

SUPERLIST

SOCIAL 2026

Research Methodology



Research Methodology Superlist Social 2026

September 2025

Version 1.0 (September 2025)

Copyright Questionmark

Parts of this publication may be reproduced if the source is acknowledged:
Questionmark (2025), "Research Methodology Superlist Social 2026", version 1.0,
September 2025, Questionmark Foundation, Amsterdam.

<https://www.thequestionmark.org/download/superlist-social-netherlands-belgium-research-method-nl-be-human-rights-2026-v1.0.en.pdf>

Authors: Gustaaf Haan, Dore de Jong, Willem van Engen - Cocquyt

Content

Background	3
This document	5
Issues and measures	6
Overview of measures and indicators	9
Indicators	12
References	43
Annexes	45

Background

Superlist is an ongoing research programme that provides insight into what supermarkets are doing to make the food system more healthy, more sustainable and more fair. Superlist also shows which supermarkets are leading the way and which are lagging behind, and what they can do to improve their position. Superlist Social focuses on human rights. The first Superlist Social was published in 2023 in the Netherlands. The first Superlist Social in Belgium was published in 2024. This document describes the criteria for Superlist Social 2026, for a comparison of supermarkets on human rights, including both Belgian and Dutch supermarkets.

Updated methodology

The current methodology is largely based on the first edition in 2023. The indicators represent a selection of key steps that supermarkets should take to respect human rights in food supply chains, both at home and abroad. However, this is not an exhaustive list and even a 100 percent score would not guarantee that the rights of all farmers and workers are respected.

The methodology also continues to reflect the expectations set on companies through international standards like the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) and the OECD Guidelines on Multinational Corporations. This also aligns with existing and upcoming legislation that makes it mandatory for large companies like supermarkets to respect human rights throughout their supply chains. This is all the more important amidst the current attempts to delay, weaken or even fully roll back the EU Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive. This continued need to invest in human rights, not just on paper but especially in practice, is reflected in the updated methodology.

Superlist Social illustrates who are relative frontrunners and laggards. In addition, the score gives a good indication of how far a supermarket is in this area. With this, all supermarkets are encouraged to continuously improve their human rights policy and practice, and especially show the laggards that they can and should do more.

Financial support

This project is made possible by the contributions of Solidaridad, Rikolto, Oxfam Novib, Questionmark Foundation, Fairtrade Belgium and Oxfam Belgium.

Solidaridad

rikolto



OXFAM Novib

Questionmark



Civil Society Partners

This Superlist is Questionmark's initiative, with consultation of the organisations mentioned below. Besides a financial contribution, these organisations all shared their knowledge and expertise in developing this research methodology and designing the study.

- Solidaridad
- Rikolto
- Oxfam Novib

Ambassadors support this Superlist project. They provide a financial contribution and help with the distribution of the report and the messages of this project.

- Fairtrade Belgium
- Oxfam Belgium

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

This document

This document describes the research methodology behind Superlist Social in the Netherlands and Belgium 2026 from research project Superlist. The methodology Superlist Social is designed to help supermarkets monitor their contribution to a fairer food system and 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 Dutch and Belgian retailers. For the Netherlands, these are the six largest supermarket chains in terms of market share: Albert Heijn, Jumbo, Lidl, Aldi, Plus and Dirk. For Belgium, the five largest supermarket chains in terms of market share are taken into account: Colruyt, Delhaize, Carrefour, Aldi, and Lidl. Together, both the Dutch supermarkets and the Belgian supermarkets have a total market share of more than 80% in their country.

Research period

The research period for Superlist Social 2026 runs from **5 September 2025** to the last reference date on **31 October 2025**. 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

The following is an overview of the comparative criteria for Superlist Social. This Superlist Social 2026 methodology is largely based on the methodology that was used for Superlist Social 2023 and Superlist Social 2024, with some improvements being made. The indicators were determined in consultation with Solidaridad, Rikolto and Oxfam Novib, and our Scientific Council. There is a continued need for large companies like supermarkets to invest in human rights, not just on paper but especially in practice. This need is reflected in the current methodology, as the indicators are more action-oriented, rather than commitment-oriented.

Structure of the method

For each issue, a number of measures are listed that supermarkets can take to ensure human rights in their food value chains are respected. 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](#).

Issue 1: Transparency and Accountability

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

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

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

Issue 2: Workers

Globally, tens of millions of people work in food supply chains. As a result, this sector has the potential to contribute to the fight against poverty and inequality.

Unfortunately, conditions in this sector are not always favourable for workers: long hours, little to no pay, dangerous working conditions and poor living conditions are just a few examples of abuses workers face. In addition, some food supply chains use child labour and forced labour (ILO, 2022).

Indicators under the 'Workers' theme compare the measures taken by supermarkets to safeguard workers' rights. Crucial to this are supporting living wages and supporting suppliers to enable respect for human rights and continuous improvement in labour standards.

Issue 3: Farmers

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

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

In addition to small-scale farmers globally, it was decided to also consider the situation of Global North farmers. The indicators specifically for Global North farmers compare measures taken by supermarkets to improve the conditions of Global North farmers from which they are sourcing directly or indirectly. Crucial to this is ensuring that supermarkets pay a right price to farmers including the cost of sustainable production, because fair and sustainable food production also depends on greater commitment and investment from supermarkets.

Issue 4: Gender

Women make up a large proportion of workers and small-scale farmers in the food and agriculture sector. But because of deeply rooted gender norms around the world, women are mostly concentrated in the lowest-paid and least secure roles in global food supply chains. Workplace violence, discrimination, lower wages and insufficient to no compensation are examples of abuses women face globally. In addition to women, people from the LGBTI+ community also disproportionately face discrimination.

Indicators under the 'Gender' theme compare measures taken by supermarkets to address gender inequality in supply chains. Crucial to this are closing the gender pay gap and the implementation of an action plan and timebound milestones to address gender-based violence and improve the position of women.

