

# **Ethical Health Check Questionnaire**

## **Smaller food companies (Under £50m)**

**Aug 2024 v2.1**

# Part 1 - Company Level Issues

Basic information

1. Company name
2. Company address
3. Company website
3. Parent company or ultimate holding company (if any)
4. Significant shareholders: please list any corporate entities that hold more than 25% shares in your company
5. Company group turnover in the last financial year
6. Date Questionnaire filled in
7. Contact email [not for publication]

<b>1 Climate Change</b>			
[Please choose any that apply and add up your total score at the bottom]			
	Score	Your score	Notes/Evidence
<b>(a) Positive Actions</b> (see also guidance notes at Appendix 1)			
Your company has published a detailed discussion of its main climate impacts	40		
Your company has published a credible discussion of past actions you have taken to reduce climate impacts	30		
Your company has published a credible discussion of intended future actions you will take to reduce climate impacts	30		
Additional points for published emissions figures relating to the above: Scope 1 and 2 current year (10). Scope 1 and 2 current and previous years (20) Scopes 1, 2 and 3 current year (30). Scopes 1, 2 and 3 current and previous year (40)	up to 40		
<b>(b) Problem areas</b>			
Company involved in developing new fossil fuel extraction	-100		
Company is making carbon neutral or carbon negative product claims (these are considered by Ethical Consumer to be misleading)	-30		
<b>Total Score</b> [score cannot be above 100 or below 0]			If your total exceeds 100, just put 100 in the box.

<b>2 Workers in the supply chain (manufacturing and retail)</b>			
	Score	Your score	Notes/Evidence
<b>1. Fairtrade</b> [select one or none]			
All the company's products are certified by Fairtrade International or Fair For Life.	80		
The company sold a significant proportion of Fairtrade or Fair for Life products.	20		
The company marketed itself or its products as 'fair trade' but was not certified Fairtrade or Fair for Life.	20		
<b>2. Supply chain practices</b> [choose as many as apply]			
An explicit policy for long term relationships with suppliers	20		
Regular and ongoing visits to suppliers and monitoring of workers' rights	20		
The company is a manufacturer which manufactures all products in-house	60		
The company is a manufacturer which manufactures some but not all products in-house	10		
Only operates in a setting where risk of workers' rights abuses are low	20		
Good payment practices - for example, paying a price sufficient to allow workers to get a fair wage, or ensuring suppliers are paid immediately / within a short time frame.	20		
<b>3. Manufacturing transparency</b> [select one or none]			
We manufacture all our own products and a list of our manufacturing locations is in the public domain	30		
We manufacture some of our own products and clearly state which these are and list manufacturing locations	20		
<b>4. Supply chain transparency</b> [choose as many as apply]			
A published list of some tier 1 suppliers/OR	10		
A published list of all tier 1 suppliers	20		
A published list of some tier 2 suppliers/OR	10		
A published list of all tier 2 suppliers	20		
Some tier 3 suppliers published	10		
<b>5. Supplier standards</b> [select one or none]			
Has some form of supply chain policy/criteria addressing labour	20		

standards			
Has a comprehensive supply chain policy - including 4+ ETI base code standards? See ETI code <a href="#">HERE</a>	30		
Has a more comprehensive supply chain policy - including 6+ ETI base code standards? See ETI code <a href="#">HERE</a>	40		
Supply chain workers rights core to whole business - with comprehensive policy/evidence embedded in its practices. Give examples.	50		
<b>Total Score (max 100)</b>			

<b>3 Animal Products</b>			
Please choose one from section (a) and one from section (b) and add up your total score at the bottom			
	Score	Your score	Notes/Evidence
<b>(a) Your brand's approach to animal rights and welfare</b>			
No animal ingredients used and a published statement that it is company policy not to use any animal ingredients (the brand is explicitly vegan or plant-based)	60		
No animal ingredients or products used	50		
Some animal ingredients used but with comprehensive ethical policies in place [e.g. animal welfare certifications]	40		
Some animal ingredients used but a very minor part of the business	40		
Explicitly vegetarian policy	10		
Sale of products with animal ingredients with some adequate policies but also some minimal/inadequate/partial policies	10		
Sale of products with animal ingredients but minimal/inadequate/partial policies	0		
<b>(b) Links in the wider company group to high-risk sectors</b>			
The company group is explicitly vegan/plant based	40		
Not explicitly vegan but no sale of animal products or products containing animal ingredients.	40		
The majority of the company group's animal products were covered by adequate policies, or it sold barely any animal products.	30		
Sale of products with animal ingredients with some adequate policies but also some minimal/inadequate/partial policies	10		
Minimal or no adequate policies regarding the animal products sold by the company	0		
<b>Total Score (Max 100)</b>			If your total exceeds 100, just put 100 in the box.

