3.5.2 report
Is the supermarket transparent about the current distribution of value and profit in food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look for disclosure of the current value distribution in the chains in public supermarket publications. We look for value distribution throughout the supply chain. Data that must be disclosed to speak of a transparent value distribution are:
- The current share of revenue or profit by segment of the chain.

[22] A fair distribution of value is at least based on principles of justice, equality, and fundamental rights at the bottom line.

    - Here, at a minimum, the price that small-scale farmer receives for the product should be known.
- The share of yield required for sustainable production[23] by segment of the chain.
    - Here, at a minimum, it should be known what share of sustainable production is required for the small-scale farmer.
- This information is published for all segments of a supply chain in a standardised way (e.g., the number of euros per 1 kg of coffee).

Weighting in the rankings
The supermarket yields 5 points for each supply chain whose current and required share for the small-scale farmer is disclosed. The supermarket can yield more points by being transparent about multiple segments in the chain. The supermarket yields a maximum of 5 bonus points for each supply chain whose entire value distribution has been disclosed. A maximum of 10 points can therefore be yielded per supply chain. The key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. So, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this index number with flexible limits: the upper limit is 50 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

Indicator HR-3.5.3 report
Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to ensure small-scale farmers receive a fair share of value and report on progress?

We examine whether the supermarket takes action to increase the share of value received by small-scale farmers and reports on this. In doing so, we look at public reporting that meets the following conditions:
- The report describes the actions taken by the supermarket to achieve fair value distribution for small-scale farmers.
- The supermarket reports annually on its achievements and progress.

One of the conditions is illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	**Meets**
The report describes the actions taken by the supermarket to achieve fair value distribution for small-scale farmers.	*"We work to ensure fair value distribution for small-scale farmers from whom we buy our bananas."*	*"In 2022, we launched Project X, whose main objective is to achieve fair value distribution in our banana supply chain. An objective in this project is to distribute value more fairly, setting prices commensurate with the*

[23] Costs associated with sustainable food production using processes and systems that are non-polluting, protect natural resources, are economically efficient, safe and fair for workers, communities and consumers, and safeguard the interests of future generations.

		cost of sustainable production, taking into account at least a living income for farmers. We will report on progress in 2023."

Table 18. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-3.5.3

Weighting in the rankings
Each example yields 1 point. One example counts per supply chain. The key figure is the sum of all points. So, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 5 points, the lower limit is 1 point. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-3.6 Engaging stakeholders

Explanation
Supermarkets should engage stakeholders in the strategy to improve conditions for small-scale farmers.

Indicator HR-3.6.1 report
Does the supermarket regularly engage relevant stakeholders with the aim of improving conditions for small-scale farmers in food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting
Here, we are looking at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The supermarket provides evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement[24] as part of the strategy to improve conditions for small-scale farmers. Stakeholders might include farmer cooperatives, farmers' unions or civil society organisations.
- Local organisations are represented among stakeholders.
- The supermarket reports annually on stakeholder engagement, including lessons learned and next steps.

One of the conditions is illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket meaningfully engages	Membership to an MSI without specific examples of	*"In 2022, we held several talks with farmer*

[24] Meaningful engagement refers to active, regular and constructive communication with stakeholders, including clear feedback to action plans.

stakeholders in its strategy to improve conditions for small-scale farmers.	active dialogue with stakeholders.	*organisation X on achieving fair and transparent contracts with farmer cooperatives. Based on these talks, the contract terms and conditions were adjusted on points X and Y."*

Table 19. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-3.6.1

Weighting in the rankings
Reporting that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-3.7 Advocating for the rights of small-scale farmers

Explanation
Supermarkets can recognise the important role that governments and companies have in ensuring that small-scale farmers are resilient and prosperous, yield at least a living income and get a fair share of the value built up in food supply chains.

Indicator HR-3.7.1 commitment
Has the supermarket publicly advocated for the rights of small-scale farmers in food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting
Here, we examine whether the supermarket publicly stands up for the rights of small-scale farmers. For this, we look at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- It involves actively contributing to the public or political debate on the position of small-scale farmers.
- In the appeal, the supermarket stands up for farmers' rights, for example by calling for better protection of small-scale farmers by law, initiatives to achieve fair value distribution, or public recognition of the need to make small-scale farmers more resilient to climate change.
- The content of the contribution has been made public.
- The contribution was expressed recently (less than two years ago) through a public platform.