Overview of measures and indicators

HR-TA Transparency and Accountability

Desired measures	Indicators		Weight
The supermarket is committed to respecting human rights.	HR-TA-UNC	Does the supermarket make an explicit commitment to uphold the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and report annually on progress?	1
The supermarket implements a robust due diligence framework.	HR-TA-DDP	Does the supermarket implement a human rights due diligence process aligned with OECD Guidelines and the UNGPs?	1
	HR-TA-CPM	Does the supermarket demonstrate how it ceases, prevents and mitigates human rights risk in food supply chains?	1
	HR-TA-BRS	Does the supermarket annually conduct and publish a broad risk scoping?	1
The supermarket assesses the impacts of its supply chain activities on rightsholders.	HR-TA-PIA	Has the supermarket recently published human rights impact assessments?	1
	HR-TA-RAT	Does the supermarket report annually on the actions taken to address the identified human rights impacts?	1.5
The supermarket traces and discloses information about its supply chains.	HR-TA-FTS	Does the supermarket disclose the names and addresses of all first-tier food suppliers?	1
	HR-TA-HRS	Does the supermarket disclose the names and addresses of suppliers along all tiers of its high-risk food categories?	1.5
The supermarket demonstrates that its buying practices align with the supermarket's human rights strategy.	HR-TA-UTP	Does the supermarket demonstrate how it eliminates unfair trading practices?	1
	HR-TA-FTP	Does the supermarket proactively implement fair trading practices?	1
	HR-TA-ROP	Do the supermarket's buying practices actively contribute to a redistribution of power in the supply chain that benefits rightsholders and the environment?	1.5
The supermarket ensures that people affected by its supply chain activities have access to grievance mechanisms and remedies.	HR-TA-AGM	Does the supermarket have a public policy and timebound plan for ensuring that rightsholders across all its high-risk supply chains have access to effective grievance mechanisms and to remedy?	1.5
	HR-TA-IGM	Does the supermarket publicly report on progress of implementation of the grievance mechanism, including measures to overcome barriers to access?	1

HR-WO Workers

Desired measures	Indicators		Weight
The supermarket supports suppliers across all food supply chains to implement labour standards.	HR-WO-SSR	Does the supermarket support suppliers to enable respect for human rights and labour standards?	1
	HR-WO-PIS	Does the supermarket positively incentivise suppliers that demonstrate continuous improvement in labour conditions?	1.5
	HR-WO-ESI	Does the supermarket demonstrate that it engages suppliers to improve when labour exploitations are exposed without a 'cut and run' approach?	1
The supermarket takes action to ensure that workers in food supply chains are paid at minimum a living wage.	HR-WO-LWG	Has the supermarket made a commitment to close the living wage gap?	1
	HR-WO-ACC	Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to close the living wage gap and report on progress in its food supply chains?	2

HR-FA Farmers

Desired measures	Indicators		Weight
The supermarket ensures fair deals for small-scale farmers in all food supply chains.	HR-FA-CSE	Has the supermarket committed to ensuring fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing from small-scale farmers?	1
	HR-FA-SES	Does the supermarket demonstrate how its sourcing practices encourage suppliers to provide fair, transparent, stable and long-term deals to small-scale farmers?	1.5
The supermarket takes action to ensure that small-scale farmers in food supply chains yield at minimum a living income.	HR-FA-LIG	Has the supermarket made a commitment to close the living income gap for small-scale farmers?	1
	HR-FA-ACC	Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to close the living income gap for small-scale farmers and report on progress in its food supply chains?	2
The supermarket promotes a fair distribution of benefits and profits in all food supply chains.	HR-FA-FDV	Has the supermarket committed to a fair distribution of value in food supply chains, benefitting small-scale farmers?	1
	HR-FA-TCD	Is the supermarket transparent about the current distribution of value and profit in food supply chains?	1.5
	HR-FA-FSV	Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to ensure small-scale farmers receive a fair share of value and report on progress?	1.5

The supermarket takes action to ensure that Global North farmers in food supply chains yield a right price.	HR-FA-RPE	Has the supermarket made a commitment to ensure a right price for Global North farmers?	1
	HR-FA-ARP	Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to ensure a right price for Global North farmers and report on progress in its food supply chains?	1.5

HR-GE Gender

Desired measures	Indicators		Weight
The supermarket takes action to improve the position of women in all food supply chains.	HR-GE-GPG	Has the supermarket committed to closing the gender pay gap in its food supply chains?	1
	HR-GE-GBV	Has the supermarket committed to implementing an action plan and timebound milestones to address gender-based violence?	1
	HR-GE-IPW	Has the supermarket published action plans and timebound milestones to improve the position of women?	1
	HR-GE-PPW	Does the supermarket systematically report progress on improving the position of women in food supply chains?	1.5

Indicators

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

TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY (HR-TA)

Commitment to respect human rights

Explanation

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

The United Nations (UN) published the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) in 2011 (UN, 2011a). The UNGPs were adopted at the end of a global multi-stakeholder process and set out clear expectations for companies (such as supermarkets) to respect human rights and provide guidance on how to do this. The UNGPs consist of a set of principles that companies must adhere to. Following the UNGPs is a way for supermarkets to ensure that human rights are respected in all countries where the supermarket operates in or sources from. The supermarket can also use the UNGPs to monitor that it does business with respect for human rights, and to track its progress.

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

Indicator HR-TA-UNG

commitment

Does the supermarket make an explicit commitment to uphold the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and report annually on progress?

Measurement and weighting

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

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

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

- The supermarket's reporting ended no more than 24 months ago.
- The report discloses the operational management's discussions on human rights risks in its supply chains.
- The report indicates how the operational management secures respect for human rights.
- The report describes the concrete actions taken by operational management over the past year to identify and address human rights violations in supply chains.

