

Superlist Environment Belgium 2026

Research methodology



Superlist Environment Belgium 2026

January 2026

Version 0.95

Copyright Questionmark

Parts of this publication may be reproduced if the source is acknowledged: Questionmark (2026), "Superlist Environment Belgium: Research Methodology", version 1.0. 2026, Questionmark Foundation, Amsterdam. **LINK not yet active:**
<https://www.thequestionmark.org/download/superlist-environment-belgium-research-method-be-environment-2026-v1.0.en.pdf>

Authors: Deborah Winkel, Gustaaf Haan, Willem van Engen - Cocquyt, Ambre Charles, Dore de Jong

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Introduction	3
Methodology	5
Issues and measures	6
Overview of measures and indicators	7
EN-CP-GCP Climate plan	
EN-PT-GPP Reporting & target-setting for the protein split	
EN-PT-PBR Proteins in ready-to-eat meals	
EN-PT-PRP Protein-rich promotions	
EN-PT-PSR Portion sizes of meat products	
EN-PT-ISM Policies for plant-rich diets	
EN-SA-GPO Reporting certificates, origin and transport method	
EN-SA-GOR Target-setting for organic	
EN-SA-CIA Certificates for Aanbod natuurinclusieve landbouw	
EN-SA-DFS Sustainable soy for animal feed	
EN-SA-DFP Sustainable palm oil	
EN-SA-DFC Sustainable cocoa	
EN-FW-GPA Food waste action plan	
Indicators	9
Appendices	44
References	54

Introduction

Supermarkets have a major influence on how food is produced and on what their customers buy. This gives them the opportunity to make both production and consumption of food healthier, more sustainable and fair. Questionmark Foundation helps supermarkets seize this opportunity, amongst others with benchmark and advocacy projects. This project is part of the ongoing benchmarking and advocacy program named Superlist, which provides insights and recommendations on the role of supermarkets in leveraging their influence for healthy, sustainable and fair consumption and production of food.

This Superlist Environment Belgium is the second edition of a benchmark and advocacy project that will show a comparison amongst Belgian supermarkets on nature and environment. The first Superlist Environment Belgium was published in 2022.

Governance

Questionmark is an independent think tank that conducts research, sets up collaborations, and fosters debate to encourage food retailers in taking responsibility for a healthy, sustainable, and fair food system. Questionmark is governed by an independent board whose members have no stake in the food industry. The integrity policy of Questionmark can be found on www.thequestionmark.org.

Financial support

This project is made possible through the contributions of EU Life, Rikolto, Testaankoop, Bos+ and Questionmark Foundation.



Co-funded by
the European Union

Civil Society Partners

Superlist Environment Belgium is Questionmark Foundation's project, with consultation of the organisations mentioned below. These organisations all shared their knowledge and expertise in developing this research methodology and designing the study.



Ambassadors

Ambassadors support the project Superlist. They help to disseminate the report and the messages of the project.



testaankoop



Experts

For comparability, this methodology builds on the methodologies of Superlist Environment Belgium '22, Superlist Green the Netherlands '25 and Superlist Europe '26, incorporating relevant (inter)national developments.

The development of these underlying methodologies involved consultation with a range of experts, including for example WWF International and local offices, Mighty Earth, Proveg and Wageningen Economic Research. In addition, for the adaptation and refinement of the present methodology, targeted input was provided by the project partners and ambassadors and individual supermarkets.

Scientific Council

Questionmark's Scientific Council has been consulted for this methodology.

- dr. ir. Ellen van Kleef - Consumer Behaviour - Wageningen University
- dr. ir. Annet Roodenburg – Nutrition and health - HAS green academy
- prof. dr. ir. Jaap Seidell - Food and Health - VU Amsterdam
- dr. Christian Schader - Head Sustainability Assessment - FiBL Switzerland
- dr. Malin Jonell - Sustainable food production and consumption - Stockholm University
- prof. dr. Janina Grabs - Sustainability Research - University of Basel

Methodology

This document describes the methodology behind Superlist Environment Belgium 2026 from research project Superlist. The methodology is designed to help supermarkets monitor their contribution to a more sustainable (regarding nature and environment) food system and to compare themselves with each other in that respect.

The methodology is 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 v1.4*' (Questionmark, 2023), a document that explains topics such as how data is collected, how results are displayed, and how various stakeholders are involved in drawing up the research methodology. This Research Framework can be found at superlijst.nl.

Supermarkets

This research focuses on Belgian retailers. The five largest supermarket chains in terms of market share are taken into account: Colruyt, Delhaize, Carrefour, Aldi, and Lidl. Together, these supermarkets have a total market share of more than 80%.

Research period

The research period for Superlist Environment Belgium 2026 runs from **23 February 2026** to the last reference date on **20 April 2026**. 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: transparency@thequestionmark.org.

Issues and measures

This document describes the methodology for Superlist Environment Belgium 2026. This methodology is largely based on the methodology that was used for Superlist Environment Europe 2026, Superlist Environment the Netherlands 2025 and Superlist Environment Belgium 2022, with some improvements being made. The indicators were determined in consultation with partners, experts, supermarkets and our Scientific Council. An important condition is that the indicators address the most important problems that ask for solutions where supermarkets can play an important role. For other conditions we refer to the Research Framework (Questionmark, 2023).

Structure of the method

For each issue, a number of measures are listed that supermarkets can take for a more sustainable food system. Later in the document, indicators are formulated by which these measures can be assessed 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 numbered¹ 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](#).

Revenue, units, or mass?

Several indicators require reporting of sales volume, broken down by specific aspect. Common units for measuring sales volume are revenue, units, or mass (kilograms of product).

For comparability, it's important that all supermarkets ultimately report using the same unit. Each unit has advantages and disadvantages, but mass generally provides the best picture (National Institute for Public Health and the Environment RIVM, 2022).

Questionmark aims to use mass as the standard for sales volume reporting everywhere. At the launch of Superlist in 2018, there was hardly any structural reporting. Therefore, earlier versions of this method allowed supermarkets the freedom to choose a unit. This version prefers mass as the unit, but for some indicators, supermarkets can still fall back on other units as a transition.

If a supermarket is not yet able to report on the volume sold, but does report on the assortment (sku's), 10% of the points will be awarded. This is seen as a first step.

¹ The letters 'EN-' stand for *environment*. This is how we distinguish the issues and indicators in our numbering system from those in the other Superlist themes 'HE' (health) and 'HR' (human rights).

Overview of measures and indicators

Climate plan (EN-CP)

Desired measures	Indicators	Weight
The supermarket has a climate plan in line with the Paris Climate Agreement.	EN-CP-GCP To what extent does the supermarket have a climate plan in line with the Paris Climate Agreement?	1.5

Protein transition (EN-PT)

Desired measures	Indicators	Weight
The supermarket sets goals to increase the share in sales of plant-based proteins.	EN-PT-GPP To what extent does the supermarket have a target for increasing the share of plant-based food in the total volume of food sold?	1
The supermarket makes buying plant-based products easy.	EN-PT-PBR To what extent do ready meals contain animal products?	0.5
The supermarket tempts customers into food routines in which plant-based proteins play a major role.	EN-PT-PRP What proportion of protein-rich promotions consists of plant-based protein sources?	1
	EN-PT-PSR Do the portion sizes of ready-to-eat meat products help to reduce meat consumption?	0
	EN-PT-ISM What policies does the supermarket have for shifting food routines towards a more plant-based diet?	0.5

Sustainable Agriculture (EN-SA)

Desired measures	Indicators	Weight	
The supermarket provides insight into the most important sustainability aspects of supply chains.	EN-SA-GPO	To what extent does the supermarket report on the origin, transport and cultivation method of the products it sells?	0.5
	EN-SA-GOR	To what extent does the supermarket have a target for increasing the purchasing volume from Organic Agriculture?	0.5
The supermarket offers sustainable agriculture products.	EN-SA-CIA	To what extent does the supermarket's assortment meet relevant sustainable agriculture requirements?	0.5
The supermarket takes action against deforestation and land conversion worldwide.	EN-SA-DFS	To what extent does the supermarket take action to stop deforestation and land conversion linked to the use of soy in animal feed?	0.5
	EN-SA-DFP	To what extent does the supermarket take action to stop deforestation and land conversion linked to the use of palm oil in its products?	0.5
	EN-SA-DFC	To what extent does the supermarket take action to stop deforestation and land conversion linked to cocoa used in its products?	0.5

Food waste (EN-FW)

Desired measures	Indicators	Weight	
The supermarket takes action to reduce food waste.	EN-FW-GPA	Has the supermarket published an action plan with concrete interventions, aimed at reducing both food loss in the supply chain and food waste at the consumer stage?	1

Indicators

Climate plan (EN-CP)

Emission reductions

Indicator EN-CP-GCP

policy

To what extent does the supermarket have a climate plan in line with the Paris Climate Agreement?

Explanation

The climate target of net-zero emissions by 2050 is the EU's contribution to the Paris Climate Agreement. The Paris Agreement states, among other things, the goal of keeping the average global temperature increase well below 2°C and sets the target of limiting further warming to 1.5°C. The agri-food system, in which supermarkets play a key role, is an important contributor to GHG emissions.

Existing agreements and targets:

- *The Paris Climate Agreement*: the average global temperature increase must remain below 2°C, with the aim of further limiting warming to 1.5°C (UN, 2015).
- *European Climate law: Climate target net-zero (2050 target)*: by 2050, greenhouse gas emissions must not exceed the level that can be absorbed or offset, resulting in net-zero emissions (EP, 2021).
- *CSRD legislation*: all included supermarkets are obligated to report on their GHG emissions, and their targets and policies to reduce these emissions.

Assessment

This assessment regards a supermarket's awareness of its responsibility to reduce emissions, the granularity of reporting on its emissions, the ambition of its targets and near-term targets and the roadmap to reach those targets.

The assessment is based on a 4-level categorization:

1. *Awareness*
The supermarket acknowledges its own role in achieving the net-zero climate target and takes initiative to meet that responsibility.
2. *Annual reporting on emission sources & amounts*
The supermarket discloses its gross GHG emissions in scope 1, 2 en 3 for a period of 24 months, that has ended not longer than 24 months before data collection. It is crucial to provide (or refer to) a description of the measurement standard used.

The GHG Protocol is preferred as the reporting standard for emissions scopes and categories to ensure comparability across supermarkets. Since the biggest share of a supermarket's emissions occurs within scope 3, reporting on these emissions is critical².

Preferably:

- the supermarket provides a breakdown of total scope 3 non-FLAG emissions into emission category levels³ and scope 3 FLAG (Forest, Land and Agriculture) emissions into food category levels, at least categories containing animal-based products;
- the supermarket provides a breakdown in separate greenhouse gases, at least for methane separately;
- the supermarket shows that the reported figures, including scope 3 emissions, are validated by an external party.

Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions

Scope 1 includes a supermarket's direct emissions (e.g., refrigerants) and scope 2 the indirect emissions from generating purchased energy (e.g., electricity consumption, generation of electricity not belonging to the supermarket itself). Scope 3 includes the indirect emissions of greenhouse gases that occur in the supermarket's value chain from both upstream (e.g., transportation of raw materials) and downstream (e.g., food waste) sources. Within scope 3, emissions related to agriculture (FLAG: forestry, land use and agriculture emissions) can be distinguished from industry related emissions (non-FLAG: energy and industry related emissions).