Some conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
It involves an active contribution to public or political debate.	Commitments in its own policy or website.	Recent press releases, media publications, endorsement of open letters

The content of the contribution has been made public.	Contribution to behind-the-scenes political or administrative decision-making.	or actions advocating for the rights of small-scale farmers.

Table 20. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-3.7.1

Weighting in the rankings

Reporting that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

GENDER (HR-4)

HR-4.1 Endorsing Principles of Gender Equality

Explanation
Every company should treat all workers equally. Sex, gender or sexual orientation should play no role in how workers are treated or involved. The UN has set out seven principles for companies to support women in the workplace, marketplace and community (UN, 2022). These principles should be high on every company's agenda and they should take action to comply with them. Supermarkets are no exception.

Indicator HR-4.1.1	commitment
Has the supermarket signed the UN Women's Empowerment Principles?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look for public publications showing that the supermarket has signed the UN Women's Empowerment Principles (UNWEP). A confirmation of (intention to) sign on the supermarket's own website is sufficient for this as long as the supermarket actually appears on the list of participants on UNWEP's website within a year. The list of signatories is publicly available at https://www.weps.org/companies.

Weighting in the rankings
Publications showing that the supermarket fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-4.1.2	commitment
Does the supermarket demonstrate how it encourages suppliers to sign the UN Women's Empowerment Principles?	

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether the supermarket encourages suppliers to sign the UNWEP. Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket commits to encourage suppliers to sign UNWEP. Examples include:
    - integrate this requirement as a criterion in sourcing specifications, or
    - a preferential sourcing policy for companies that have signed the principles, or
    - provide training on how to apply the principles.
- The supermarket publishes a list of at least five suppliers from high-risk supply chains that are UNWEP signatories.
- The supermarket publishes a target for increasing the number of suppliers signed up to UNWEP.

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-4.1.3	policy
Has the supermarket published a gender policy for its operations and supply chains?	

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether the supermarket has published gender policies for its own operations and all supply chains. Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket has published a gender policy for its own operations.
- The supermarket recognises the specific challenges that disproportionately affect women in supply chains, including their hidden or unpaid productive roles and women's greater unpaid care work.
- The policy outlines the causes of the specific challenges affecting women in supply chains.
- A commitment to improvement on the following, with concrete examples of the kind of improvements the supermarket envisages:
    - the representation and rights of women in the workplace and in supply chains, and
    - regular, meaningful and constructive cooperation with trade unions, and
    - provision of health and safety measures that are gender-sensitive.
- The supermarket undertakes to involve stakeholders in this policy and validate it with them. Stakeholders include women's rights organisations and women's rights groups, trade unions or civil society organisations advocating for women.

Bonus points
The supermarket can yield 1 bonus point by including the LGBT+ community in its gender policy in addition to women.

Weighting in the rankings
Policies for own operations that meet all conditions yield 1 point. Policies applicable to all supply chains that meet all conditions yield 3 points. The key figure is the sum of the points for the policy and the bonus points. This key figure is not scaled; 5 points results in a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points results in a score of 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

HR-4.2 Recognition of gender inequality

Explanation
One step to address gender inequality is to make the problem transparent. Disclosing gender-specific information and understanding the barriers women face in supply chains is important here. Supermarkets should be transparent about the position of women within their own organisation and in the chains.

Indicator HR-4.2.1	policy
Does the supermarket systematically track and disclose gender-disaggregated data about its food supply chains?	

Measurement and weighting
For this indicator, we look at publicly published policies showing that the supermarket systematically collects and publishes data disaggregated by gender down to the level of cooperatives/producer groups. To score, the supermarket should release at least three types of data per high-risk supply chains. Examples of data disaggregated by gender that comply are[25] :

- wage data by gender, or
- access to benefits, or
- overtime allowance, or
- annual leave, or
- number of workers with temporary or informal contracts, or
- membership of trade unions or small-scale farmers' cooperatives, or
- duration of employment, or
- the proportion of companies in the chain with a female owner, or
- the proportion of women in low vs high-paying positions (i.e., supervisor/management positions).