Weighting in the rankings

Supermarkets are awarded points according to the table below.

Part of indicator	Points
Commitment to follow the UNGPs	1 point
Reporting	4 points

Table 1. Scoring system for indicator HR-TA-UNG.

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

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

Due diligence

Explanation

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

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

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

Indicator HR-TA-DDP

policy

Does the supermarket implement a human rights due diligence process aligned with OECD Guidelines and the UNGPs?

Measurement and weighting

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

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

Indicator HR-TA-CPM

report

Does the supermarket demonstrate how it ceases, prevents and mitigates human rights risk in food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket's report relates to a period that ended no more than 24 months ago.
- The report discloses the implementation of due diligence, including a description of actions taken to mitigate, address and prevent human rights risks.
- The report shows that stakeholders and Rightsholders, including trade unions and civil society organisations, have been actively involved in the implementation of the policy. It states who are involved, how this was done and how stakeholders' views were taken into account.

Weighting in the rankings

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

Indicator HR-TA-BRS

report

Does the supermarket conduct and publish a broad risk scoping?

Measurement and weighting

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

- The risk analysis contains a substantiated inventory of all supply chains with a high risk of human rights violations (high-risk supply chains).
 - This inventory should allow the supermarket to prioritise the most significant risk areas for further investigation. Steps 2.2 to 2.4 in the OECD Guidance can be followed for this purpose.
- The prioritisation of risks the supermarket will address is substantiated in line with the UNGPs and the OECD Guidance (steps 2.2 to 2.4).
- The supermarket publishes an update of the risk analysis, relating to a period that ended no more than 24 months ago.

Weighting in the rankings

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

Human rights impact assessment

Explanation

Human rights impact assessments (HRIA)² are research studies to identify negative human rights impacts of business activities. These in-depth assessments can help companies to understand where and how their operations or sourcing activities are harming people, and subsequently to establish and implement action plans to address those negative impacts (Oxfam International, 2024).

Meaningful engagement³ of stakeholders is essential in HRIAs. Stakeholders here are Rightsholders and the organisations that represent them. They are the individuals and groups affected by business activities and it is their rights that must be respected. Stakeholders may include, for example, formal and informal workers, small-scale farmers and women in supply chains, and Indigenous people and communities in the vicinity of company facilities or activities. Supermarkets should involve these groups in determining how to take action to improve their conditions.

² Guidance can be found in the [Community Based Human Rights Impact Assessment Initiative](#) by Oxfam.

³ Meaningful engagement refers to active, regular and constructive communication with stakeholders, including clear feedback to action plans.

Measurement and weighting

Here, we look in public publications whether the supermarket has published HRIAs since February 2023⁴. These HRIAs must meet at least the following conditions:

- The HRIA covers all relevant human rights impacts in the supply chain. The human rights in the HRIA correspond to all internationally recognised human rights in line with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.
- The HRIA includes an action plan to address risks. The action plan should:
 - specify which resources have been allocated, and
 - include the roles and responsibilities to implement the proposed measures, and
 - include a timeline to address adverse effects, and
 - show how the supermarket will address the causes, and
 - specify the expected results, and
 - specify how the supermarket will monitor progress.
- The HRIA includes meaningful stakeholder engagement during all phases of research. The HRIA describes how stakeholders have been involved:
 - Detailed explanation of sample selection with gender breakdown, and
 - Engaging Rightsholders with diverse views, with a focus on the most vulnerable groups, and
 - How it was determined to sample participants from at least each of the following relevant groups:
 - Farmers in supply chain, small-scale farmers or farmers' cooperatives (if relevant).
 - Workers (including migrant workers) from farms and fisheries, worker families, workers from other stages of the supply chain where relevant (e.g., at factories, transport, distribution centres and retail).
 - Workers' associations, trade unions.
 - Affected communities, including women, minorities and vulnerable groups.
 - Civil society organisations, women's rights organisations and indigenous groups, religious leaders and/or relevant religious organisations.

Bonus points

The supermarket can yield bonus points by publishing at least one HRIA a year that focuses on gender equality. It recognises the intersectionality⁵ of impacts. The HRIA on gender equality must meet the following conditions:

- The HRIA identifies elements that affect human rights, such as underlying gender inequality.

⁴ Since the cut-off date of Superlist Human Rights the Netherlands: February 15, 2023.

⁵ By intersectionality, we mean the overlapping risks of marginalisation related to intersecting axes of identity, such as ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, skin colour and health.

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

Weighting in the rankings

Each HRIA published since February 2023 that meets all the conditions yields 1 point. Publishing three HRIAs yields 5 bonus points. An HRIA that pays special attention to gender equality yields 1 bonus point. The key figure is the sum of the basic points and the bonus points. To determine the score, this number is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 10, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.

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

Indicator HR-TA-RAT

report

Does the supermarket report on the actions taken to address the identified human rights impacts?

Measurement and weighting

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

- The report describes how the supermarket implemented the action plan in practice and what steps were taken.
- The report describes what impact the action plan has had and which goals have been achieved.
- The report describes which relevant stakeholders the supermarket has involved in implementation.
- The reporting covers a period that ended no more than 24 months ago, until an action plan is fully implemented.
- The reporting should start within a year of publication of the HRIA and action plan.

Weighting in the rankings

Each reporting that fulfils all conditions yields 1 point. This key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 10, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.

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

Transparency about the supply chains

Explanation

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

Indicator HR-TA-FTS

report

Does the supermarket disclose the names and addresses of all first-tier food suppliers?

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket publishes on its website the names and addresses of all first-tier food suppliers. The supermarket may also refer to the specific location on the sourcing organisation's website where this information can be found. On reporting that involves only own brands, the own brand factor applies (see Annex 4).
- The supermarket (or sourcing organisation) updates the overview at least annually and clearly indicates the date on which the last update was performed.
- The supermarket claims that all first-tier suppliers are included in the list or, if the list is not complete, the supermarket indicates what number of first-tier suppliers is not included in the list, and the categories of products these parties supply.