3. Target setting horizon

The supermarket sets targets for reducing emissions. Any long term target (with a deadline beyond 2035) should be accompanied by an absolute intermediate target for 2035 or earlier. This intermediate target should receive the same, full commitment of the supermarket as the end target.

Preferably:

- the supermarket has set a concrete near-term target by 2035 or earlier;
- no offsetting is being used to reach the near-term targets. Offsetting is defined as emission reductions or removals achieved through indirect mitigation mechanisms, such as carbon credits, to counterbalance emissions (IPCC, 2023);
- the end target amounts to net-zero by 2050 latest and the supermarket is transparent about the residual emissions;
- the supermarket has set a specific target to reduce methane emissions.
- the supermarket is transparent about the GHG emissions for base year no later than 2022;
- The near-term target for 2030 is in line with the ambition of the Paris Agreement to limit further global warming to 1.5°C. This translates into:

² reporting on scope 3 must at least cover scope 3.1 (purchased goods and services) emissions.

³ reporting the breakdown of scope 3.1 into FLAG and non-FLAG emissions is sufficient in case no other scope 3 sub-categories do contain FLAG emissions.

- a. having a near-term reduction target for FLAG emissions in scope 3 validated in line with 1.5°C by the Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi). This leads to half of the points since the SBTi cannot yet verify whether a reduction target for non-FLAG scope 3 emissions is in line with 1.5°C for the supermarket industry;
- b. preferably, minimally 43% reduction of CO2-equivalent emissions compared to 2019 for 100% of all scopes according to the 1.5°C no or limited overshoot pathways as defined by Working Group 3 in the Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC (IPCC AR6 WG3 C1 pathways) (CarbonBrief, 2023). If the supermarket has a different base year than 2019, the responsibility to prove that its near-term target is in line with the IPPC C1 pathway, lies with the supermarket. By, for example, reporting 2019 emissions' level;
 - the supermarket has already started reducing emissions in line with 1.5°C:
 - since its own baseline no later than 2022;
 - preferably from 2019 to ensure comparability across supermarkets and accountability.

4. *Climate Roadmap*

After setting targets and measuring current GHG emissions, supermarkets should specify the roadmap with which they plan to achieve the short-term and long-term reduction targets.

Preferably: the supermarket also acknowledges its responsibility towards its suppliers. Reducing emissions, particularly in scope 3, involves altering the types of products suppliers produce and the methods they use to produce them. Ensuring a just transition towards a sustainable food system requires sharing the financial burden of this transition across the entire value chain. Direct investment in supply chains and financial support for implementing sustainable practices are essential to achieve reductions in total emissions. The supermarket explains clearly how the financial support is generically available to suppliers of the most sold products and how that leads to a reduction in total emissions.

Measurement and Weighting

The table below specifies the scoring for each level. Points in each level can only be obtained if all minimum requirements in lower levels have been met (but not necessarily all full requirements).

		Points
1. Awareness		
The supermarket acknowledges its own role in contributing to net zero.		1
2. Reporting on emission sources & amounts		
MINIMUM requirements level 2	The supermarket discloses its scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions in CO2-equivalent.	2

	The supermarket discloses its scope 3 GHG emissions separately from its scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions.	4	
FULL requirements level 2	The supermarket provides a breakdown of total scope 3 emissions into FLAG and non-FLAG emissions.	5	
	Breakdown of total scope 3 non-FLAG emissions at emission category level.	2	
	Breakdown of total scope 3 FLAG emissions at food category level.	2	
	The supermarket provides a breakdown of the emissions for the different GHG, at least for methane separately.	2	
	All published scope 1, 2 and 3 emission data is externally validated.	5	
3. Target Setting horizon			
MINIMUM requirement level 3	The supermarket has set a near-term target for at least scope 3 by 2035 or earlier.	3	
FULL requirements level 3	The supermarket has a commitment for net-zero by 2050 latest.	2	
	The supermarket is transparent about the residual emissions for the net-zero commitment by 2050 latest.	2	
	The supermarket has set a concrete near-term target for at least scope 3 by 2030 or earlier.	4	
	No offsetting is being used to reach the near-term targets.	3	
	The supermarket has set a target specifically to reduce methane emissions.	2	
	The supermarket is transparent about the total GHG emissions for the base year, preferably 2019, no later than 2022.	2	
	The near-term target for 2030 is in line with the ambition of the Paris Agreement to limit further global warming to 1.5°C. (max. 4 points)		
		Near-term FLAG target is validated in line with 1.5°C by SBTi.	2
		The near-term target for 2030 is in line with 1.5°C no or limited overshoot pathways.	4
	Demonstrable reduction in total GHG emissions (max. 10 points)		
		Demonstrable reduction in total GHG emissions since its own baseline.	5
		Demonstrable reduction in total GHG emissions since base year 2019.	10
	Demonstrable reduction of 10% or more in total GHG emissions (max. 15 points)		
	Demonstrable reduction of 10% or more since its own baseline in total GHG emissions.	7.5	

	Demonstrable reduction of 10% or more since base year 2019 (half of what is required for the “1.5° no or limited overshoot pathways”) in total GHG emissions..	15
	Demonstrable reduction of 20% or more in total GHG emissions. (max. 30 points)	
	Demonstrable reduction of 10% or more since its own baseline in total GHG emissions.	15
	Demonstrable reduction of 20% or more since base year 2019 (in line with the “1.5° no or limited overshoot pathways”) in total GHG emissions.	30
4. Climate Roadmap		
Short term roadmap	The reduction potential for specific reduction measures is quantified, as part of a roadmap to reach the 2030 target. <u>Calculation</u> <i>15 points x the total emission reduction potential of the specified mitigation measures as a share of the reduction target in 2030.</i> <u>Example of a short term climate-roadmap:</u> <i>“We want to achieve our 55% emissions reduction goal in 2030 via a combination of measures. Via a protein transition we will reduce our total emissions by 23%. Manure Management will further reduce our emissions by 8%. (etc)”</i> <u>Scoring calculation for this example:</u> <i>* 15 points x 23/55 for Protein Transition reduction of overall emissions + * 15 points x 8/55 for Manure Management reduction of overall emissions + * ... (etc)</i>	15 x %
Long term roadmap	The reduction potential for specific reduction measures is quantified, as part of a roadmap to reach the end target. <u>Calculation</u> <i>8 points * the total emission reduction potential of the specified mitigation measures as a share of the reduction target in 2050.</i>	8 x %
	Financial support of suppliers for transition. The financial support is generically available to suppliers of the most sold products and how that leads to a reduction in total emissions.	5

Table 1. Score of EN-CP-GCP with examples.

The key figure for this indicator is the sum of points a supermarket receives according to [table 1](#). The maximum key figure on this indicator is therefore 128 points. The key figure is fully scaled to a score of 0-100.

If the reporting or targets is limited to a supermarket's private label portfolio, it is important to indicate the share of these products in the total sales. The score will be multiplied with this share.

Protein transition (EN-PT)

Target share plant-based food

Indicator EN-PT-GPP

policy

To what extent does the supermarket have a target for increasing the share of plant-based food in the total volume of food sold?

Explanation

Animal proteins currently make up about 60% of protein in the average European Diets (Nature Publishing Group, 2024). Europeans consume twice as much animal-protein as the amount recommended by EAT Lancet (EAT Lancet, 2025). Shifting to a more plant-based diet is essential for decreasing the footprint of the food system, as also acknowledged by the Green Deal. The ideal share within the boundaries of planetary and human health - as proposed by EAT Lancet - is 26% animal-based foods, and 74% plant-based foods, if all food groups are included (ProVeg International, 2024). Moreover, the Flemish government has set the target to reach a 60:40 ratio in protein consumption by 2030 with 60% plant-based and 40% from animal protein sources (Vlaamse overheid, 2025).

With the 'protein transition' we refer to a shift in consumers' food patterns from animal-based to plant-based protein food sources. This shift aims to reduce the environmental impact of our diets and promote healthier, more sustainable food choices. The aim is not to completely substitute all animal-based protein sources for plant-based ones, since the average European Diets already contains more protein than is reasonable within planetary boundaries (EAT Lancet, 2025). The protein transition should be seen as part of a larger transition towards a more balanced diet.

Assessment

This indicator assesses the supermarkets commitment to increasing the share of plant-based food in the total sales volume⁴ of food products. Three levels of commitment are recognised: 1) awareness, 2) disclosure and 3) target setting.

1. Awareness

The supermarket acknowledges its own role in the protein transition and provides policy examples to support the transition.

2a. Partial disclosure

The supermarket discloses the share of animal versus plant-based food as a part of the total sales volume, according to the WWF Planet-Based Diets Retailer methodology

⁴ Weight in kilograms of the total food sales.

(WWF methodology). Reporting is minimally on 'protein rich foods' (food group 1) and 'dairy and dairy alternatives' (food group 2).

2b. Full disclosure

The supermarket discloses the share of animal versus plant-based food of their total sales volume. The share may be calculated at product or ingredient level, or be limited to protein content of products, using the WWF methodology or the GPA/ProVeg Protein Tracker⁵. In case the supermarket reports using the WWF methodology, it has to also report the protein splits of food groups 1 and 2 as described in 2a. The result should be expressed as one aggregated metric, to ensure comparability between supermarkets. For more information about why these two methodologies are accepted, see the text box below.

Reporting in both 2a and 2b should cover a period that has ended not longer than 12 months before data collection, with a specification of the time period over which the data was collected.

3a. Partial disclosure + timebound and measurable target

On top of disclosure as in 2a, the supermarket has a *timebound and measurable* target for 2030 in line with the Planetary Health Diets (PHD) for at least the food group 'protein rich foods'. According to the PHD, the ideal food split translates into 74/26 plant-based/ animal-based foods in 2050, when all food groups are included (EAT, 2019; ProVeg International, 2024). When focusing on protein rich foods (food group 1 and 2), the food split in line with the PHD would be 60/40 plant-based/animal based in 2050. It is crucial that:

- the target is *timebound and measurable*, and
- the first deadline for this intermediate target is not later than 2030.
- the target is in line with PHD. This is assessed using linear growth for supermarkets that reported their respective baseline protein split.

3b. Full disclosure + timebound and measurable target

On top of disclosure as in 2b, the supermarket has a *timebound and measurable* target for (latest) 2030, in line with the Planetary Health Diets (PHD). According to the PHD, the ideal food split would be 74/26 plant-based/ animal-based foods in 2050, when all food groups are included (ProVeg International, 2024). Each supermarket should set itself a timebound and measurable target for 2030 in line with this ideal split. In case the supermarket reports using the WWF methodology, it is required that the 'partial' target in 3a is in line with the PHD in order to score points in 3b.

4. Being on track

The share of plant-based food in the total volume of food products (split) as reported in level 2 is on track towards reaching the target in level 3. This level is only attainable in case the supermarket has a baseline for comparison, not being the latest split disclosed under

⁵ While the Protein Tracker and WWF methodology are the primary standards, the Eimeet framework is explicitly permitted for Belgian supermarkets to ensure alignment with local measurement practices.

level 2. The first split the supermarket has ever disclosed counts as the base year. Baseline and current split should be given in the same format⁶.

Measuring the share of plant-based food in the total volume of food products.