Weighting in the rankings
Each high-risk supply chain that meets the conditions yields 1 point. The key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. Thus, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 5, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-4.2.2	report
Does the supermarket recognise and disclose the specific challenges that women in food supply chains face and seek to understand and address root causes?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look at public publications showing that the supermarket:

[25] Guidance can be found in the ETI Gender Data initiative.

- recognises the specific challenges that disproportionately affect women in supply chains, and
- reports on the progress of this issue, and
- seeks to understand the causes of negative effects women experience. Examples of underlying causes include:
    - unequal gender norms, and
    - violence against women, and
    - unpaid care responsibilities, and
    - the often precarious and informal employment of women in supply chains where prices are too low to pay fair wages.

Weighting in the rankings
Publications that show the supermarket meets all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0. The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

HR-4.3 Position of women

Explanation
In many supply chains, women workers and small-scale farmers are in a disadvantaged position. It is important that supermarkets work to improve the position of women and combat abuses. This should pay extra attention to the specific problems women face in the workplace, such as lower wages, an unsafe working environment or even workplace violence. Supermarkets can take several steps to improve the position of women, including closing the gender pay gap, countering gender-based violence, and promoting women's membership in trade unions and farmers' cooperatives.

Indicator HR-4.3.1	commitment
Has the supermarket committed to closing the gender pay gap in its food supply chains?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look at public publications showing that the supermarket has made a commitment to reduce the gender pay gap in supply chains. The commitment must meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket acknowledges the existence of a gender-related pay gap.
- The supermarket pledges to take action to close this wage gap within two years, starting in at least three high-risk supply chains, and reports progress against measurable targets.

Weighting in the rankings
Publications that show the supermarket meets all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0. The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-4.3.2	commitment
Has the supermarket committed to implementing an action plan and time-bound milestones to address gender-based violence?	

Measurement and weighting
Many workers and especially women face forms of harassment or violence at work. ILO Convention 190 for the Elimination of Violence and Harassment at Work, was adopted in April 2021 and sets out international agreements for creating a safe working environment.
For this indicator, we look for publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket acknowledges the existence of gender-based violence in supply chains and pledges to publish action plans to address it within one year.
- Published action plans meet at least the following conditions:
    - The plan recognises risks of gender-based violence in supply chains and refers to ILO Convention 190[26] .
    - The plan describes actions and time-bound targets to address gender-based violence.
    - These actions and targets are linked to a timeframe of up to five years and apply to at least three supply chains.

Weighting in the rankings
An acknowledgement with commitment that meets the conditions will yield 3 points. Each published action plan that meets the conditions yields 1 point. The key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. Thus, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 6, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-4.3.3	policy
Has the supermarket published action plans and timebound milestones to improve the position of women?	

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether the supermarket has plans to improve the position of women. In doing so, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

[26] Guidance can be found in CNV's model agreement (p.10)

- The supermarket has published an action plan with time-bound targets to improve the position of women in high-risk supply chains.
- These goals and actions are linked to a time frame of up to five years.
- The supermarket has set at least three targets for at least three high-risk supply chains.
- Examples of objectives[27] :
    - Closing the gender pay gap.
    - More women in higher paid and management positions.
    - More women members of trade unions or small-scale producer cooperatives.
    - More women with permanent contracts.
    - More women earning at least a living income.
    - Recruiting or advancing more women into technical and management positions.

The exact targets may vary from country to country where high risk is identified, but they should all aim to improve the position of women.

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR-4.3.4	report
Does the supermarket systematically report progress on improving the position of women in food supply chains?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:
- The supermarket systematically reports progress on women's empowerment targets, sharing challenges and lessons learned. The supermarket does this for at least three high-risk supply chains.
- The supermarket has a time-bound commitment to report progress on targets for three other high-risk supply chains.
- The commitment is less than three years in the future.

Weighting in the rankings
Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

[27] Guidance on measurable targets can be found in the ETI Gender Data initiative.

HR-4.4 Respect for women's rights

Explanation
In addition to actions in their own operations to promote women's rights, supermarkets also have a responsibility to work with suppliers that consider women's rights of paramount importance. Where this is not yet the case, supermarkets have a responsibility to encourage suppliers to create better conditions for women.

Indicator HR-4.4.1	policy
Has the company developed strong supply chain partnerships that enable women's rights to be respected?	

Measurement and weighting
We investigate whether the supermarket has mechanisms through which suppliers are supported to respect women's rights. In doing so, we look for examples in public publications of supporting suppliers to address the gender inequalities faced by women workers and small-scale farmers.