<b>4 Company Ethos and Wider Issues</b>			
[Please choose any that apply and add up your total score at the bottom]			
	<b>Score</b>	<b>Your score</b>	<b>Notes/Evidence</b>
<b>(a) Structure and purpose</b>			
Co-op or Mutual	40		
Not-for-profit or charitable structure	40		
Climate transition focussed/all products are environmental alternatives	30		
Registered social enterprise	20		
B Corp	20		
Part employee owned (>10%)	20		
Living wage certified	10		
Profit share for workers (only if also living wage certified)	10		
<b>(b) Controversial sectors</b>			
			Direct involvement only - not supply chain or banking
Company is not involved in any sectors considered by Ethical Consumer to be highly controversial: arms/military, fossil fuels, mining, nuclear power/weapons.	20		
<b>(c) Approach to pay ratios</b>			
			Please State Highest Pay Level
Do you have a limit on your pay ratio? If so what is this?	20		
Any director paid above £1million annually (total compensation)	-10		
<b>(d) Lobby groups</b>			
Please list any industry associations you belong to here.			
Not a member of any of the lobby groups on ECs list in Appendix 1	10		
<b>Total [Max 100]</b>			If your total exceeds 100, just fill in 100 in the your score box.

<b>5 Tax Conduct</b> [Please fill in the Part that reflects your company best]			
	<b>Score</b>	<b>Your score</b>	<b>Notes/Evidence</b>
<b>Part 1. Certification or no subsidiaries in tax havens</b>			
Are you Fair Tax Mark certified? If yes, score 100 and fill in your total score below.	100		
If not, but you don't have any subsidiaries or a parent company registered in Tax Havens score 100.	100		See Ethical Consumer's list at Appendix 2 of the Guidance Notes if in doubt.
<b>Part 2. If you have any subsidiaries or a parent company registered in Tax Havens, but have clear non-avoidance policies.</b>			
(a) Do you publish a clear public tax statement confirming that it is company policy not to engage in tax avoidance activity or to use tax havens for tax avoidance purposes?	20		
(b) Do you publish country by country reports annually of revenue earned and taxes paid for all the countries you operate in.	20		
(c) Can you list these subsidiaries and explain what type of company each is (e.g. holding company, finance, commercial store) and why it is not being used for tax minimisation purposes.	30		
<b>Part 3. Subsidiaries or a parent company registered in Tax Havens, but without clear non-avoidance policies.</b>			
One subsidiary in a tax haven with no public country-by-country reporting or policy statement and narrative explanation.	20		
Two or more subsidiaries or a parent company in a tax haven with no public country-by-country reporting or policy statement and narrative explanation.	0		
<b>Total Score (Max 100)</b>			



## Part 2 - Product Level Issues

### Basic product information

1. Product Name
3. Company name
3. Webpage where product details appear
4. Name of product supplier - if not manufactured in house
5. Address of manufacturing/production location
6. Date Questionnaire filled in
7. Contact email [Not for publication]