When reporting on the share of plant-based food in the total volume of food products (split) it is important that supermarkets report *one metric* that shows the percentage of plant-based food of the total sales volume. The metric should enable comparison with the Planetary Health Diets targets.

At the moment there is no industry standard for this metric. There are two methodologies that several supermarkets use to measure their split: the WWF Planet-Based Diets Retailer methodology (WWF, 2024) and the GPA/ProVeg Protein tracker (GPA & Proveg, 2025). Ideally, supermarkets will agree on a single metric for the sake of comparability; however, it is more important for supermarkets to begin to monitor their split using an independent method as soon as possible than to delay in choosing one or the other.

1. Awareness			
Supermarket acknowledges its own role in the protein transition and provides policy examples to support the transition.		1 point	
2. Disclosure			
a. Partial Disclosure		b. Full Disclosure	
Supermarket discloses the share of animal versus plant-based food of part of their sales, including at least all products in the food groups 'protein rich foods' (food group 1) and 'dairy and dairy alternatives' (food group 2) using the WWF metric. Concerns a period concluded no more than 12 months ago. Terms are clearly explained.	8 points	The supermarket discloses the share of animal versus plant-based food of their total sales volume, using the WWF metric* or the GPA/Proveg Protein Tracker**. Concerns a period concluded no more than 12 months ago.	12 points
3. Target			
a. partial target		b. full target	
On top of disclosure in 2a, the supermarket has a time bound and measurable target for (latest) 2030 for at least the food group 'protein rich foods'.	4 points	The supermarket reports as in 2b and has a time bound and measurable target for (latest) 2030*.	8 points

⁶ If a supermarket has improved its method of measurement since the base year, it is allowed to recalculate the baseline split according to the new method.

Target is in line with the Planetary Health Diet.	6 points		Target is in line with the Planetary Health Diet*.	12 points
4. Being On Track				
The share of plant-based food in the volume of food products, as reported in level 2 is on track towards reaching the target in level 3. This level is only attainable in case the supermarket has a baseline for comparison.			10 points	

Table 2. Scoring of EN-PT-GPP with examples per level. A supermarket receives a sum of all points according to this table. *When reporting using the WWF metric, partial disclosure and target are required to score for the full disclosure and targets (see the text above for the explanation). ** While the Protein Tracker and WWF methodology are the primary standards, the Eimeet framework is explicitly permitted for Belgian supermarkets to ensure alignment with local measurement practices.

The key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points a supermarket receives according to [table 2](#). The maximum key figure on this indicator is therefore 43 points. The key figure is fully scaled to a score of 0-100.

Plant-based food the easy choice

Not everyone has to eat a vegetarian or vegan diet: a sustainable diet that respects planetary boundaries still leaves room for meat or cheese. However, the proportion of animal proteins in our diet should be reduced in favour of plant-based food. Supermarkets can contribute to this shift by making it easier for consumers to choose plant-based products..

Indicator EN-PT-PBR

assortment

To what extent do ready-to-eat meals contain animal products?

Explanation

In some product groups, animal proteins such as meat are common but unnecessary; just think of pizzas or pasta sauces, which do not need to contain any meat. Avoiding meat in those product groups does not require a rigorous change in food choices and thus makes eating (more) plant-based an easy choice.

In this indicator, we distinguish between protein sources in ready meals (refrigerated, frozen or non-perishable) according to their contribution to a protein shift, as explained in [Appendix 2](#).

Measurement and weighting

In every supermarket, we look at ready meals whose animal protein content could be reduced without rigorous change. We cover the following product groups:

- Traditional Belgian meals
- Pasta, lasagne
- Pizza

- Quiche
- Ready-made soup
- Meal salads

Table 3 indicates how different protein sources affect the score of these products. The classification of protein sources is explained in [Appendix 2](#).

Protein source	Contains	Examples of ready meals	Points
Meat and fish	Meat, fish or shellfish	Lasagna with mince, pizza with meat, salad with shrimp or ham	0
Dairy, cheese and eggs	Dairy, cheese or eggs	Tomato cream soup, vegetarian stew containing milk, quiche with eggs, Caesar salad with cheese, pizza with cheese	3
Plant-based	No meat, fish, dairy, cheese or eggs	Vegetable soup, pasta with tomato sauce, meal salad with grilled vegetables	10

Table 3. Points per product for EN-PT-PBR. See Appendix 2 for more details.

Each product is awarded the number of points described in table 2. If a product contains different protein sources, it receives the lowest number of points. For example: a salad with strips of beef (0 points), cheese (3 points) and peas (10 points), gets 0 points. A product group's score is the average number of points of all products within the product group. The key figure for this indicator is the average number of points for all product groups.

Weighting in the ranking

To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 7, the lower limit is 4. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the ranking of supermarkets is: 0.5.

Shifting routines towards plant-based proteins

Consumers do not always make conscious decisions about their food, as our food choices are often routine behaviour. But routines can evolve, including through the interaction between consumers and other parties that shape our food routines (PBL, 2020). When it comes to the consumption of plant-based and animal proteins, supermarkets can help steer shoppers' choices. The following indicators measure the extent to which supermarkets contribute to more plant-based food routines.

Indicator EN-PT-PRP

promotions

What proportion of protein-rich product promotions consists of plant-based protein sources?

Explanation

Advertising meat not only directly encourages customers to buy meat, but also reinforces the image that meat should be part of a natural, normal daily meal. In this indicator, we investigate whether a supermarket helps to change that image by including more plant-based proteins and fewer animal proteins in its weekly promotions.

Scientific research shows that of all types of promotions, volume discounts ("2 for the price of 1," etc.) are the most likely to lead to excessive consumption (PHE, 2020). Therefore, the use of volume discounts is considered an aggravating factor in this indicator.

Measurement and weighting

For each promotion flyer in the research period, we look at promotions of plant-based and animal-based protein sources.

Protein-rich products containing only plant proteins are classified as "plant-based core," and products containing almost exclusively animal proteins are classified as "animal-based core." See also [Table 4](#) below. All other product types, including plant-based non-core and composite products, are excluded from this indicator.

Plant-based core	Animal-based core
Beans and pulses	Meat and poultry
Meat and fish alternatives	Processed meat
Plant-based cheese and dairy alternatives	Fish and shellfish
Mushrooms	Dairy
Nuts	Eggs
Seeds	Cheese

Table 4. Protein sources and product types that are included for indicator EN-PT-PRP.

A promotion for multiple products counts if at least one product is a protein source according to Table 4 above. These deals are categorised by protein source. If a promotion applies to both plant-based and animal-based protein sources, each type of protein counts as a separate deal. For example, a deal for various snacks, including both cheese cubes (animal-based) and nuts (plant-based), counts as two separate promotions. See table 5 for examples of different protein sources.

Protein source	Main ingredient	Examples
Animal-based core	Meat, fish and shellfish	Chicken wings, ham, smoked salmon, shrimps, fish sticks, tuna salad
	Dairy, cheese and eggs	Eggs, mature cheese, quark, milk, milkshake, ice cream, butter, dairy desserts, garlic butter, coffee with dairy
Plant-based core	No meat, fish,	Hazelnuts, peanut butter, chickpeas, meat

	dairy/cheese or eggs	substitute without cheese, plant-based variants dairy drink or ice cream, mushrooms
--	----------------------	---

Table 5. Categorisation of promotions for indicator EN-PT-PRP.

The number of animal-based core and plant-based core products is measured per flyer, with the score calculated as the percentage of plant-based products among all protein-rich products on promotion. The key figure for this indicator is the average share of plant-based protein promotions across all supermarket flyers during the study period.

Avoiding volume discounts on animal protein promotions

The final score for this indicator is multiplied by a factor depending on the type of promotion. A distinction is made between the following two types of promotions: Volume discount: a discount that only applies when purchasing multiple products at once. For example, "buy three, get two for €4," "2 for €4," or "second half price." Other promotions, where the discount also applies to a single product, or where no discount is given.

For all promotions on animal protein sources, the share with volume discounts is determined. The total number of points per supermarket across all flyers is multiplied by a factor depending on the share of promotions in the flyer that are offered as volume discounts; see [Table 6](#). For example, if the supermarket only applies a small volume discount to animal protein-rich products (up to 5%), the score is multiplied by 1.0. If many animal protein-rich promotions in the flyer are volume discounts (>50%), the score is multiplied by 0.7.

Calculation volume discount factor	
Share animal-based promotions with volume discount	Factor
>50%	0.7
>40-50%	0.75
>30-40%	0.8
>20-30%	0.85
>10-20%	0.9
>5-10%	0.95
0-5%	1.0

Table 6. Volume discount factor, based on animal-based promotions in all examined flyers.

Weighting in the ranking

To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 0.75,

the lower limit is 0.4. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the ranking of supermarkets is: 1.

Indicator EN-PT-PSR

assortment

Do the portion sizes of ready-to-eat meat products help to reduce meat consumption?

Explanation

Consumers view the portion sizes of meat offered in supermarkets and restaurants as an indication of the appropriate 'normal' consumption amount, since consumers eat one burger or one schnitzel, not 150 grams of burger or 100 grams of schnitzel (Be4Life, 2018). Portion sizes create a certain implicit standard (Steenhuis, Leeuwis, and Vermeer, 2010), 19 with larger portions unconsciously perceived as the recommended consumption amount. This has led to an increase in the population's total food consumption (Cavanagh et al., 2014). A meta-analysis has actually shown that doubling the portion size leads to a 35% increase in consumption (Zlavetska, Dubelaar, and Holden, 2014). One way to reduce animal protein intake is to encourage smaller portion sizes, especially for red processed meat. This intervention can help change what is seen as a 'normal' portion of meat, without requiring rigorous change of consumers.

Measurement and weighting

For this indicator, we examine the portion sizes of different pre-packaged meat products in each supermarket:

- burgers (beef burgers, hamburgers, chicken burgers, etc.)
- sausages
- schnitzels (including filled schnitzels such as cordon bleu)

Portion description	Portion size	Points
small	≤ 80 grams	1
standard	> 80 grams en ≤ 100 grams	0.5
large	> 100 grams en ≤ 150 grams	0.1
extra large	> 150 grams	0

Each product receives the number of points described in table 5. The score of each product group is the sum of all points, divided by the number of products in the product group. The key figure for this indicator is the average score of all product groups. Weighting in the ranking To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 0.6, the lower limit 0.4. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework.

Weighting in the ranking

The weighting of this indicator has been adjusted to 0. Therefore, it is not included in the ranking. This is due to the significant changes in the meat aisle due to the availability of

hybrid products, which makes this indicator less meaningful.

Indicator EN-PT-ISM

shop

What policies does the supermarket have for shifting food routines towards a more plant-based diet?

Explanation

In recent years, some supermarkets have taken initiatives to encourage a plant-based diet or have experimented with related interventions. Some of these initiatives are having a positive effect. Even if an intervention turns out to have little effect, however, the experiment may have successfully raised awareness of the influence of the food environment on a plant-based diet. We use this indicator to compare the extent to which supermarkets contribute to this.

Measurement and weighting

For this indicator, we look at interventions, both in physical stores and online, that encourage people to eat (more) plant-based rather than animal proteins. We focus hereby on in-store tactics. The measurement is done primarily by assessing publicly available documents (policies, annual reports, etc). Spot checks may be conducted if there is reason to doubt that a certain policy is actually implemented in practice.