Examples include:
- Working with suppliers to ensure that women have access to and are aware of membership in trade unions, labour groups and cooperatives.
- Offering training or specific programmes for suppliers.
- Collaborating with MSIs that specifically target gender.
- Facilitating capacity building to improve women's access to land and productive inputs.
- Helping increase the representation of women in the management structures of producer groups.
- Supporting more women's access to management positions.
- Raising awareness to expose gender norms.

Weighting in the rankings
Each example that meets the conditions scores 1 point. Key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. Thus, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 5 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

Indicator HR -4.4.2	report
Does the supermarket positively incentivise suppliers that demonstrate continuous improvement in addressing gender inequality?	

Measurement and weighting

We examine whether the supermarket offers incentives to suppliers that demonstrate continuous improvement in gender equality. In doing so, we look at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The report contains examples of continuous improvements in gender equality in supply chains based on dialogue, cooperation and trust between the supermarket and its supplier(s).
- The supermarket supports and rewards suppliers who show progress. Ways in which this can be done include:
    - joint business plans/long-term contracts that include mutual expectations on improving gender equality, or
    - agreements to (largely) close the gender pay gap, or
    - price premiums that contribute to further improving gender equality, or
    - preferential sourcing, larger order quantities and preferential payment terms, or
    - the supermarket is committed to helpful behaviour and solutions during peak seasons and when suppliers face problems.
- The supermarket demonstrates how these rewards contribute to gender equality and reports on progress.

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The report includes examples of continuous improvements.	Report on a one-off initiative with a supplier.	The supermarket reports on the long-term improvement it is making with suppliers, reflects the steps that are being taken and will continue to be taken.
The supermarket supports and rewards suppliers who show progress.	The supermarket asks its suppliers for continuous improvement through a Supplier Code of Conduct, but imposes this as a requirement without support or reward.	The supermarket enters into a long-term contract with a supplier with a proven commitment to continuous improvement on gender equality.
The supermarket demonstrates how these rewards contribute to gender equality and reports on progress.	Report on the use of a Supplier Scorecard or KPIs without publishing how they contribute to gender equality.	The supermarket reports on improvements expected from suppliers in terms of gender equality and reports annually on support and rewards for suppliers who commit to these issues.

Table 21. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-4.4.2

Weighting in the rankings
Each example that meets the conditions yields 1 point. Key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. Thus, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 5 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-4.5 Engaging stakeholders

Explanation
Supermarkets should engage stakeholders in the strategy to improve working conditions for women.

Indicator HR-4.5.1 report
Does the supermarket regularly engage relevant stakeholders with the aim of improving conditions for women in food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting
We examine whether the supermarket engages in meaningful dialogue[28] with stakeholders, such as women's organisations. The dialogue should aim to understand the causes of gender inequality in supermarket supply chains and come up with solutions to address them. In doing so, we look for public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- The supermarket provides evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement as part of the strategy to promote women's rights in supply chains. Stakeholders might include women's rights organisations, trade unions or civil society organisations advocating for women.
- Local organisations are represented among stakeholders.
- The supermarket reports annually on stakeholder engagement, including lessons learned and next steps.

One of the conditions is illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket provides evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement as part of its strategy to promote women's rights in supply chains.	Membership to an MSI without specific examples of active dialogue with stakeholders.	*"In 2022, we met with organisations X and Y to discuss the conditions of women in sector/region Z. From these discussions, we drew the following lessons: X, Y and Z. Our next steps are X, Y and Z."*

Table 22. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-4.5.1

[28] Meaningful engagement refers to active, regular and constructive communication with stakeholders, including clear feedback to action plans.

Weighting in the rankings
Reporting that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

HR-4.6 Advocating for women's rights

Explanation
Supermarkets can publicly stand up for women's rights and the need to improve the position of women in supply chains.

Indicator HR-4.6.1	commitment
Has the supermarket publicly advocated for the rights of women in food supply chains?	

Measurement and weighting
Here, we examine whether the supermarket publicly stands up for women's rights. For this, we look at public reporting that meets the following conditions:

- It involves actively contributing to public or political debate.
- In the appeal, the supermarket stands up for women's rights, for example by calling for better protection of women by law, expressing support for initiatives to achieve fair value distribution, or addressing the root causes of gender inequality in supply chains.
- The content of the contribution has been made public.
- The contribution was recently (less than two years ago) expressed through a public platform.
- The supermarket reports annually on progress on this issue.