<b>1 Sustainable Agriculture</b>			
	Score	Your score	Notes/Evidence
<b>How organic is your company? (select one)</b>			
Whole company organic AND incorporating innovative(/ancient) methods (e.g. permaculture, agroecology, agroforestry, coppicing, biodynamic)	90		
Whole company organic	80		
Half or more of the company's products are organic	40		
Offers some organic food	10		
No organic options	0		
<b>Is there a policy on GM? (select all that apply)</b>			
The whole company was organic, and so had already received positive marks for no use of GM in the previous question	0		
Not organic but no GM ingredients in own brand	10		
Not organic but no GM animal feed permitted in own brand	10		
<b>Reducing pesticide use? (select one)</b>			
The whole company is organic, or >50% organic. It received points for being organic earlier in the rating so did not gain additional marks for this.	0		
Not organic but has a clear policy on pesticides which acknowledges their harmful effect, has a clear aim to reduce their use, and states that it does not use pesticides on the Highly Hazardous Pesticide List.	10		
No policy on pesticides	0		
<b>Policy on biodiversity/ecosystems (select one)</b>			
A stated aim to reduce agricultural impact in relation to diversity and ecosystems and had taken steps towards this	20		
A statement acknowledging biodiversity/ecosystems and a stated aim to reduce agricultural impact.	10		
No policy around biodiversity	0		
<b>Other positive actions around pollution, water use and food waste (choose all that apply)</b>			
Evidence of reducing agricultural pollution/run-off (especially from animal farming e.g. pigs, poultry, fish farming etc.)	10		
Explicit policy on reducing water use/waste in supply chain	10		

Evidence of steps to reducing food waste across supply chain	10		
<b>Total Score [max 100]</b>			

GM = Genetically Modified

<b>2 Sustainability of packaging (SME companies)</b>			
<b>[please select any that apply]</b>	Score	Your score	Notes/Evidence
<b>(a) Product packaging amounts</b>			
Have you reduced the overall amount of packaging used across your direct operations in recent years?	20		
Have you reduced the overall amount of packaging used across your supply chain in recent years?	20		
<b>(b) Consumer packaging reusable/returnable/unpackaged [select one option]</b>			
Zero waste approach (all packaging reusable, return scheme, packaging free)	70		
Packaging primarily reusable, returnable, or unpackaged, with the remaining packaging plastic free and made from recycled materials	70		
Primarily reusable, returnable, or unpackaged, where remaining packaging is plastic free, but made from virgin materials	60		
Significant % of the company's total packaging is reusable, returnable, or unpackaged	40		
<b>(c) Single use packaging (select the highest scoring option if any apply - Significant % is normally above 50%)</b>			
All single-use product packaging is plastic free and made from recycled materials	60		
All packaging (95%+) is certified home compostable	60		
All packaging is plastic free but is made from virgin materials	50		
Significant % of single-use product packaging is plastic free, made from recycled materials	30		
Significant % of single-use product packaging is plastic free but made from virgin materials	20		
Significant % of packaging is certified home compostable	20		
<b>(c) Other steps to reduce packaging (e.g. selling in bulk).</b>			
Evidence of significant steps to reduce packaging of all products	50		
Evidence of significant steps to reduce packaging of more than 50% products	20		
Evidence of some steps to reduce overall packaging	10		
<b>Total Score [max 100]</b>			

<b>3 Palm oil</b>			
[Only needs filling in if the food product under review commonly contains palm oil]			
[please select one]	Score	Your score	Notes/Evidence
Palm oil free	100		
A retailer with a palm oil free own brand. If it retails other products with palm it must require RSPO certification for palm oil and derivatives	100		
All oil certified RSPO or organic	80		
A retailer with a Palm oil free own brand, but sells products not all RSPO	70		
The company did not meet higher scoring criteria but did have some evidence of more responsible palm sourcing	20		
<b>Total Score [max 100]</b>			

## Part 3 How to calculate your score and take next steps

We are looking for an average score across the number of categories which you have completed.

1. Please copy in your total scores from the score cards that you filled in into the table below and add them up to create a total score in the bottom right column.

<b>Part 1 Company Level Scores</b>	<b>Score</b>
Climate Change	
Workers	
Animals	
Company Ethos	
Tax conduct	
<b>Part 2 Product Level Scores</b>	
Sustainable Agriculture	
Sustainability of packaging	
[Palm Oil]	
<b>Your Total Score</b>	

2. Take the total number of categories that you have completed and then divide your total score by the number of categories. This is your draft ethiscore.