[Table 8](#) below lists the conditions a policy needs to meet to receive a minimum of 10 points. [Table 9](#) lists a number of aspects of the policy that may result in extra points. In the two right-hand columns, we provide examples of what does or does not meet the conditions.

Set of minimum conditions	Basic points	Examples	
		Insufficient	Sufficient
<p>The intervention is aimed at reducing the share of animal proteins in food routines. This does not include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reformulating products without changing food routines - promoting plant-based products in general, unless it is plausible that this will (also) reduce the amount of animal protein being produced. 	10	<p>"Our meal kits do not contain animal-based stock cubes. If a recipe requires stock, we add garden herb stock." (Not aimed at changing food routines)</p>	<p>"During barbecue season (June-Sept), X% of products on our BBQ shelf are vegetarian."</p> <p>"We never picture meat, fish or poultry in our marketing material, unless we are actually marketing animal products."</p> <p>"The standard preparation method listed on all our meal kits is vegetarian. The option to add meat or fish is only mentioned as an alternative."</p>
<p>The intervention goes beyond legal requirements and is not yet common practice in supermarkets.</p>		<p>"We offer a wide selection of delicious alternatives to meat." (Common practice)</p>	<p>"Our meat substitutes are placed right next to comparable meat products, to inspire non-vegetarians."</p> <p>"We offer a substantially larger range of meat substitutes than the average supermarket. Compared to x number of meat products, our range encompasses y number of</p>

			<i>alternatives."</i> <i>"We no longer indicate on our wines whether they go well with meat, fish or poultry. Instead, we suggest pairings with vegetarian dishes or describe the wine's taste in a neutral way."</i>
The implementation, scope and size of the intervention are clearly described.		<i>"Where possible, we inspire our customers to eat tasty vegetarian food." (Unclear how and where)</i>	<i>"At least x percent of our recipe suggestions for main dishes online and in each store are vegetarian."</i>
The intervention is (also) aimed at customers who are not actively looking for a more plant-based diet.		<i>"Vegetarians will find all meat substitutes on a separate shelf."</i> <i>"Our webshops have a filter that allows customers to easily find vegetarian or vegan products."</i>	<i>"We make a vegetarian suggestion for every meat product on our shelves."</i> <i>"Every meat product selected online comes with a flag; clicking on the flag immediately gives customers a list of vegetarian alternatives."</i>
The intervention will be in effect for more than a year and is preferably permanent (unless it concerns a scientific experiment).		<i>"During our Plant Food Week, our promotion flyer did not contain any special offers for meat."</i>	<i>"Every other week, our promotion flyer does not contain any special offers for meat."</i>

Table 8. Conditions that EN-PT-ISM policies must meet.

Each intervention that meets all of the conditions mentioned in table 6 will be awarded 10 points. [Table 9](#) below lists a number of circumstances that result in extra points.

Extra points (add to basic points)		Not sufficient (examples)	Sufficient (examples)
Supermarket quantitatively reports on the effect of the intervention.	+ 5	<i>"The intervention was successfully implemented." (No quantification)</i>	<i>"The intervention led to a 30% decrease in sales of minced meat, in favour of pulses."</i> <i>"The intervention did not demonstrably increase sales of meat substitutes."</i>
The intervention has been scientifically researched (previously or elsewhere) and has proven to be effective.	+ 5	No reference to literature.	Reference to relevant scientific literature.
In 2024-2026, one or more branches took part/will take part in scientific research into this intervention or other interventions that meet the above conditions.	+ 5⁷	Internal research. Research for product improvement.	Research (e.g. in collaboration with a university) into influencing behaviour at a specific branch in favour of a plant-based diet.

⁷ In the exceptional case where a supermarket abolished all measures because scientific research has shown they are ineffective, the supermarket will still receive these extra points for the cooperation of its stores in that research.

Supermarket takes several distinct actions that all meet the above conditions.	+ 5 per extra interventi on	<i>"At least 80% of main meal recipes are vegetarian. Lunch meal recipes are even 100% vegetarian."</i> (Does not involve different interventions)	<i>"At least 80% of our recipe suggestions are vegetarian, and our promotion flyer never contains more than one offer for meat."</i>
--	---	---	--

Table 9. Circumstances that can each yield extra points within EN-PT-ISM.

The key figure for this indicator is the sum of the points for all interventions that a supermarket has published as official policy and, when checked, implemented.

Weighting in the ranking

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 60 points, the lower limit 0. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the ranking of supermarkets is: 0.5.

Sustainable agriculture (EN-SA)

Transparency of supply chains

Indicator EN-SA-GPO

policy

To what extent does the supermarket report on the origin, transport and cultivation method of the products it sells?

Explanation

Transparency is the first step towards improvement. Knowledge about products' origin, cultivation and transport and whether or not products are certified enables the supermarket to try and increase its sales of sustainable and, if possible, local products. This insight also gives policymakers and society greater insight into the transition towards a sustainable food system.

Measurement and weighting

We investigate the extent to which the supermarket reports about a number of characteristics of the supply chain that are relevant for the environment. [Table 10](#) provides the points awarded for each type of information that the supermarket publishes or that can potentially be derived from more extensive or more detailed reporting. The format of reporting has no influence on the number of points awarded; what matters is that the information is available. Revenue volume is preferably reported in mass volume (kilograms of product sold)⁸.

Category	Metrics to be reported			
	Certifications	Cultivation method	Origin	Transport method
Fresh vegetables, incl. potato	20 points	20 points	20 points	20 points
Fresh fruit	20 points	20 points	20 points	20 points
Vegetables, preserves	10 points	10 points		
Fruit, preserves	10 points	10 points		
Eggs	10 points		10 points	
Dairy	10 points		10 points	
Meat	10 points		10 points	
Fish	10 points	10 points	10 points	

Table 10. Scoring of EN-SA-GPO.

⁸It is also permitted to report in terms of turnover or units, provided this is clearly indicated. See the box "Revenue, units, or mass?" in Issues and measures.

Certifications

Report the share of certified products in the total volume of products sold in that particular category. We take into account all certifications that have been assessed by Milieu Centraal with a minimum of 4 out of 5 points for the environment and control (see Appendix 3).

The guide for distinctive certifications distinguishes between non-tropical and tropical fruit for the EU Organic certification. For ease of use, this distinction is not made for this indicator. Therefore, certifications may be reported for all fruits and vegetables, with the EU Organic, EKO, and Demeter certifications being included as distinguishing certifications for this indicator.

A supermarket may also report on other certifications, as long as the share is covered by the certifications can be deduced:

- One or more distinctive certifications as ...% of sales in the category
- No (distinctive) certifications or unknown ...% of sales in the category

This metric is valued for each separate category according to the following calculation. The number of points indicated in the cell in the table is multiplied by the reported share of sales with distinctive certifications in that category.

Cultivation method

Report a breakdown of the volume sold in the category, by cultivation method:

- share of open field cultivation ...% of sales in the category
- share of covered cultivation / greenhouse horticulture ...% of sales in the category
- share(s) of other cultivation method(s) (to be specified) ...% of sales in the category
- share (partly) unknown ...% of sales in the category

This metric is valued for each separate category according to the following calculation. The number of points indicated in the cell in table 8 is multiplied by the sum of reported shares outside of '(partly) unknown'.

Origin

Report a breakdown of the volume sold in the category, by origin:

- share coming from the region ...% of sales in the category
- share coming from Belgium ...% of sales in the category
- share from the EU (except Belgium) ...% of sales in the category
- share from outside the EU ...% of sales in the category
- share of origin mixed EU/non-EU ...% of sales in the category
- share (partly) unknown ...% of sales in the category

This metric is valued for each separate category according to the following calculation. The number of points indicated in the cell in table 8 is multiplied by the sum of reported shares outside of '(partly) unknown'.

When a supply chain is spread across different countries or regions (for example, when production and processing take place at different locations), the location furthest from the supermarket's distribution center counts as the origin. When reporting on the region, the supermarket is expected to provide its own definition of regional.

The sum of the shares outside of "(partly) unknown" is multiplied by the number of points from the table.

Transport method

Report a breakdown of the volume sold in the category, by type of transport

- road transport ...% of sales in the category
- air + road transport ...% of sales in the category
- water + road transport ...% of sales in the category
- (partly) unknown ...% of sales in the category

This metric is valued for each separate category according to the following calculation.

The number of points indicated in the cell in table 8 is multiplied by the sum of reported shares outside of '(partly) unknown'.

If reporting is aggregated for certain product categories, we will count half the number of points for each of the categories that are merged. For example: a supermarket that reports a combined figure on certified eggs and dairy receives 2 × a maximum of 5 points, instead of 2 × 10 points for separate reporting. If the figure also covers categories not mentioned in table 10 (for example, the supermarket's total sales), we award a quarter of the points. The key figure for this indicator is the sum of the points awarded, which means the maximum achievable score is 290 points.

If the reporting or objectives do not cover all products, it is important to indicate the percentage of the assortment within these categories. For policies that only apply to private labels, the private label factor applies (see Appendix 4).

Weighting in the ranking

To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits; the upper limit is 145 points, the baseline is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the ranking of supermarkets is: 0.5

Organic target and reporting

Indicator EN-SA-GOR

policy

To what extent does the supermarket have a target to increase the purchasing volume from organic agriculture?

Explanation

With a target, the supermarket demonstrates its commitment to the importance of organic farming at all levels. This provides the government, farmers, and the broader community with greater insight into the expected growth of the organic food market. For further explanation, see the policy advisory report [Organic in the Supermarket](#).

Measurement and weighting

Supermarket publications assess the extent to which the supermarket has a target for increasing the share of organic products in the total volume of human food products (Table 11). The level of compliance for the report/target is then determined. The supermarket receives bonus points if a purchasing target has been formulated (Table 11). To measure the key figure, the target's ambition factor is determined (Table 12) and

multiplied by the points from Table 11 and the ambition factor from Table 12. The maximum achievable score is 110.

Level	Definition	Points
Basic level Reporting in general	<p>Supermarket reports on the share of organic in the total mass volume human nutrition (per kg product)⁹. The reporting suffices the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is clearly stated whether the reporting is based on purchasing or sales share. • The period covered by the reporting is clearly stated. The period ended no more than 12 months ago. 	<p>Basic points:</p> <p>10</p>
Level 1 Reporting + sub-target	<p>Condition: reporting as per basic level. Besides, the supermarket formulates a measurable target for increasing the share of organic in the volume of one or more of the categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fresh potatoes, vegetables and fruit • Bread, grains and grain products • Eggs • Meat, cold cuts and poultry • Dairy and dairy products • Other (all other categories together) <p>The target meets the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The target is formulated in the same terms as those used by the supermarket (per kilogram of product). • It is clearly stated whether this is a growth target or an end target. 	<p>Basic points</p> <p>+</p> <p>Ambition factor</p> <p>x 30</p>
Level 2 Reporting + full target	<p>Condition: reporting as per level 1. Besides, the supermarket formulates a measurable target for increasing the share of organic in the <u>total volume human nutrition</u>.</p> <p>The target meets the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The target is formulated in the same terms as those used by the supermarket (per kilogram of product). • It is clearly stated whether this is a growth target or an end target. 	<p>Basic points</p> <p>+</p> <p>Ambition factor</p> <p>x 70</p>
Level 3 Disaggregated reporting + target	<p>Condition: reporting as per level 2, where in addition to reporting on the total share, the organic share is also reported and, possibly, sub-targets are set for the following product groups:</p> <p>Fresh potatoes, vegetables and fruit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bread, grains and grain products • Eggs • Meat, cold cuts and poultry • Dairy and dairy products • Other (all other categories together) 	<p>Basic points</p> <p>+</p> <p>Ambition factor</p> <p>x 90</p>
BONUS POINTS	<p>For each level, 10 bonus points apply if reporting (and objectives) are formulated in terms of purchasing volume (rather than sales volume). The volume share must then be expressed in kilograms of product.</p>	10

Table 11. Determining the level of reporting and target setting.