Weighting in the rankings

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

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

Indicator HR-TA-HRS

report

Does the supermarket disclose the names and addresses of suppliers along all tiers of its high-risk primary products?

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket has made a timebound commitment to disclose the names and addresses of all suppliers at all levels of a supply chain in all high-risk primary products⁶ within two years.
- The supermarket disclosed the names and addresses of all suppliers at all levels of a supply chain in a high-risk primary product.

⁶ A primary product is defined as a raw material or primary agricultural product that can be bought and sold, e.g. bananas, coffee, tea, etc.

- If the list is not complete, the supermarket indicates what number of suppliers is not included in the list.
- For animal primary products, this extends to the animal feed layer.
- Relevant information should be published on the supermarket's website.
- When a supermarket has not published all suppliers, part of the points can still be awarded for publishing all own brand suppliers. In this case, the own brand factor applies (see Annex 4).

Some conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

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

Sourcing practice and human rights policy

Explanation

Translating supermarkets' human rights policies into their sourcing practices is important to ensure that all relevant policies are aligned. Sourcing practices affect the extent to which human rights are respected in supply chains. Sourcing practices include agreements on various aspects, such as price negotiations, delivery terms, production conditions and quality requirements. Rules to make these agreements fair are laid down in both legal and voluntary international standards. Legally, there is the European UTP⁷ directive, which in the Netherlands has been transposed into the Unfair Trading Practices Directive. A voluntary standard is the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) Guide to Buying Responsibly.

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

⁷ UTP: Unfair Trading Practices

Does the supermarket demonstrate how it eliminates unfair trading practices?

Measurement and weighting

We examine whether the supermarket demonstrates how it eliminates unfair trading practices⁸. For this, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

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

Does the supermarket proactively implement fair trading practices?

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket never negotiates a price below the cost of production. At a minimum, this should include paying a living wage/income and the costs associated with production.

⁸ We define unfair trading practices in line with ETI's Guide to Buying Responsibly.

- The supermarket supports suppliers in implementing labour standards and human rights as described in a Supplier Code of Conduct. This support consists of material and practical support such as funding and training.
- The supermarket maintains long-term and stable sourcing relationships with the small-scale farmers it buys from. The supermarket publishes the target around duration and volume of these relationships, examines the duration and volume of its current relationships, and ensures that these are aligned with the target and reports on this process.
- When placing orders, the supermarket maintains delivery times that do not lead to excessive working hours or outsourcing.
- The supermarket prevents last-minute order cancellations or changes by focusing on stable and predictable order volumes.
- The supermarket actively considers working conditions and human rights when selecting suppliers and refrains from terminating a supplier relationship purely on the basis of price or quality.
- For policies that involve only own brand products, the own brand factor applies (see Annex 4).

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

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

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

Bonus points

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

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

Indicator HR-TA-ROP

report

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

Measurement and weighting

We examine whether a supermarket has sourcing practices that actively contribute to a redistribution of power in the supply chain that benefits Rightsholders.

Meaningful stakeholder engagement (MSE) is a critical component of human rights due diligence and the first step towards a redistribution of power. Stakeholders are in particular those who are directly involved and rightsholders, such as trade unions, local civil society organisations and farmers' cooperatives. MSE is based on an equal, legitimate, accessible, safe, and respectful dialogue that leads to concrete actions to improve the conditions of workers, farmers, and communities.

We look at public commitments or reports that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket describes exactly what it does to redistribute power by explaining the role of meaningful stakeholder engagement and how stakeholders are included.
- The supermarket describes:
 - Which stakeholders are being collaborated with (such as trade unions, farmers' cooperatives or women's organisations), and
 - How women are involved, and
 - What steps are being taken in collaboration with relevant stakeholders to achieve a fairer distribution of power.
- The document describes commitments for the near future, and/or actions taken less than two years ago.

Some conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket describes exactly what it does to redistribute power and put people and the environment first, by explaining the role of meaningful stakeholder engagement and how stakeholders are included.	Commitments to living income without clarifying how this contributes to stakeholder-centred redistribution of power.	<i>"We are aware that our current business model hardly empowers workers and small-scale farmers in our supply chains. Therefore, we are analysing our business model, starting with commodity Z. To this end, we are organizing two round table sessions with stakeholder organizations A and B, around the question of power distribution. We will report on the results by 2025 at the latest."</i>
The supermarket explains the steps being taken in collaboration with relevant stakeholders to achieve a fairer distribution of power.	Action plans to increase power of small-scale farmers without specific objectives or where farmers themselves do not play an active, equal role in the implementation of these activities.	<i>"For a healthy and fair value chain, it is vital to better distribute the power in the supply chain, benefitting stakeholders. Based on two round table sessions with stakeholder organisations A and B, we have decided to restructure our supply chain for commodity Z. For all of our Z, we start a long-term</i>

		<i>collaboration with farmers' cooperatives X and Y that enable them to better defend their rights and the interests of the farmers they represent. Besides, we ensure equal negotiations with trade unions W and V on wage increases and improved conditions."</i>
--	--	---

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

Weighting in the rankings

Any supply chain where the supermarket can demonstrate meaningful stakeholder engagement yields 1 point. Three supply chains that comply yields 5 bonus points. The key figure is the sum of all points. To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 10, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework. The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 1.5.

Access to grievance mechanism

Explanation

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

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

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

Indicator HR-TA-AGM

policy

Does the supermarket have a public policy and timebound plan for ensuring that rightsholders across all its high-risk supply chains have access to effective grievance mechanisms and to remedy?