Some conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Conditions</th><th colspan="2">Examples</th></tr>
<tr><th>Not enough</th><th>Meets</th></tr>
<tr><td>It involves actively contributing to public or political debate.</td><td>Commitments in its own policy or website.</td><td rowspan="2">Recent press releases, media publications, endorsement of open letters or actions advocating for women's rights.</td></tr>
<tr><td>The content of the contribution has been made public.</td><td>Contribution to behind-the-scenes political or administrative decision-making.</td></tr>
</table>

Table 23. Example of policies that do or do not meet the conditions of HR-4.6.1

Weighting in the rankings
Reporting that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. This key figure is not scaled; 1 point yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.
The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.

References

Consumer & Market Authority. (2021). *Ban on unfair trading practices in the agricultural supply chain | ACM.nl*.

ETI. (2017). *Guide to buying responsibly*.

EU. (2015, April 25). *Article 28-The right to collective bargaining and action*. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights.

Haan, G., Engen, W. van, Winkel, D., & Linnebank, C. (2022). *Superlist Research Framework.*. Questionmark.

ILO. (2017). *Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy.*.

ILO. (2022a). *Global estimates of modern slavery: Forced labour and forced marriage*. International Labour Office. https://doi.org/10.54394/CHUI5986

ILO. (2022b). *ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.*.

Ministry of General Affairs. (2017, January 4). *Improving international corporate social responsibility-International corporate social responsibility (IMVO)-Rijksoverheid.nl* [Subject]. Ministry of General Affairs.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2019, June 6). *OECD Due Diligence Guidance for IMVO - Publication-National Contact Point OECD Guidelines.* [Publication]. Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

OECD. (2011). *OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, 2011 Edition.*. OECD. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264115415-en

OECD. (2018a). *OECD DUE DILIGENCE GUIDANCE FOR RESPONSIBLE BUSINESS CONDUCT*.

OECD. (2018b). *OECD-FAO Guidance for Responsible Agricultural Supply*

Chains-OECD..

Ricciardi, V., Ramankutty, N., Mehrabi, Z., Jarvis, L., & Chookolingo, B. (2018). How much of the world's food do smallholders produce? *Global Food Security.*, *17*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2018.05.002

VN. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights.*.

VN. (2011a). *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.*.

VN. (2011b). *HUMAN RIGHTS DUE DILIGENCE : UN Guiding Principles Reporting Framework.*. UN. (2022). *Endorse the Women's Empowerment Principles | UN Global Compact.*.

UN, U. H. R. C. (39th sess : 2018 : (2018). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas :*

Annexes

ANNEX 1

Definitions

In the comparative criteria for the human rights theme, we use the following definitions unless otherwise indicated. In addition, the definitions as stated in the Research Framework apply.

Due diligence	Human rights due diligence means the process by which companies identify, prevent and mitigate the actual and potential negative consequences of their actions, and by which they can be held accountable for their approach to those consequences as an integral part of their decision-making process and risk management systems. In developing due diligence, the focus is not on the risks to the company, but on the rights of, and the actual and potential risks of negative impacts on, other stakeholders, such as workers and local communities.
Sustainable production costs	Costs associated with sustainable food production using processes and systems that are non-polluting, protect natural resources, are economically efficient, safe and fair for workers, communities and consumers, and safeguard the interests of future generations.
Meaningful engagement	Active, regular and constructive communication with stakeholders, including clear feedback to action plans.
Fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing	The practices that enable small-scale farmers to take self-determination over their lives, businesses and communities through trade.
High-risk supply chains/product types	Supply chains or product types identified by the supermarket as high-risk in a risk analysis based on scale, scope and irreversibility of (potential) human rights violations.