⁹It is also permitted to report in terms of turnover or units, provided this is clearly indicated. See the box "Revenue, units, or mass?" in Issues and measures.

Ambition factor

To assess the ambition of different types of objectives, each final objective is converted into an average annual growth rate. This calculates how much the organic share must grow on average per year to reach the final objective the supermarket has set for itself. Growth objectives do not need to be converted. If there are different objectives for different categories (level 1), the objective with the lowest ambition factor is decisive.

Ambition factor						
Annual growth required for target	Target formulated for... (= annual growth continues until...)					
	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
5% - 10% per year	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5
> 10% - 20% per year	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6
> 20% - 30% per year	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.9
>30% - 50% per year	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1	1
> 50% per year	0.7	0.9	1	1	1	1

Table 12. Ambition factor, dependent on the expected annual growth and the target year.

Calculation example ambition factor

Supermarket XYZ has a target to sell 16% organic in 2029.

Supermarket XYZ purchased 6% organic in 2023.

From 2023 (last measurement) until 2029 (target year) is 6 years.

This means that the share organic needs to grow 17.8% per year¹⁰, to reach the target in 2029. The ambition factor can now be read from table 12: 0.5.

Definitions

Purchasing share organic	The amount of certified organic products purchased as a percentage of total purchased human food products. The percentage is calculated in kilograms of organic product as a percentage of total purchased products.
Sales share organic	Amount of products sold as organic, as a share of total human food products sold, per kilogram. Volume is calculated in kilograms of product.
End target	Target for a certain share of organic in a given year. For example: "20% organic in 2030".
Growth target	Target for a specific annual growth rate for the organic share. For example: "30% year-on-year growth in the organic share by 2028."

Weighting in the ranking

The key figure is scaled with flexible limits: 75 as the upper limit and 0 as the lower limit.

For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the ranking of supermarkets is: 0.5.

¹⁰ The calculation for this is: $(\frac{A}{B})^{(1/C)} - 1$ where A = share organic in target, B=last measurement share organic en C= years until target, from target year. See also: <https://www.wikihow.com/Calculate-an-Annual-Percentage-Growth-Rate>

Assortment sustainable agriculture

Indicator EN-SA-CIA

assortment

To what extent does the supermarket's assortment meet relevant sustainable agriculture requirements?

Toelichting

A supermarket can take responsibility for making agriculture more sustainable by guaranteeing a minimum sustainability level through their purchasing conditions. Alternatively, supermarkets offer their customers a choice of certified and uncertified products. In this indicator, we investigate the extent to which a supermarket's assortment is covered by relevant certifications that take into account environment and nature.

Measurement and weighting

Relevant certifications are those that receive at least 4 out of 5 points for environment and control in Milieu Centraal's assessment (see [Appendix 3](#)). This method analyses the extent to which a supermarket takes responsibility for making agriculture more sustainable at three different levels, see Table 13.

Level of responsibility	Points
1. No responsibility The assortment does not include any products of the product type that meet the requirements of relevant certifications.	No points
2. Responsibility lies with the customer The assortment includes at least one choice for this product type that meets the requirements of relevant certifications.	1 point per product type
3. Supermarket takes responsibility For this product type, the assortment only includes products that meet the requirements of relevant certifications.	5 points per product type

Table 13. Scoring per product type for EN-SA-CIA.

We have made a selection of clearly defined product types that are widely sold by supermarkets and that reflects the extent to which a supermarket takes responsibility. For fruits and vegetables, these were selected based on the most sold products (in kg of product) (VLAM, 2025) and seasonal considerations. For fruits and vegetables, fresh products (excluding frozen and preserved) are taken into account, including pre-cut fruits and vegetables. For each of the selected product types in table 14, we determine the level at which a supermarket takes responsibility for sustainable agriculture. The key figure is the average number of points for all product types.

Fresh vegetable	Fresh fruit	Animal-based	Other
tomato (unprocessed)	banana	milk (natural)	potatoes
carrot	apple	yoghurt (natural)	pasta
onion (unprocessed)	grapes	Gouda cheese (natural, slices)	rice
chicory	melon	eggs	chocolate bars
lettuce	strawberries	minced beef (natural)	filter coffee and coffee pads
Red bell pepper	pear	brochettes	tea (black)
courgette	kiwi	sausage	

Table 14. Product types per product group within EN-SA-CIA.

Weighting in the ranking

The key figure is scaled with flexible limits: 2.5 as the upper limit and 1 as the lower limit. A supermarket with 2.5 points gets a score of 100 (unless another supermarket scores higher), a supermarket with 1 point gets a score of 0 (unless another supermarket scores lower). For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the ranking of supermarkets is: 0.5.

Fighting deforestation and land conversion

Indicator EN-SA-DFS

policy

To what extent does the supermarket take action to stop deforestation and land conversion linked to the use of soy in animal feed?

Explanation

The most important forest-risk commodities for embedded deforestation and CO2 emissions in Belgium are soybean and palm oil (Bager, Persson, and dos Reis, 2021). Much of this soy is used as animal feed for the production of animal products such as meat, cheese and milk. But the cultivation of soy is problematic. It requires a lot of space, for example, often at the expense of forested areas and other important ecosystems (WWF, 2021). Deforestation plays an important role in climate change and contributes to the loss of biodiversity. And the import of soy is a key driver of the nitrogen surplus. The EUDR (EU Deforestation Regulation (EP, 2023)) requires companies such as supermarkets to indicate that their products, amongst others soy, do not contribute to deforestation. However, the Regulation mainly focuses on forests and not explicitly on other natural ecosystems such as savannas, wetlands or grasslands. In this indicator, we focus on deforestation and land conversion as a separate problem that requires a solution.

Measurement and weighting

For this indicator, we look at a supermarket's publicly available publications to check which action(s) it is taking to stop deforestation and land conversion linked to the production of soy for animal feed. To make a real impact, as is part of the EUDR, European retailers should encourage upstream supply chain actors to become 100% sustainable, and only work with upstream actors that are not involved in any unsustainable activities, such as deforestation or conversion of nature.

The reported volume sold must include all products that are in Tier 2 as defined by the Consumer Goods Forum Soy Sourcing Guidelines. This includes products coming from animals, fed with soy (e.g. meat, dairy and eggs).

The supermarket receives points for each action in table 16. For the component 'Implementation and control', points can only be obtained if the supermarket scores 2 or more points on 'Deforestation- and conversion-free soy in animal feed via certification' (see table 17 for the scoring of this).

If the reporting or objectives do not cover all products, it is important to indicate the percentage of the assortment within these categories. For policies that only apply to private labels, the private label factor applies (see [Appendix 4](#)).

Intervention	Points
Deforestation-free target	
Which goals does the supermarket set to prevent deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems, linked to soy?	

A	In addition to complying with the EUDR, the supermarket also commits to avoiding the conversion of all natural ecosystems by the end of 2025.		2
B	The supermarket uses clear cut-off dates: no products will be accepted from agricultural land freed up by deforestation or conversion of natural ecosystems after this date. These cut-off dates are no later than:		
	B1	31 December 2020 for natural forests (EUDR conform)	1
	B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 2008 for soy originating from natural forests from the Amazon or Brasil (Amazon Soy Moratorium conform); 2020 for all other areas (SBTN no-conversion target conform) 	3
Transparency about the supply chain			
The supermarket publishes information about the origin of soy (max. 5 points).			
A	Publication of countries and/or regions of origin. Minimally countries with a high risk.		% x 2
B	Publication of municipalities and/or farms of origin.		% x 5
The supermarket publishes a list of all direct and indirect soy suppliers in the supply chain.			% x 5
Implementation and control			
Baseline: deforestation- and conversion-free soy in animal feed via certification (max 10 points)			table 17
The supermarket publicly publishes an action plan with a clear target date for implementation of the zero-deforestation and conversion policy for natural ecosystems for all suppliers in the supply chain of soy for animal feed. (*) (max 6 points) This includes:			
A	An overview of the risks in the chain concerning deforestation and landconversion, including the soy suppliers and products with the highest risk (for example through monitoring tools or external verification);		2
B	A step-by-step plan to address these risks, including a cut-off date;		2
C	An escalation approach (e.g. grievance mechanism) with concrete consequences if suppliers/traders do not comply with the agreements, including dialogue, suspension and exclusion, as recommended by the Accountability Framework Initiative. This escalation approach enters into force when the cut-off date is not met.		2
The supermarket's purchasing conditions stipulate that soy for animal feed must be deforestation- and land conversion-free, minimally via segregated certification. (*)			2
Collaboration with third parties on initiatives that have measurable goals to improve transparency throughout the supply chain and/or to promote sustainable production. (*)			2
Reporting action plan			

Reporting on the compliance action plan at least once a year (*). If this is not yet measurable due to a newly published action plan, a commitment from the supermarket to report annually also counts.	2
---	---

Table 16. Scoring of EN-SA-DFS. The number of points is the sum of the points of all interventions a supermarket reports on. % stands for the share that is reported on. (*) This intervention only counts if ≥ 2 points are given for the 'baseline'.

Efforts to stop deforestation and conversion via certification <i>Conversion free is defined as other wooded lands and other natural ecosystems, such as the cerrado.</i>	Points
a. Share unknown: deforestation not (completely) excluded Sales-weighted share of animal products from farms that (partly) use soy in their animal feed, for which forests (might) have been felled, if this is explicitly included in the report. One point is awarded for transparency.	$\% \times 1$
b. Share deforestation- and conversion free soy via book and claim credits Sales-weighted share of soy used in animal supply chains, covered by book and claim credits. All certificates with book and claim credits that comply with the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines are applicable. See the textbox below for the certificates that are applicable.	$\% \times 2$
c. Share deforestation- and conversion free soy via mass balance credits Sales-weighted share of soy used in animal supply chains, covered by mass balance credits. All certificates with mass balance credits that comply with the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines are applicable. See the textbox below for the certificates that are applicable.	$\% \times 5$
d. Share deforestation- and conversion free soy via segregated certificates Sales-weighted share of soy used in animal supply chains, covered by segregated certificates. All certificates with segregated credits that comply with the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines are applicable. See the textbox below for the certificates that are applicable.	$\% \times 8$
e. Share deforestation- and conversion free soy via identity preserved certificates Sales-weighted share of soy used in animal supply chains, covered by identity preserved certificates. All certificates with identity preserved credits that comply with the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines are applicable. See the textbox below for the certificates that are applicable.	$\% \times 10$

Table 17. Levels of deforestation- and conversion-free soy in animal feed via certification. The total number of points for this component is the sum of the points, where % is the reported share that meets the level. Each kilogram of product sold can only count for one of the above levels. The total is therefore a maximum of 10 points.