Measurement and weighting

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

A timebound commitment yields 1 point. A supermarket that has already realised grievance mechanisms that meet the conditions yields 3 points. This key figure is not scaled; 4 points yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

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

Indicator HR-TA-IGM

report

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

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket evaluates the functioning of grievance mechanisms for all high-risk supply chains and the results are published.
- When different groups of potentially disadvantaged Rightsholders access the grievance mechanism and they experience obstacles, the supermarket addresses them and identifies solutions.
- The supermarket pays particular attention to the barriers faced by women within these different groups of workers and small-scale farmers.
- The supermarket reports annually on the effectiveness of its grievance mechanism(s), including:

- How many grievances were received by category (e.g., grouping by human rights, environment, corruption, etc) and what follow-up actions were taken.
 - An explanation showing that the supermarket knows the extent to which people with grievances trust and use the grievance mechanism.
 - A framework showing how the supermarket assesses the grievances process and the effectiveness of the outcomes.
 - An analysis of trends and patterns in the reporting period around concerns or grievances, outcomes related to salient issues, and lessons learned.
 - Examples of grievances related to salient problems in the reporting period (if any).
- Reporting over a period that ended no more than 24 months ago, shows that the supermarket contributes to timely remedial action when grievances are found to be justified.

Some conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

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

WORKERS (HR-WO)

Respecting labour standards

Explanation

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

Indicator HR-WO-SSR

policy

Does the supermarket support suppliers to enable respect for human rights and labour standards?

Measurement and weighting

We examine whether a supermarket supports suppliers in respecting human rights and labour standards. This could include programmes or financial support to train suppliers and workers on human and/or labour rights, or facilitating access to trade unions.

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

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

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
For each primary product, the supermarket explains how it supports suppliers to implement respect for human and labour rights.	The supermarket, through a Supplier Code of Conduct, requires suppliers to comply with standards on health and safety in the workplace, but does not describe actions the supermarket takes to support suppliers to implement these standards where necessary.	The supermarket describes the approach to support measures that help suppliers improve and protect the health and safety of workers in factories and land-based workers, for example through financial support, training and active monitoring.
The supermarket makes this support available for the entire primary product.	The supermarket offers support to suppliers and producers of mangoes in Brazil, but not to suppliers and producers in the other countries where the supermarket buys mangoes.	The supermarket offers support for suppliers and products from all countries where mangoes are purchased. If all mangoes are purchased from one

		country, then that is enough. If mangoes come from several countries, then this is about the suppliers in all those countries.
--	--	--

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

Weighting in the rankings

Each high-risk primary product where support is available yields 1 point. Making support available in three high-risk primary product yields 5 bonus points. The key figure is the sum of the base points and the bonus points.

Thus, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, this key figure is scaled with flexible limits; the upper limit is 10, the lower limit is 0. For an explanation of this method of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.

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

Indicator HR-WO-PIS

report

Does the supermarket positively incentivise suppliers that demonstrate continuous improvement in labour conditions?

Measurement and weighting

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

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

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The report includes examples of continuous improvements.	Report on a one-off initiative with a supplier.	The supermarket reports on the long-term improvement it is making with suppliers, reflects the steps that are

		being taken and will continue to be taken.
The supermarket rewards suppliers who show progress.	The supermarket asks suppliers for continuous improvement through a Supplier Code of Conduct, but imposes it as a requirement without support or reward.	The supermarket enters into a long-term contract with a supplier with a proven commitment to continuous improvement in working conditions.
The supermarket demonstrates how these rewards contribute to better working conditions and reports on progress.	Report on the use of a Supplier Scorecard or KPIs without publishing how they contribute to improvements in working conditions.	The supermarket reports on improvements expected from suppliers on working conditions and reports annually on support to and rewards for suppliers who make efforts on these issues.

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

Weighting in the rankings

Each example per primary product that meets the conditions yields 1 point. Key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points, up to a maximum of 5 points. This number is not scaled; 5 points gives a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

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

Indicator HR-WO-ESI

commitment

Does the supermarket demonstrate that it engages suppliers to improve when labour exploitations are exposed without a 'cut and run' approach?

Measurement and weighting

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

Living wage

Explanation

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

Indicator HR-WO-LWG

commitment

Has the supermarket made a commitment to close the living wage gap?

Measurement and weighting

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

Policies that meet all conditions per primary product yield 1 point, up to a maximum of 4 points. A general commitment for all supply chains yields 5 points. The key figure is the sum of all points. This number is not scaled; 5 points gives a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

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

Indicator HR-WO-ACG

policy

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

Measurement and weighting

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 2.

FARMERS (HR-FA)

Fair agreements

Explanation

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

Indicator HR-FA-CFS

commitment

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

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket makes a company-wide timebound commitment to ensure fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing in all supply chains⁹ from small-scale farmers. This includes at least:
 - Long-term agreements with small-scale farmers and/or farmer cooperatives with stable and secure order volumes.
 - Fair prices that allow small-scale farmers to achieve at least a living income and cover the costs of production.

Company wide policies that meet the following condition, yield a maximum of 1 extra point in total:

- Contracts provide safeguards that protect farmers from unforeseen (external) circumstances, such as failed harvest, war or increased inflation or costs, where there is an allocation of risk between the supermarket and farmer for risks that cannot be carried by the farmer alone.

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

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
Company-wide commitment to ensure fair, transparent, stable and long-term supplies to small-scale food producers.	General description of the importance of a good relationship with small-scale farmers without specific commitments.	<i>"We pledge to adopt fair and transparent sourcing practices that ensure small-scale farmers receive a fair price for their produce, which allows them to yield</i>

⁹ Fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing refers to those practices that enable small-scale farmers to take self-determination over their lives, businesses and communities through trade.