Intersectionality	The overlapping risks of marginalisation related to intersecting axes of identity, such as ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, skin colour and health.
Small-scale farmers	Small-scale farmers are food producers who are not structurally dependent on permanent hired labour and carry out their production mainly with family members. This includes small-scale farmers, cattle farmers, fisherfolk and other food producers.
Living income	The net annual income required by a household in a given location to afford a decent standard of living for all members of that household. The elements of a decent standard of living include food, water, housing, education, health care, transport, clothing and other essential needs, including provisions for unexpected events.
Living wage	The wage received by a worker for a standard working week in a given place that is sufficient to provide the worker and his or her family with a decent standard of living. The elements of a decent standard of living include food, water, housing, education, health care, transport, clothing and other essential needs, including provisions for unexpected events.
Human rights risks	The likelihood of negative impacts that companies may cause on people, the environment and society, to which they may contribute or in which they are directly involved. This is therefore an externally oriented interpretation of risk with a focus on risks to people, such as workers and small-scale farmers, not risks to supermarkets themselves (such as financial risk, market risk, operational risk or image risk).
Multi-stakeholder initiative (MSI)	Partnerships between companies, governments, civil society and other stakeholders to address issues of mutual interest, including human rights, sustainability and chain transparency.
Supply chain	The entire delivery process to get the food from the producer from a specific country to the supermarket shelves. For example, *limes from Spain* is one supply chain, *limes from Mexico* another. For this research, we only include food supply chains.
Product type	Generic products of one kind. For example: *bananas, avocados, milk chocolate*.
Product group	Collection of product types that belong together. For example: *sweet spreads, muesli, cheese, milk*.

Product category	Collection of product groups at the highest level. For example: *spreads*, *vegetables*, *fruit*, *meat*, *dairy*, *breakfast cereals*.

ANNEX 2

Guidelines and international standards

The indicators are largely based on international standards and guidelines related to human rights compliance by companies in the food industry, including supermarkets. The main guidelines and international standards are described in this annex.

United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs)

In June 2011, the United Nations (UN) Human Rights Council unanimously endorsed the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) (UN, 2011a). The UNGPs set a global standard for preventing and addressing the risk of adverse human rights impacts associated with business activities. The UNGPs comprise three pillars, consisting of the state's duty to protect human rights, the corporate social responsibility to respect human rights, and access to remedies for victims of corporate abuse.

The UNGPs consist of 31 principles that indicate, among other things, that companies should at least respect human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labour Organisation's (ILO) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. To achieve this, companies are expected to act carefully to avoid violating the rights of others and address any negative consequences. To this end, the UNGPs encourage companies to carry out due diligence to identify their actual and potential impact on human rights and take action to prevent and address negative impacts.

OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (OECD Guidelines)

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) revised the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (OECD Guidelines) in 2011 (OECD, 2011). These OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises are recommendations made by governments, including the Dutch government, to multinational companies on international corporate social responsibility. The OECD Guidelines provide guidance for companies to deal with issues such as chain responsibility,

human rights, child labour, environment and corruption. In doing so, it is expected that if the OECD Guidelines are implemented, companies will become more transparent about their performance in this area and do less risky business.

The Dutch government is committed to complying with the OECD Guidelines and has set the target that 90% of large companies in the Netherlands subscribe to the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises as a frame of reference for their international activities by 2023 (Ministry of General Affairs, 2017).

The OECD Guidelines are further developed into detailed recommendation documents that elaborate on what is expected of companies. The main guidelines for the Superlist Social are the OECD Due Diligence Guidance and the OECD FAO Guidance.

OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct
The OECD Due Diligence Guidance aims to create a common understanding among governments and stakeholders and to support companies in applying the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, by explaining its due diligence recommendations and related conditions in understandable language (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2019). The Guide focuses on the practical application of the OECD Guidelines using six steps. At the same time, the Guide aims to support companies in implementing the due diligence recommendations contained in the UNGPs and the ILO Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy (ILO, 2017).

OECD-FAO Guidance for Responsible Agricultural Supply Chains
Besides the general Due Diligence Guidance, the OECD has also produced a number of sector-specific guidance documents, including the OECD-FAO Guidance for Responsible Agricultural Supply Chains (hereafter referred to as the OECD-FAO Guidance) (OECD, 2018b). The OECD-FAO Guidance aims to support companies active in the global food chain in applying the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. The OECD-FAO Guidance focuses practical due diligence recommendations on companies in agricultural supply chains, specifically taking into account key risk areas in these types of supply chains, such as negative impacts on human and labour rights, animal welfare, deforestation and natural resource depletion.

When the Superlist Social refers to the OECD Guidelines, it refers to both the OECD Guidelines and the practical implementation as described in the underlying guides, in particular the OECD Guidance and the OECD-FAO Guidance.