Soy certificates All certificates that comply with the FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guidelines from 2021 are applicable. The following certificates are applicable as certificates/credits: Agricultura

Sustentable Certificada, Amaggi Responsible Soy Standard, BFA mv-soja, Cargill Triple S, Sustainable Farming Assurance Program, US Soy Sustainability Assurance Protocol (SSAP), ISCC, Sustainable Feed Standard, ADM Responsible Soybean Standard, Bunge Pro-S, Louis Dreyfus Company (LDC), Programa Coamo en RTRS, SFAP-Non- Conversion, Proterra, Danube Soy/Europe Soy, ISCC+, CRS (*IDH, 2022, sec. 3.4.1 and 3.4.2*).

The key figure for this indicator is the total of all points awarded in [table 16](#).

Weighting in the ranking

To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 29, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the ranking of supermarkets is: 0.5.

To what extent does the supermarket take action to stop deforestation and land conversion linked to the use of palm oil?

Explanation

Palm oil is used in a wide range of products, from cosmetics and detergents to candles and biscuits. Worldwide, (tropical) forests and peatlands are burned down to create palm oil plantations. This practice puts local communities and plantation workers at high risk of having their human rights violated, and has a major impact on the climate and ecosystems.

Measurement and weighting

For this indicator, we look at a supermarket's publicly available publications to check which action(s) it is taking to stop deforestation and land conversion linked to the production of palm oil. To make a real impact, as is part of the EUDR, European retailers should encourage upstream supply chain actors to become 100% sustainable, and only work with upstream actors that are not involved in any unsustainable activities, such as deforestation or conversion of nature.

The supermarket receives points for each action in table 18. For the component 'Implementation and control', points can only be obtained if the supermarket scores 2 or more points on 'Deforestation- and conversion-free palm oil via certification' (see table 19 for the scoring of this).

If the reporting or objectives do not cover all products, it is important to indicate the percentage of the assortment within these categories. For policies that only apply to private labels, the private label factor applies (see [Appendix 4](#)).

Intervention		Points
Deforestation-free target		
Which goals does the supermarket set to prevent deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems, linked to palm oil?		
A	In addition to complying with the EUDR, the supermarket also commits to avoiding the conversion of all natural ecosystems by the end of 2025.	2
B	The supermarket uses clear cut-off dates: no products will be accepted from agricultural land freed up by deforestation or conversion of natural ecosystems after this date. These cut-off dates are no later than (max. 3 points):	
	B1 31 December 2020 for natural forests (EUDR conform)	1
	B2 November 2018 for HCV areas and HCS forests (RSPO conform)	3
Transparency about the supply chain		

The supermarket publishes information about the origin of palm oil (max. 5 points).		
A	Publication of countries and/or regions of origin. Minimally countries with a high-risk.	% x 2
B	Publication of municipalities and/or farms of origin.	% x 5
The supermarket publishes a list of all direct and indirect palm oil suppliers in the supply chain.		% x 5
Implementation and control		
Baseline: deforestation- and conversion-free palm oil via certification (max 10 points)		table 17
The supermarket publicly publishes an action plan with a clear target date for implementation of the zero-deforestation and conversion policy for natural ecosystems for all suppliers in the supply chain of palm oil. (*) (max 6 points) This includes:		
A	An overview of the risks in the chain concerning deforestation and land-conversion, including the palm oil suppliers and products with the highest risk (for example through monitoring tools or external verification);	2
B	A step-by-step plan to address these risks, including a cut-off date;	2
C	An escalation approach (e.g. grievance mechanism) with concrete consequences if suppliers/traders do not comply with the agreements, including dialogue, suspension and exclusion, as recommended by the Accountability Framework Initiative. This escalation approach enters into force when the cut-off date is not met.	2
The supermarket's purchasing conditions stipulate that palm oil must be deforestation- and land conversion-free, minimally via segregated certification. (*)		2
Collaboration with third parties on initiatives that have measurable goals to improve transparency throughout the supply chain and/or to promote sustainable production. (*)		2
Reporting action plan		
Reporting on the compliance action plan at least once a year (*). If this is not yet measurable due to a newly published action plan, a commitment from the supermarket to report annually also counts.		2

Table 18. Scoring of EN-SA-DFP. The number of points is the sum of the points of all interventions a supermarket reports on. % stands for the share that is reported on. (*) This intervention only counts if ≥ 5 points are given for the 'baseline'.

Efforts to stop deforestation and conversion via certification <i>Conversion free is defined as other wooded lands and other natural ecosystems, such as the cerrado.</i>	Points
a. Share unknown: deforestation not (completely) excluded Sales-weighted share of products from farms that (partly) use palm oil, for which forests (might) have been felled, if this is explicitly included in the report. One point is awarded for transparency.	% x 1

<p>b. Share deforestation- and conversion free palm oil via book and claim credits Sales-weighted share of palm oil, covered by book and claim credits.</p> <p>Certificates with book and claim credits coming from the following are applicable: RSPO, ISCC PLUS, POIG.</p>	<p>$\% \times 2$</p>
<p>c. Share deforestation- and conversion free palm oil via mass balance credits Sales-weighted share of palm oil, covered by mass balance credits.</p> <p>Certificates with mass balance credits coming from the following are applicable: RSPO, ISCC PLUS, POIG.</p>	<p>$\% \times 5$</p>
<p>d. Share deforestation- and conversion free palm oil via segregated certificates Sales-weighted share of palm oil, covered by segregated certificates.</p> <p>Certificates with segregated certificates coming from the following are applicable: RSPO, ISCC PLUS, POIG.</p>	<p>$\% \times 8$</p>
<p>e. Share deforestation- and conversion free palm oil via identity preserved certificates Sales-weighted share of palm oil, covered by identity preserved certificates.</p> <p>Certificates with identity preserved certificates coming from the following are applicable: RSPO, ISCC PLUS, POIG.</p>	<p>$\% \times 10$</p>

Table 19. Levels of deforestation- and conversion-free palm oil via certification. The total number of points for this component is the sum of the points, where % is the reported share that meets the level. Each kilogram of product sold can only count for one of the above levels. The total is therefore a maximum of 10 points.

The key figure for this indicator is the total of all points awarded in [table 18](#).

Weighting in the ranking

To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 29, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the ranking of supermarkets is: 0.5.

To what extent does the supermarket take action to stop deforestation and land conversion linked to cocoa used in its products?

Explanation

Cocoa is not only a popular Belgian commodity, but also a very important forest-risk commodity. Belgium is Europe's second-largest cocoa bean importer and an important distributor of cocoa derivatives, mainly for cocoa-processing industries in neighbouring countries (CBI, 2025). While Belgian chocolate may be known for its quality, it still leaves a trail of deforestation in its wake, particularly in Ghana and Ivory Coast. Together, these two countries produce nearly two-thirds of the world's supply of cocoa (World Cocoa Foundation). To mitigate the risk of deforestation, European retailers should encourage and support upstream supply actors to become 100% sustainable. Going forward, they should only work with upstream cocoa actors that are not involved in any unsustainable activities (or that have a clear action plan on how to achieve sustainable production within a well-defined period of time), such as deforestation or the conversion of nature.

Measurement and weighting

For this indicator, we look at a supermarket's publicly available publications to check which action(s) it is taking to stop deforestation and land conversion linked to the production of cocoa. To make a real impact, as is part of the EUDR, European retailers should encourage upstream supply chain actors to become 100% sustainable, and only work with upstream actors that are not involved in any unsustainable activities, such as deforestation or conversion of nature.

The supermarket receives points for each action in table 20. For the component 'Implementation and control', points can only be obtained if the supermarket scores 2 or more points on 'Deforestation- and conversion-free cocoa via certification'¹¹ (see table 21 for the scoring of this).

If the reporting or objectives do not cover all products, it is important to indicate the percentage of the assortment within these categories. For policies that only apply to private labels, the private label factor applies (see [Appendix 4](#)).

Intervention		Points
Deforestation-free target		
Which goals does the supermarket set to prevent deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems, linked to cocoa?		
A	In addition to complying with the EUDR, the supermarket also commits to avoiding the conversion of all natural ecosystems by the end of 2025.	2

¹¹ Corporate sustainability initiatives are acknowledged under *Implementation and Control* (see [Table 20](#)) but are not counted for the 'baseline' (see [Table 21](#)), as they lack independent third-party compliance monitoring.

B	The supermarket uses clear cut-off dates: no products will be accepted from agricultural land freed up by deforestation or conversion of natural ecosystems after this date. These cut-off dates are no later than (max. 3 points):		
B1	31 December 2020 for natural forests (EUDR conform)		1
B2	The supermarket uses 2020 for all other areas (SBTN no-conversion target conform)		2
B3	The supermarket uses 1 January 2014 for all natural ecosystems (in line with the Rainforest Alliance Sustainable Agriculture Standard)		3
Transparency about the supply chain			
The supermarket publishes information about the origin of cocoa (max. 5 points).			
A	Publication of countries and/or regions of origin. Minimally countries with a high-risk.		% x 2
B	Publication of municipalities and/or farms of origin.		% x 5
The supermarket publishes a list of all direct and indirect cocoa suppliers in the supply chain.			% x 5
Implementation and control			
Baseline: deforestation- and conversion-free cocoa via certification (max 10 points)			table 21
The supermarket publicly publishes an action plan with a clear target date for implementation of the zero-deforestation and conversion policy for natural ecosystems for all suppliers in the supply chain of cocoa. (*) (max 6 points) This includes:			
A	An overview of the risks in the chain concerning deforestation and land-conversion, including the cocoa suppliers and products with the highest risk (for example through monitoring tools or external verification);		2
B	A step-by-step plan to address these risks, including a cut-off date;		2
C	An escalation approach (e.g. grievance mechanism) with concrete consequences if suppliers/traders do not comply with the agreements, including dialogue, suspension and exclusion, as recommended by the Accountability Framework Initiative. This escalation approach enters into force when the cut-off date is not met.		2
The supermarket's purchasing conditions stipulate that cocoa must be deforestation- and land conversion-free, minimally via segregated certification. (*)			2
Collaboration with third parties on initiatives that have measurable goals to improve transparency throughout the supply chain and/or to promote sustainable production. (*)			2
Reporting action plan			
Reporting on the compliance action plan at least once a year (*). If this is not yet measurable due to a newly published action plan, a commitment from the supermarket to report annually also counts.			2

Table 20. Scoring of EN-SA-DFC. The number of points is the sum of the points of all interventions a supermarket reports on. % stands for the share that is reported on. (*) This intervention only counts if ≥ 2 points are given for the 'baseline'.

Efforts to stop deforestation and conversion via certification <i>Conversion free is defined as other wooded lands and other natural ecosystems, such as the cerrado.</i>	Points
a. Share unknown: deforestation not (completely) excluded Sales-weighted share of products from farms that (partly) use cocoa, for which forests (might) have been felled, if this is explicitly included in the report. One point is awarded for transparency.	$\% \times 1$
c. Share deforestation- and conversion free cocoa via mass balance credits Sales-weighted share of cocoa, covered by mass balance credits. Certificates with mass balance credits coming from the following are applicable: Fairtrade, Rainforest Alliance.	$\% \times 5$
d. Share deforestation- and conversion free cocoa via segregated certificates Sales-weighted share of cocoa, covered by segregated certificates. Certificates with segregated certificates coming from the following are applicable: Fairtrade, Rainforest Alliance.	$\% \times 8$
e. Share deforestation- and conversion free cocoa via identity preserved certificates Sales-weighted share of cocoa, covered by identity preserved certificates. Certificates with identity preserved certificates coming from the following are: Rainforest Alliance	$\% \times 10$

Table 21. Levels of deforestation- and conversion-free cocoa via certification. The total number of points for this component is the sum of the points, where % is the reported share that meets the level. Each kilogram of product sold can only count for one of the above levels. The total is therefore a maximum of 10 points.