		<i>at least a living income. We therefore enter into long-term contracts of at least X years with farmers' cooperatives in which we pay a living income premium on top of the market price. We do this in all chains, starting in those where small-scale farmers provide a significant share of production."</i>
--	--	---

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

Weighting in the rankings

Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. A company wide policy for contracts providing safeguards that protect farmers, yields 1 extra point. This key figure is not scaled; 2 points yields a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

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

Indicator HR-FA-SES

report

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

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket demonstrates how it ensures fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing¹⁰ from small-scale farmers, including by supporting and encouraging suppliers to achieve this. This includes at least:
 - Long-term agreements with small-scale farmers and/or farmer cooperatives with stable and secure order volumes.
 - Fair prices that allow small-scale farmers to achieve at least a living income and cover the costs of production.
- The supermarket provides recent (maximum two years ago) examples of implemented policies from high-risk supply chains.

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

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
Initiatives that support suppliers to enter into fair, transparent, stable and long-term agreements with small-scale farmers.	The supermarket is a member of Multi-stakeholder initiatives (MSIs). (Does not necessarily demonstrate an active role)	Projects (whether in collaboration with third parties or not) working with suppliers to enter into fair agreements with

¹⁰ Fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing refers to those practices that enable small-scale farmers to take self-determination over their lives, businesses and communities through trade.

		small-scale farmers involving, as a minimum, long-term agreements and fair prices that cover at least a living income and production.
	Sourcing Fairtrade ¹¹ products without active collaboration with suppliers, farmer cooperatives, civil society organisations and/or other stakeholders.	Active sourcing policy working with chain partners to achieve long-term fair price agreements with small-scale farmers (cooperatives).

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

Weighting in the rankings

Each example of a high-risk supply chain that meets all conditions, yields 1 point. Three examples yield 5 bonus points. In theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 10 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.

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

Living income

Explanation

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

Indicator HR-FA-LIG

commitment

Has the supermarket made a commitment to close the living income gap for small-scale farmers?

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket publicly acknowledges that small-scale farmers often do not yield enough to cover their basic living costs and emergency situations.
- The supermarket is committed to working with stakeholders to achieve a living income. Stakeholders include small-scale farmers, farmer cooperatives and/or civil society organisations.

¹¹ See Annex 3 for more information on the role of certification.

- The supermarket commits to measure and publish the gap between actual income and living income for a high-risk primary product. This commitment is timebound and implementation is planned less than two years in the future.

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket publicly acknowledges that small-scale farmers often do not yield enough to cover their basic living costs and emergencies.	<i>"By sourcing Fairtrade-certified products¹², we ensure that farmers earn a fair income."</i>	<i>"Market prices are often insufficient for small-scale farmers to support themselves and their families to reasonable living standards. We are therefore committed to providing a living income from which farmers can cover their basic costs as well as unexpected expenses. To this end, we ensure that small-scale farmers receive at least a Living Income Reference Price."</i>
The supermarket is committed to working with stakeholders to achieve a living income. Stakeholders include small-scale farmers, farmer cooperatives and/or civil society organisations.	<i>"We will source Fairtrade-certified products as much as possible."</i>	<i>"We will start a project in 2025 together with Fairtrade and a local farmers' cooperative to establish and implement a living income price."</i>
The supermarket commits to measure and publish the gap between actual income and living income for a high-risk primary product. This commitment is timebound and implementation is planned less than two years in the future.	<i>"We will set a premium to achieve a living income."</i>	<i>"We will conduct and publish a survey in 2025 to measure the gap between current income and living income based on the XYZ method in our coffee, cocoa and tea. Based on these measurements, we will set a premium to close the gap between current and living income. We aim to close the gap within two years."</i>

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

Weighting in the rankings

A commitment per high-risk supply chain that meets each of the three conditions yields 1 point. The key figure is the sum of all points. This key figure is not scaled; 3 points gives a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

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

¹² See Annex 3 for more information on the role of certification.

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

Measurement and weighting

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

The weighting of this indicator in determining the rankings is: 2.

Fair distribution of value

Explanation

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

Indicator HR-FA-FDV

commitment

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

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket has committed to pursue fair value distribution for small-scale farmers.
- Supermarket names what a fairer distribution of value means¹³.
- The supermarket gives examples of planned actions to achieve this fair value distribution.

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

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

Indicator HR-FA-TCD

report

Is the supermarket transparent about the current distribution of value and profit in food supply chains?

¹³ A fair distribution of value is at least based on principles of justice, equality, and fundamental rights at the bottom line.

Measurement and weighting

Here, we look for disclosure of the current value distribution in the chains in public supermarket publications. We look for value distribution throughout the supply chain. Data that must be disclosed to speak of a transparent value distribution are:

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

Weighting in the rankings

The supermarket yields 1 point for each supply chain whose current and required share for the small-scale farmer is disclosed. The supermarket can yield more points by being transparent about multiple segments in the chain. The supermarket yields 1 bonus point for each supply chain whose entire value distribution has been disclosed. A maximum of 2 points can therefore be yielded per supply chain. The key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. So, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this index number with flexible limits: the upper limit is 10 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.

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

Right price for Global North farmers

Explanation

Farmers should receive an income that enables them to build up a buffer against setbacks, and make the necessary investments in making their production sustainable for the future. For Global North farmers it is important that costs of production are covered, including labour and investment costs. Supermarkets should ensure that everyone in the supply chain receives at least a right price.

Indicator HR-FA-RPE

commitment

Has the supermarket made a commitment to ensure a right price for Global North farmers?

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket publicly acknowledges that farmers often do not yield enough to cover the costs of production, including labour and investment costs.
- The supermarket is committed to working with stakeholders to calculate and help achieve a right price. Stakeholders include farmers, farmer cooperatives,

policy makers and/or civil society organisations and other value chain actors that are involved.

- This commitment is timebound and implementation is planned less than two years in the future.

These conditions are illustrated with examples in the table below.