Due Diligence Process
The OECD Guidelines describe a six-step Due Diligence process (OECD, 2018a), namely:

1. Integrating responsible business behaviour into policies and management systems
2. Identifying and assessing adverse impacts in operational process, supply chains and business relationships
3. Stopping, preventing or mitigating adverse effects
4. Monitoring implementation and results
5. Communicating how adverse effects have been addressed
6. Facilitating or collaborating on improvement where possible

Ethical Trading Initiative Guide to Buying Responsibly

The Guide to Buying Responsibly is a guide prepared by the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) for companies and organisations wishing to develop and adopt responsible sourcing practices (ETI, 2017). ETI describes responsible sourcing as buying in a way that enables positive change at the supplier level so that every part of the supply chain benefits. It requires a trusting, direct and fair relationship in which both parties are able to negotiate and share risks equally, and a buyer who is committed to supporting human rights within the supply chain. The Guide is a collection of practical recommendations and tools to buy responsibly and to strengthen a company's human rights policy through its sourcing strategies.

Unfair Trading Practices (UTPs) in the agricultural supply chain

The European Union has a ban on Unfair Trading Practices (UTPs) in the Agricultural Supply Chain. Since November 2021, this legislation is also valid in the Netherlands to protect suppliers and producers of agricultural and food products (Authority Consumer & Market, 2021). The legislation distinguishes between 'black' and 'grey' practices, where black practices are not allowed under any conditions and grey conditions are only allowed if the supplier and the buyer have made clear agreements on this.

The black unfair trading practices are:

- Payments after 30 days for perishable products and after 60 days for non-perishable products
- Cancelling an order of perishable products less than 30 days in advance
- Amending contracts and terms and conditions unilaterally or retroactively
- Forcing suppliers to pay for wasting products
- Refusing to put agreements in writing
- Making suppliers pay for:
    - matters not related to the sale of the products
    - spoilage and loss after delivery
    - investigation of customer grievances
- Unlawfully obtaining, using and/or disclosing business-sensitive information from suppliers

- (Threatening to) Retaliate, e.g., removing products from sale or reducing the quantity of products ordered

The grey unfair trading practices, unless clearly agreed together in advance, are:

- Returning and/or removing unsold products (e.g., from the shelves) without paying for those products
- Requesting reimbursements for:
    - costs for storage, inclusion in the range etc.
    - costs of promotion, such as marketing, advertising or display in shops
    - discounts on products from promotions
    - personnel costs for furnishing the premises where the supplier's products are used

UN Women's Empowerment Principles

Principle 1: Establish high-level corporate leadership for gender equality
Principle 2: Treat all women and men fairly at work - respect and support human rights and nondiscrimination
Principle 3: Ensure the health, safety and well-being of all women and men workers
Principle 4: Promote education, training and professional development for women
Principle 5: Implement enterprise development, supply chain and marketing practices that empower women
Principle 6: Promote equality through community initiatives and advocacy
Principle 7: Measure and publicly report on progress to achieve gender equality

Figure 1. The UN Women's Empowerment Principles (UN, 2022).

ANNEX 3

Definitions

Engagement of Stakeholders

Stakeholders are people or groups with interests that may be harmed by a company's activities and supply chains. International guidelines and standards, including the UNGPs and the OECD Guidelines, expect companies to identify the people and groups with interests who should be taken into account in a specific activity. Due diligence also covers stakeholders whose interests have been harmed (affected stakeholders) and stakeholders whose interests have not been harmed but may still be harmed (potentially affected stakeholders). Stakeholders also include groups or organisations representing the interests of individuals and groups (potentially) affected by business activities. These include civil society organisations, national human rights institutions, local organisations and communities, human rights defenders, trade unions and governments.

The OECD Guidelines prescribe that engagement of stakeholders should be done in meaningful ways. Meaningful engagement involves two-way communication, mutual and open dialogue, good will and genuine consultation. In addition, engagement should be interactive, meaning that companies make efforts to base decision-making on the views of those likely to be affected. This involves, for instance, companies contacting stakeholders in a timely manner, sharing all necessary information, so that stakeholders can form an informed view of how the company's decision might affect their interests, and complying with agreements made. There should also be continuous engagement, meaning that the dialogue with stakeholders is not a one-off but continues throughout the entire duration of an operation or activity.