The key figure for this indicator is the total of all points awarded in [table 20](#).

Weighting in the ranking

To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 29, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the ranking of supermarkets is: 0.5.

Food Waste (EN-FW)

Food Waste

Indicator EN-FW-GPA

policy

Has the supermarket published an action plan with concrete interventions, aimed at reducing both food loss in the supply chain and food waste at the consumer stage?

Explanation

Food loss in the supply chain is a recurring issue due to stock management, less sales than predicted and a shorter shelf-life than expected. It represents about 8% of the food wasted per person in 2023 in Belgium (Eurostat, 2025; FAO, 2017). With optimised supply chain and stock management, supermarkets can reduce this food loss and waste. It is important to tackle food waste because of its significant environmental and economical consequences (FAO, 2017).

Moreover, food waste in households represented 43% of the food wasted per person in 2023 in Belgium (Eurostat, 2025). Supermarkets do not have control over their customers' behaviour at home. However, they can influence people's shopping behaviour, especially on the amount of food bought, and thus potentially wasted. Campaigns that stimulate bulk purchases, impulse buying, larger packaging and supermarket design, for example, lead people to buy more than they need (Eurostat, 2025). This increases the risk of food being thrown away at home. Consumers indicate that the main reasons they throw away food are preparing too much food, not using food in time or having bought too much food (Vlaamse overheid, 2019).

Measurement and weighting

For this indicator, supermarkets' reported policies and performance are measured using the criteria in table 22. The key figure for this indicator is the total of all points awarded in table 14. We adopt the definition of food waste proposed by Fusions (FUSIONS EU, 2014)

Points are awarded according to the following levels:

Level	Actions	Points
1	The supermarket has published an action plan with concrete interventions aimed at reducing both food loss in the supply chain and food waste at the consumer stage.	1
2	The action plan includes measurable and time-bound targets, and clear definitions of figures and indicators used. The supermarket monitors and reports its own performance against the targets.	2
3	The plan includes an estimate by an independent third party of the total food loss and waste in the supply chain and at the consumer stage that is related to the supermarket.	4

4	The plan includes an assessment by an independent third party of actions the supermarket should prioritise to combat food loss and waste in the supply chain and at the consumer stage. Cost-effectiveness may be used as a prioritisation criterion. Targets in the action plan reflect this prioritisation.	6
---	---	---

Table 22. Scoring of EN-3.1.1 The number of points is the sum of the points of all actions the supermarket takes.

Weighting in the ranking

To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 7, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see 'Score and scaling' in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the ranking of supermarkets is: 0.5.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Definitions	45
Appendix 2	Food types protein shift	46
Appendix 3	Sustainability certifications	50
Appendix 4	Private label factor	50
Appendix 5	Changelog	51
	References	54

Definitions

This research methodology for Belgium's Superlist Environment uses the following definitions, unless stated otherwise. The definitions used in the Research Framework are also applicable.

Promotion	Mention of one product or a group of products in a supermarket's weekly promotion flyer, for which, for example, a special price applies, or which the supermarket highlights for a different reason. See also the Research Framework (bron).
Main ingredient	The first ingredient in a product's list of ingredients. If the second ingredient is present in a comparable amount, both ingredients may be considered the main ingredient. If a product lacks an ingredient declaration, the main ingredient is derived from the product's name or category, if possible.
Sustainable agriculture	Sustainable agriculture meets the needs of present and future generations, while ensuring profitability, environmental health, and social and economic equity. Sustainable food and agriculture contributes to all four pillars of food security – availability, access, utilisation and stability – and the dimensions of sustainability (environmental, social and economic) (FAO, 2022).
Distinctive certifications	A certification that takes relevant environmental action, with a proper control system in place. See also Appendix 3.
Volume sold	Weight in kilograms of total food sales.

Food types contributing to the protein shift

A healthy and environmentally responsible diet includes meat and other animal products. However, the environmental impact of the lowest-impact animal products is generally greater than that of plant-based alternatives (Poore and Nemecek, 2018). Therefore, the consumption of animal products—especially in Western countries—must be reduced to a level that aligns with planetary boundaries. The change in our food culture and eating habits that this requires is commonly referred to as the "protein transition" (Willett et al., 2019).

This research methodology distinguishes between three categories of protein-rich foods, depending on their contribution to this protein transition:

- No contribution
- Small contribution (small step)
- Significant contribution

The categorisation reflects both the environmental impact of the food type and the extent to which it helps reduce the central role of animal products in our cooking habits and eating culture.

Cheese and meat substitutes

We recognise that the environmental impact of cheese is not always better than that of certain types of meat. If it were only about direct impact reduction, the individual footprint of all types of animal-based foods would have to be weighed against each other. However, in today's food culture, switching to a vegetarian diet (which still includes dairy and eggs) is an obvious step towards less animal-based food.

A similar situation applies to (ultra)processed products sold as 'meat substitutes'. These products are not always the best choice for health. Nevertheless, these products can be an important tool in transitioning to a more plant-based diet.

For this reason, cheese and processed meat substitutes are not excluded in this method, but valued as an intermediate step towards a diet of largely plant-based, low-processed foods.

No contribution: meat, fish & shellfish

It is not assumed that meat, fish, or shellfish contribute to the protein transition. "Meat" refers to red meat from mammals such as cows, pigs, goats, sheep, and horses, and white meat from rabbits and poultry, such as chickens, turkeys, ducks, and geese.

The international EAT Lancet report has calculated that by 2050, globally, we should consume an average of no more than 42 grams of meat and 28 grams of fish per day per person (Willett et al., 2019). The Food Consumption Survey 2022-2023 showed that on average, Belgians ate 108 grams of meat per day (Sciensano, 2025).

Small Step: Dairy, Cheese, and Eggs

Other animal products such as cheese, dairy, and eggs generally have a slightly lower environmental impact. However, this is not a rule; some (aged) cheeses have an

environmental footprint comparable to or even significantly larger than some types of white meat or fish. Yet, dairy and eggs play a different role in our cooking habits and food culture. They are usually just an ingredient or a topping, not the centerpiece of a dish. As such, they are easier to replace in (or remove from) dishes than meat or fish. The public tends to view vegetarian products (containing dairy or eggs) as something "halfway" on the spectrum between animal- and plant-based foods.

Significant contribution: plant-based protein sources

Plant-based protein sources such as legumes, nuts, and seeds are the meat substitutes that contribute most to the necessary dietary change. The environmental impact of these food types is almost always much lower than that of the other two product categories (EAT, 2024).

Sustainability certifications

Certifications

Several of the indicators of this methodology use certifications to measure (an aspect of) sustainability. But the certifications that are in use today have varying degrees of control, and not all of them have distinctive environmental requirements. For this research, we used a selection of certifications, based on the Keurmerkenwijzer assessment of Milieu Centraal (Milieu Centraal, 2025). That assessment provides an overview of certifications used in the Netherlands and applicable to Belgium as well. Milieu Centraal assessed these certifications on a number of aspects: their level of ambition with regards to environmental, social and animal welfare efforts; reliability and transparency. Standards, sustainability labels and logos are marked as 'top certifications' if they score a minimum of 4 out of 5 points on all aspects. These 'top certifications' correspond to the certifications deemed 'most ambitious' in another analysis conducted by Basic, WWF and Greenpeace (WWF/Greenpeace/Basic, 2021). Because the emphasis of our study is on the difference a certification makes on the environment, we only considered Milieu Centraal's assessment in terms of environmental requirements and control. We use the same lower limit as they did for their top certifications, namely 4 out of 5 points. We use the term 'distinctive certifications' for these certifications.

Certification	Fish	Meat	Dairy	Eggs	Vegetables	Fruit	Rice	Coffee	Tea	Cocoa
ASC	✓									
Better Life label 1 star		–	–	–						
Better Life label 2 stars		–	✓	–						
Better Life label 3 stars		–	✓	–						
Climate Activator					–	–		–	–	–
Biocyclische-Veganlandbouw					✓	✓				
Demeter		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
EKO		✓	✓	✓	✓*	✓*				
EU-Organic	–	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Fairtrade	✓ (wild fish)				✓**	✓**	–	✓	✓	✓
Fair for Life					–	–		–	–	–
Fair Trade USA	–									
FairWild								–	–	–
Friend of the Sea Aquaculture	–									

Friend of the Sea Fisheries	–									
GGN Certified Farming	–				–	–				
Keten Duurzaam Varkensvlees		–								
Knorr Duurzaamheidslogo					–	–				
MSC	✓									
On the way to PlanetProof			–	–	–	–				
Rainforest Alliance					✓**	✓**		✓	✓	✓
Sustainable Rice Platform							✓			

Table 23. Certifications accepted for this theme. All combinations of certifications and product groups marked with '✓' are accepted; when there is a '-' the certification does have criteria for the product category, but these are not strict enough for us to be able to accept them.

** The EKO certification is not a distinctive certification for tropical fruits and vegetables.*

*** Rainforest Alliance and Fairtrade are distinctive certifications for tropical fruits and vegetables.*

APPENDIX 4

Private label factor

A supermarket is responsible for its entire product range. In practice, supermarkets sometimes only provide information on their private label products. To make that information mutually comparable, a private label factor is applied. If a supermarket only has a policy on private label products on a certain subject, the points for that subject are multiplied by the own brand factor.

- If a supermarket has a policy on private label products but does not give information on the proportion of private label products in relation to the total product sales, we use a private label factor of 0.2.
- If a supermarket publicly reports the share of private label products in their total sales, the private label factor is equal to this share.