Conditions	Examples	
	Not enough	Meets
The supermarket publicly acknowledges that farmers often do not yield enough to cover the costs of production, including labour and investment costs.	<i>"By sourcing certified products, we ensure that farmers earn a fair income."</i>	<i>"Market prices are often insufficient for farmers to support themselves and their families to reasonable living standards. We are therefore committed to providing a right price from which farmers can cover the costs of production including labour and investment costs and generate savings to reinvest in the sustainability of their business."</i>
The supermarket is committed to working with stakeholders to achieve a right price. Stakeholders include farmers, farmer cooperatives, civil society organisations and other value chain actors that are involved.	<i>"We will source certified products as much as possible."</i>	<i>"We will start a project in 2025 together with an NGO and a local farmers' cooperative to establish and implement a right price."</i>
The supermarket commits to measure and publish the gap between actual income and a right price. This commitment applies to a minimum of three high-risk supply chains and is less than two years in the future.	<i>"We will set a premium to achieve a right price."</i>	<i>"We will conduct and publish a survey in 2025 to measure the gap between current market prices and a right price based on the XYZ method together with the dairy farmers that we work with. Based on these measurements, we will set a premium to close the gap between actual price paid and a right price. We aim to close the gap within two years."</i>

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

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

Does the supermarket demonstrate actions it has taken to ensure a right price for Global North farmers and report on progress in its food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket publishes measured data on the gap between actual price and right price, based on average production costs, that contributes to earning a living income. This measurement should include at least the following information:
 - the average income of Global North farmers in a specific supply chain, and
 - the right price needed to contribute to a living income and based on average production costs data for a specific supply chain and
 - an assessment of the extent to which unpaid, cooperating family members, especially women, have disposal of earned income.
- The supermarket reports on progress in paying the right price in a specific Global North supply chain, including specific activities, partnerships.
- The supermarket shows how stakeholders (such as farmers' cooperatives and unions, civil society organisations) are involved.

Weighting in the rankings

Each supply chain whose reporting fulfils all conditions yields 3 points. Key figure for this indicator is the sum of all points. So, in theory, this key figure has no upper limit. To determine the score, we scale this key figure with flexible limits: the upper limit is 5 points, the lower limit is 0 points. For an explanation of this way of scaling, see the topic *Scaling* in the Research Framework.

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

GENDER (HR-GE)

Position of women

Explanation

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

Indicator HR-GE-GPG

commitment

Has the supermarket committed to closing the gender pay gap in its food supply chains?

Measurement and weighting

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

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

Weighting in the rankings

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

Indicator HR-GE-GBV

commitment

Has the supermarket committed to implementing an action plan and timebound milestones to address gender-based violence?

Measurement and weighting

Many workers and especially women face forms of harassment or violence at work. ILO Convention 190 for the Elimination of Violence and Harassment at Work, was adopted in April 2021 and sets out international agreements for creating a safe working environment.

For this indicator, we look for publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket acknowledges the existence of gender-based violence in supply chains and pledges to publish action plans to address it within one year.
- Published action plans meet at least the following conditions:
 - The plan recognises risks of gender-based violence in supply chains and refers to ILO Convention 190¹⁴.
 - The plan describes actions and timebound targets to address gender-based violence.
 - These actions and targets are linked to a timeframe of up to five years and apply to at least three supply chains.

Weighting in the rankings

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

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

Indicator HR-GE-IPW

policy

Has the supermarket published action plans and timebound milestones to improve the position of women?

Measurement and weighting

We examine whether the supermarket has plans to improve the position of women.

In doing so, we look at publicly published policies that meet the following conditions:

- The supermarket has published an action plan with timebound targets to improve the position of women in high-risk supply chains.
- These goals and actions are linked to a time frame of up to five years.
- The supermarket has set at least three targets in a high-risk supply chain.
- Examples of objectives¹⁵ :
 - Closing the gender pay gap.
 - More women in higher paid and management positions.
 - More women members of trade unions or small-scale producer cooperatives.
 - More women with permanent contracts.
 - More women earning at least a living income.
 - Recruiting or advancing more women into technical and management positions.

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

¹⁴ Guidance can be found in CNV's [model agreement](#) (p.10)

¹⁵ Guidance on measurable targets can be found in the ETI Gender Data initiative.

Weighting in the rankings

Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. Policies for at least three high-risk supply chains yield 5 bonus points. This key figure is not scaled; 10 points yield a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

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

Indicator HR-GE-PPW

report

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

Measurement and weighting

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

- The supermarket systematically reports progress on women's empowerment targets, sharing challenges and lessons learned for a high-risk supply chain. The supermarket has a timebound commitment to report progress on targets for another high-risk supply chain.
- The commitment is timebound and implementation is planned less than three years in the future.

Weighting in the rankings

Policies that meet all conditions yield 1 point. Reporting for at least three high-risk supply chains yields 5 bonus points. This key figure is not scaled; 10 points yield a score of 100 for this indicator, 0 points a score 0.