For Superlist Social, for several indicators, we look at whether supermarkets involve stakeholders in decision-making, setting policies and strategies, and undertaking activities and projects. This always involves a consideration of whether supermarkets have involved relevant stakeholders and/or their advocates, such as trade unions on labour rights issues and farmers' cooperatives on issues related to small-scale farmers. It is also assessed whether the engagement of stakeholders was meaningful according to the above definition. To assess this, supermarkets are expected to report in detail on the engagement of stakeholders.

Certifications

Certifications that support small-scale farmers and workers and contribute to fairer value distribution, such as Fairtrade, are sold by supermarkets for a wide range of products. We recognise that selling products with a label is a good first step to show a company's commitment to fairer trading practices. We expect supermarkets to go beyond this first step and actively use these kinds of partnerships to ensure that their own sourcing practices offer more say and a greater share of the product's value to workers and small-scale farmers.

Of all the labels, Fairtrade has the highest requirements for production conditions and prices. With Fairtrade, the following conditions apply:

- There is a minimum price, with which the farmer should be able to pay the cost of production. The minimum price should prevent the farmer from making a loss if the price of a product (suddenly) falls.
- A premium is paid to the cooperative of which the farmer is a member. The farmers in the cooperative decide together how to spend that money, such as buying machinery or building a school. This sets Fairtrade apart from many other labels.
- Fairtrade has defined a Living Income Reference Price for certain products from specific regions (including cocoa and coffee), which can be added on a voluntary basis to reduce the gap between living income and actual income of small-scale farmers.

Collaborations

Companies can work together to ensure respect for human rights, for example across sectors, at the industry level or with relevant stakeholders. Collaboration can be useful to combine knowledge on sectoral risks and solutions, to increase impact where possible, and to make due diligence more efficient and effective for all stakeholders.

In the Social Superlist, initiatives or projects carried out in cooperation with other parties may count for several indicators. Examples include collaborations with civil society organisations, trade unions, farmers' cooperatives, suppliers, business partners and governments, whether or not in the context of a Multi-Stakeholder Initiative (MSI).

In the case of third-party collaborations, a supermarket is expected to actively participate in the collaboration, report on progress, and engage stakeholders in meaningful ways. It is also important that the supermarket discloses information about the collaboration that shows that the initiative contributes to the measure.

In most cases, sourcing certified products does not count, unless there is an active collaboration with a certification body in a specific product type or supply chain that meets the above expectations. Also, membership to an MSI does not automatically

count, unless the supermarket demonstrates active collaboration, for example in the context of a specific initiative or working group.

High-risk food chains

Supermarkets are expected to identify and address all (potential) negative human rights impacts. However, it is not always possible to address all risks simultaneously, especially when resources are limited or when many risks are identified in different chains or countries. For these reasons, supermarkets may prioritise in their risk analysis to determine which human rights issues will be addressed as a priority.

Prioritisation should be made in line with the UNGPs (principle 14). This means that supermarkets should assess (potential) negative human rights impacts identified in the risk analysis based on scale (severity of impact), scope (reach, e.g., number of people affected) and irreversibility (to what extent the situation can be remedied).

Several indicators in the Superlist Social refer to high-risk supply chains or high-risk product types. These are therefore supply chains or product types that the supermarket has identified as high-risk in the risk analysis based on scale, scope and irreversibility. A supermarket must describe the reasons why a supply chain or product type has been identified as high-risk. When asked for initiatives or activities in high-risk supply chains or product types, supermarkets are expected to take action first in the chains they have prioritised.

ANNEX 4

Own brand factor

A supermarket is responsible for its entire product range. In practice, supermarkets sometimes only provide information on own brand products. To make that information mutually comparable, an own brand factor is applied. If a supermarket only has a policy on own brands on a certain subject and does not indicate what proportion of its sales are own brand products, the points for that subject are multiplied by the own brand factor.
The own brand factor depends on the proportion of own brand products in relation to the entire product range according to the table below.

Share of private label	Own brand factor
0% - <30%	0.2
≥30% - <60%	0.4
≥60% - 100%	0.6

As mentioned above, if a supermarket reports the share of own brand products in total *sales*, the own brand factor is equal to this share. In other cases, the researchers determine the own brand factor based on the product range in the Questionmark database.