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

Changelog

Indicator number SL EN BE '26	Indicator number SL EN BE '22	Changes
Climate plan		
EN-CP-GCP	n/a	<p>New indicator for SL EN Belgium. It is based on the indicators used in Superlist Green the Netherlands '25 and Superlist Environment Europe '26. Small adjustments have been made, according to lessons learned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - half points are rewarded for the SBTi target validation for scope 3 target alignment with 1.5°C degree - half points are rewarded for a different base year than 2019 - definition off-setting - definition of financial support to suppliers - 1 minimum requirement for target setting to prevent double points for net zero commitment
Protein transition		
EN-PT-GPP	EN-1.1.1	<p>This indicator has been changed a lot to accommodate both Eiweet (Protein Tracker) from GPA/Proveg and the WWF method. Considering the Belgian context, reporting using the Eimeet methodology is also allowed.</p> <p>This indicator is based on the indicators used in Superlist Green the Netherlands '25 and Superlist Europe '26. Small adjustments have been made, according to lessons learned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a supermarket reporting and setting targets using the WWF method, can score in column b only in all elements in column a are sufficient. In other words, - a supermarket reporting and setting targets covering all food groups using the WWF method, has to report the split protein-rich food groups (1 and 2), and have targets for these two which are in line with PHD.
EN-PT-PSR	EN-1.3.2	The weighting of this indicator has been adjusted to 0. Therefore, it is not included in the ranking. This is due to the significant changes in the meat aisle due to the availability of hybrid products, which makes this indicator less meaningful.
Sustainable agriculture		
EN-SA-GPO	EN-2.1.1	'Eco-Score' (or Green-score) is no longer part of the

		<p>methodology as an intermediate step because it focuses on letting consumers make responsible choices which is not aligned with the strategy of Superlist. Moreover, this scoring system is still in the experimental phase and doesn't allow international comparability of the Superlist indicator.</p> <p>The <i>keurmerkenwijzer</i> of Milieu Centraal has been updated. We have included the changes in the methodology. For example, Fairtrade, EU organic and Demeter are now sufficient for exotic fruits such as bananas, and the certification On the way to Planet Proof is now insufficient.</p>
EN-SA-GOR	n/a	<p>This indicator has been added. It assesses supermarkets' target-setting for organic certified categories in the sales volume with 3 different levels of reporting and target-setting. The indicator is based on the indicator used in Superlist Green the Netherlands '25. It has been added because organic is a major certification for sustainable agriculture, and the European Union has the target to have at least 25% of the EU's agricultural land to produce organic food by 2030.</p>
EN-SA-CIA	EN-2.2.1	<p>The methodology is the same as in 2022, with a small change in the fruit selection. The season of the data collection has been taken into account (March and April are not in the season for tangerine and oranges).</p> <p>In SL Green NL '25 we looked at focus products on organic. These are not included in the Belgian methodology.</p>
EN-SA-DFS	EN-2.3.1	<p>Strengthened with regards to the upcoming EU Deforestation Regulation, in line with the other deforestation and conversion indicators. The indicator is based on the indicators used in Superlist Green the Netherlands '25. Small adjustments have been made, according to lessons learned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in the table under 'Transparency about the supply chain', the methodology asked for '<i>Minimally a distinction between countries with a high-risk and countries with a low risk.</i>'. We strengthened this to: '<i>minimally countries with a high risk</i>', as we want to have insight in the (high-risk) countries supermarkets are sourcing from.
EN-SA-DFP	EN-2.3.2	<p>Strengthened with regards to the upcoming EU Deforestation Regulation, in line with the other deforestation and conversion indicators.</p> <p>We look at data published by supermarkets and for the levels of certification also at the data in the</p>

		latest publication of the WWF Palmoil scorecard
EN-SA-DFC	EN-2.3.3	<p>Strengthened with regards to the upcoming EU Deforestation Regulation, in line with the other deforestation and conversion indicators.</p> <p>Accepted certifications are Rainforest Alliance and Fairtrade.</p>
General remark		
<p>Superlist sometimes also deviates in the units to be reported in: e.g. Superlist asks for reporting of the sales volume, compared other reporting schemes ask for reporting on assortment (SKU's). Reporting based on sales volume is required in Superlist because it gives a more accurate representation of the certified products actually consumed instead of the share of certified products in the assortment. We have decided to acknowledge this transparency (i.e. reporting based on sku's) as a first step, and will give 10% of the points for reporting on assortment, instead of on sales. This is indicated p. 6 in the methodology.</p>		

References

- Bager, Simon L, U. Martin Persson, and Tiago N.P. dos Reis, 2021. 'Eighty-Six EU Policy Options for Reducing Imported Deforestation: One Earth', no. 4 (2): 289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2021.01.011>
- Be4Life, 2018. 'Het Duwtje in de Juiste Richting: Langetermijneffecten Gedrag. Hoe de Vlaamse Consument Begeleiden Naar Een Milieuverantwoord Consumptiepatroon. -Case Retail & Case Bedrijfsrestaurants'. Gent: Onderzoeksgroep consumentengedrag - Be4Life. <https://omgeving.vlaanderen.be/sites/default/files/atoms/files/Eindrapport%20gedrag%20en%20voeding%20lange%20termijn.pdf>
- CarbonBrief, 2023. 'Interactive: The Pathways to Meeting the Paris Agreement's 1.5C Limit'. CarbonBrief. <https://interactive.carbonbrief.org/one-point-five-pathways/index.html>
- Cavanagh, Karen, Lenny R Vartanian, C Peter Herman, and Janet Polivy, 2014. 'The Effect of Portion Size on Food Intake Is Robust to Brief Education and Mindfulness Exercises'. *Journal of Health Psychology* 19 (6): 730–139. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1359105313478645>
- CBI, 2025. 'What Is the Demand for Cocoa on the European Market? | CBI'. CBI. 26 March 2025. <https://www.cbi.eu/market-information/cocoa/what-demand>
- EAT, 2019. 'EAT-Lancet Commission Summary Report'. https://eatforum.org/content/uploads/2019/07/EAT-Lancet_Commission_Summary_Report.pdf
- EAT, 2024. 'The Planetary Health Diet'. Accessed 8 October 2024. <https://eatforum.org/eat-lancet-commission/the-planetary-health-diet-and-you/>
- EAT Lancet, 2025. 'Summary Report of the EAT-Lancet Commission'. https://eatforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/EAT-Lancet_Commission_Summary_Report.pdf
- EP, 2021. *Regulation (EU) 2021/1119 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 June 2021 Establishing the Framework for Achieving Climate Neutrality and Amending Regulations (EC) No 401/2009 and (EU) 2018/1999 ('European Climate Law')*. OJ L. Vol. 243. <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/1119/oj/eng>
- EP, 2023. *Regulation (EU) 2023/1115 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 May 2023 on the Making Available on the Union Market and the Export from the Union of Certain Commodities and Products Associated with Deforestation and Forest Degradation and Repealing Regulation (EU) No 995/2010 (Text with EEA Relevance)*. OJ L. Vol. 150. <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2023/1115/oj/eng>
- Eurostat, 2025. 'Food Waste and Food Waste Prevention - Estimates'. Eurostat. Accessed 11 December 2025. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Food_waste_and_food_waste_prevention_-_estimates
- FAO, 2017. 'Food Loss and Waste in the Food Supply Chain'. FAO, July. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/36cb45bc-392c-41fb-97f1-90ca1f16ee7f/content>
- FUSIONS EU, 2014. 'FUSIONS Definitional Framework for Food Waste 2014.Pdf'. FUSIONS EU. <https://www.eu-fusions.org/phocadownload/Publications/FUSIONS%20Definitional%20Framework%20for%20Food%20Waste%202014.pdf>
- GPA & Proveg, 2025. 'Eiweet Methodiek Supermarkt'. https://eiweet.nl/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/2025_Eiweet-Monitor-Update-okt-2025-Green-Protein-Alliance-Proveg.pdf

- IDH, 2022. 'Beyond Chocolate'. 2022.
<https://www.idhsustainabletrade.com/initiative/beyondchocolate/>
- IPCC, 2023. 'Annex I: Glossary'. In *Climate Change 2022 - Mitigation of Climate Change*, edited by Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change (Ipcc), 1st edn, 1793–1820. IPCC. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926.020>
- Milieu Centraal, 2025. 'Keurmerkenwijzer'. 2025.
<https://milieucentraal-prod-umbraco01.azurewebsites.net>
- Nature Publishing Group, 2024. 'Circular Food System Approaches Can Support Current European Protein Intake Levels While Reducing Land Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions'. *Nature Food* 5 (5): 402–12. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-024-00975-2>
- PBL, 2020. 'Voedselconsumptie veranderen: bouwstenen voor beleid om duurzamere eetpatronen te stimuleren'. 4044. Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving.
<https://www.pbl.nl/publicaties/voedselconsumptie-veranderen>
- PHE, 2020. 'An Analysis of the Role of Price Promotions on the Household Purchases of Food and Drinks High in Sugar, and Purchases of Food and Drinks for out of Home Consumption'. Public Health England.
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/947412/Sugar_Reduction_analysis_of_price_promotions_on_the_household_purchases_of_food_and_drinks_high_in_sugar__4_.pdf
- ProVeg International, 2024. 'Rebalancing Protein Sales'. *ProVeg International*. ProVeg International, 18 October 2024. <https://proveg.org/article/rebalancing-protein-sales/>
- Questionmark, 2023. 'Superlist Research Framework v1.4'. Stichting Questionmark.
<https://www.thequestionmark.org/download/superlist-research-framework-v1.4.en.pdf>
- Sciensano, 2025. 'Food Consumption: Meat and Plant-Based Alternatives, Food Consumption Survey 2022-2023'. Text. Sciensano.Be. 2025.
<https://www.sciensano.be/en/results-national-food-consumption-survey-2022-2023/food-consumption/meat-and-plant-based-alternatives>
- Steenhuis, Ingrid H. M., Franca H. Leeuwis, and Willemijn M. Vermeer, 2010. 'Small, Medium, Large or Supersize: Trends in Food Portion Sizes in The Netherlands'. *Public Health Nutrition* 13 (6): 852–57. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980009992011>
- UN, 2015. 'Paris Agreement'. United Nations.
https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf
- Vlaamse overheid, 2019. 'Voedselverlies en consumentengedrag bij Vlaamse huishoudens'. Departement Omgeving Vlaanderen.
<https://archieff.algemeen.omgeving.vlaanderen.be/xmlui/handle/acd/260221>
- Vlaamse overheid, 2025. 'Green Deal. 010 eiwitshift op ons bord. Ei-meet. Monitoring...'. Vlaanderen.be. Vlaamse overheid. Accessed 10 December 2025.
<https://www.vlaanderen.be/publicaties/green-deal-010-eiwitshift-op-ons-bord-ei-meet-monitoring-eiwitname-en-aankopen-in-vlaanderen>
- VLAM, 2025. 'GROENTE- & FRUITVERBRUIK IN BELGIË IN 2024'. Vlaams Centrum voor Agro- en Visserijmarketing.
<https://www.vlaanderen.be/vlam/sites/default/files/publications/2025-06/Consumptie%20van%20groenten%20en%20fruit%20in%20Belgi%C3%AB%202024.pdf>
- Willett, Walter, Johan Rockström, Brent Loken, Marco Springmann, Tim Lang, Sonja Vermeulen, Tara Garnett, et al., 2019. 'Food in the Anthropocene: The EAT–Lancet Commission on Healthy Diets from Sustainable Food Systems'. *The Lancet* 393 (10170): 447–92. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31788-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4)
- WWF, 2021. 'Stepping Up: The Continuing Impact of EU Consumption on Nature'. WWF.
https://wwfeu.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/stepping_up_the_continuing_impact_of_eu_consumption_on_nature_worldwide_fullreport_low_res.pdf
- WWF, 2024. 'WWF Planet Based Diets Retailer Methodology'.
<https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/wwf-planet-based-diets-retailer-methodology.pdf>
- WWF/Greenpeace/Basic, 2021. 'Étude de Demarches de Durabilité Dans Le Domaine Alimentaire'. WWF/Greenpeace/Basic.
https://lebasic.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/VF_RAPPORT_TRANSVERSE_2021_0924.pdf

Zlavetska, Natalina, Chris Dubelaar, and Steven S Holden, 2014. 'Sizing up the Effect of Portion Size on Consumption: A Meta-Analytic Review'. *Journal of Marketing* 78 (3): 140–54. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1509/jm.12.0303>