Total score/categories	=	
------------------------	---	--

-----

3. If your draft ethiscore score is more than 65 you may be eligible to use the Ethical Consumer Best Buy label with its linked promotional opportunities. For more information see below and at: [www.ethicalconsumer.org/promote-your-business-ethical-consumer/screenings-best-buy](http://www.ethicalconsumer.org/promote-your-business-ethical-consumer/screenings-best-buy)

If it isn't, you may be able to put into place a few policies and practices and come back in a relatively short time to score yourself again. It should be obvious from the document what improvements are needed where.

If it's looking tricky and you'd like some help, perhaps with policy development, Ethical Consumer can arrange a formal advice session with one of its researchers. Costs start at around £300. For more information on this contact: [ruairidh@ethicalconsumer.org](mailto:ruairidh@ethicalconsumer.org)

#### **4. Best buy label certification**

If your score is above 65, and you want to explore using the promotional logo, send these forms to us to check and we will review your score.

We charge a small fee for reviewing a score (around £225). This we will invoice in advance of research taking place.

Please contact Ruairidh ([ruairidh@ethicalconsumer.org](mailto:ruairidh@ethicalconsumer.org)) on our Best Buy Research Team with your questionnaire if this is the case.

If we agree that your score makes the grade we'll get back to you and Simon can begin a discussion with you about logo licencing.

If we don't agree that your score makes the grade (companies are sometimes inclined to score themselves more highly than we are!) we will give you suggestions of what changes you could make. We will re-assess you for free after any changes have been made in a six month period..

Please remember that, should you decide to go ahead with the Best Buy label, this document will be published (with redactions if necessary) as a downloadable PDF on the Ethical Consumer website.

## Appendix 1: Technical Notes

### 1. Climate

Credible discussion: must include discussion of main areas of carbon impact e.g. supply chain/production, or the use of its product [likely to be the main areas of climate impact - see list below].

- Our list so far or main impacts in the following sectors:  
 eletricals and white goods - use phase, so energy efficiency of products  
 clothing - fabric production,  
 footwear - leather,  
 generic food - agriculture,  
 meat - deforestation,  
 dairy - cows and feed  
 finance - impact reduction in either lending, or investments, or for insurance companies, what they underwrite

To show it was detailed, it should state:

It identified its main areas of climate impact to be: XXXX

OR

It gave quantified examples of how it had or would reduce the impacts of its supply chain, or the use of its product: [which were likely to be the main areas of climate impact]

OR

It had calculated how much progress it was making and gave figures with a clear baseline or defined period: [e.g. compared to 2020, or, this year.]

- The level of detail required should reflect the impact of the sector. If the company is operating in a sector that doesn't have a huge carbon impact it doesn't need such an impressive discussion as one that does. Reporting some figures can be treated as a form of discussion.
- As a small company, if its key materials have a lower carbon impact, past and future may be credible, as it is offering lower carbon options on an ongoing basis. Being vegan may be accepted, organic is not.

### 2 List of lobby groups

- American Chamber of Commerce/AMCHAM-EU
- Bilderberg Group
- Business Action for Sustainable Development
- Round Table / European Round Table of Industrialists
- European Services Forum
- International Chamber of Commerce
- Transatlantic Business Dialogue
- Trilateral Commission
- US Coalition of Service Industries
- World Economic Forum



### 3. 2023 List of tax havens

Algeria	Lebanon
American Samoa	Liberia
Angola	Liechtenstein
Anguilla	Luxembourg
Antigua and Barbuda	Maldives
Aruba	Malta
Bahamas	Marshall Islands
Bangladesh	Mauritius
Barbados	Monaco
Belarus	Montenegro
Belize	Montserrat
Bermuda	Namibia
Bolivia	Netherlands
British Virgin Islands	Oman
Brunei	Palau
Cameroon	Panama
Cayman Islands	Puerto Rico
Cook Islands	Qatar
Costa Rica	Russia
Curacao	Rwanda
Cyprus	Samoa
Estonia	Seychelles
Fiji	Singapore
Gambia	Sri Lanka
Gibraltar	St Lucia
Guam	St. Kitts and Nevis
Guatemala	Switzerland
Guernsey	Thailand
Hong Kong	Trinidad and Tobago
Hungary	Turks and Caicos Islands
Ireland	UAE
Isle of Man	US Virgin Islands
Jersey	Vanuatu
Jordan	Venezuela
Kuwait	Vietnam
Latvia	