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

References

- Authority Consumer & Market, 2021. 'Verbod oneerlijke handelspraktijken in de landbouwketen | ACM.nl'. 2021.
<https://www.acm.nl/nl/onderwerpen/concurrentie-en-marktwerking/concurrentie-en-afspraken-tussen-bedrijven/concurrentie-de-landbouw-en-voedselketen/verbod-oneerlijke-handelspraktijken-de-landbouwketen>
- ETI, 2017. 'Guide to Buying Responsibly'. Ethical Trading Initiative.
https://www.ethicaltrade.org/sites/default/files/shared_resources/guide_to_buying_responsibly.pdf
- ILO, 2017. 'Tripartite Declaration of Principles Concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy'. International Labour Office.
https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_emp/@emp_ent/@multi/documents/publication/wcms_094386.pdf
- ILO, 2022. Global Estimates of Modern Slavery: Forced Labour and Forced Marriage. International Labour Office. <https://doi.org/10.54394/CHUI5986>
- Ministerie van Algemene Zaken, 2017. 'Verbeteren internationaal maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen - Internationaal maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen (IMVO) - Rijksoverheid.nl'. Onderwerp. Ministerie van Algemene Zaken. 4 January 2017.
<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/internationaal-maatschappelijk-verantwoord-ondernemen-imvo/bevorderen-internationaal-maatschappelijk-verantwoord-ondernemen>
- Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 2019. 'OESO Due Diligence Handreiking voor IMVO - Publicatie - Nationaal Contactpunt OESO-richtlijnen'. Publicatie. Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken. 6 June 2019.
<https://www.oesorichtlijnen.nl/documenten/publicatie/2019/06/06/oeso-due-diligence-handreiking-voor-mvo-nls>
- OECD, 2011. 'OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, 2011 Edition'. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
<https://www.oecd.org/daf/inv/mne/48004323.pdf>.
- OECD, 2018a. 'OECD DUE DILIGENCE GUIDANCE FOR RESPONSIBLE BUSINESS CONDUCT'. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-due-diligence-guidance-for-responsible-business-conduct_15f5f4b3-en.html.
- OECD, 2018b. 'OECD-FAO Guidance for Responsible Agricultural Supply Chains - OECD'. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
<https://www.oecd.org/daf/inv/investment-policy/rbc-agriculture-supply-chains.htm>
- Oxfam International, 2024. 'Towards Meaningful Human Rights Impact Assessments'. Oxfam International.
<https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/621584/dp-towards-meaningful-human-rights-impact-assessments-120124-en.pdf?sequence=1>
- Questionmark, 2023. 'Superlist Research Framework v1.4'. Stichting Questionmark.
<https://www.thequestionmark.org/download/superlist-research-framework-v1.4.en.pdf>
- Ricciardi, Vincent, Navin Ramankutty, Zia Mehrabi, Larissa Jarvis, and Brenton Chookolingo, 2018. 'How Much of the World's Food Do Smallholders Produce?' *Global Food Security* 17 (June). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2018.05.002>

- UN, 2011a. 'Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights'. United Nations.
https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesBusinessHR_EN.pdf.
- UN, 2011b. 'HUMAN RIGHTS DUE DILIGENCE : UN Guiding Principles Reporting Framework'. United Nations. 2011.
<https://www.ungpreporting.org/glossary/human-rights-due-diligence/>
- UN, 2022. 'Endorse the Women's Empowerment Principles | UN Global Compact'. United Nations. 2022.
<https://www.unglobalcompact.org/take-action/action/womens-principles>

Annexes

ANNEX 1

Definitions

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

Due diligence	Human rights due diligence means the process by which companies identify, prevent and mitigate the actual and potential negative consequences of their actions, and by which they can be held accountable for their approach to those consequences as an integral part of their decision-making process and risk management systems. In developing due diligence, the focus is not on the risks to the company, but on the rights of, and the actual and potential risks of negative impacts on, other stakeholders, such as workers and local communities.
Meaningful engagement	Active, regular and constructive communication with stakeholders, including clear feedback to action plans.
Fair, transparent, stable and long-term sourcing	The practices that enable small-scale farmers to take self-determination over their lives, businesses and communities through trade.
High-risk supply chains, product types or products	Supply chains, product types or products identified by the supermarket as high-risk following a human rights risk analysis based on severity (scale, scope and remediability) and likelihood (actual or potential) of human rights violations.
Human Right Impact Assessment	Human rights impact assessments (HRIA) are research studies to identify negative human rights impacts of business activities. These in-depth assessments can help companies to understand where and how their operations or sourcing activities are harming people, and subsequently to establish and implement action plans to address those negative impacts (Oxfam International, 2024).

Intersectionality	The overlapping risks of marginalisation related to intersecting axes of identity, such as ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, skin colour and health.
Small-scale farmers	Small-scale farmers are food producers who are not structurally dependent on permanent hired labour and carry out their production mainly with family members. This includes small-scale farmers, cattle farmers, fisherfolk and other food producers.
Global North farmers	Farmers in the Global North for whom the following qualities apply: 1) in control of ¹⁶ main resources of production, not formally a part of bigger chains; 2) in control of business operations; 3) in control of the market, both input and output; 4) in control of the labour by their household, where input of paid employment is limited; 5) producing for the market, in a diversified way; 6) living in farming communities, who organise forms of mutual exchange, support and credit.
Right price	A right price allows farmers to achieve at least a living income and cover the costs of production.
Living income	The net annual income required by a household in a given location to afford a decent standard of living for all members of that household. The elements of a decent standard of living include food, water, housing, education, health care, transport, clothing and other essential needs, including provisions for unexpected events.
Living wage	The wage received by a worker for a standard working week in a given place that is sufficient to provide the worker and his or her family with a decent standard of living. The elements of a decent standard of living include food, water, housing, education, health care, transport, clothing and other essential needs, including provisions for unexpected events.
Human rights risks	The likelihood of negative impacts that companies may cause on people, the environment and society, to which they may contribute or in which they are directly involved. This is therefore an externally oriented interpretation of risk with a focus on risks to people, such as workers and small-scale farmers, not risks to supermarkets themselves (such as financial risk, market risk, operational risk or image risk).
Multi-stakeholder initiative (MSI)	Partnerships between companies, governments, civil society and other stakeholders to address issues of mutual interest, including human rights, sustainability and chain transparency.

¹⁶ “In control of” meaning having autonomy and being independent in access to means of production and capital.

Supply chain	The entire delivery process to get the food from the producer from a specific country to the supermarket shelves. For example, limes from Spain is one supply chain, limes from Mexico another. For this research, we only include food supply chains.
Primary product	A primary product is defined as a raw material or primary agricultural product that can be bought and sold, e.g. bananas, avocados, cocoa, coffee, tea, etc.

Guidelines and international standards

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

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

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

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

OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (OECD Guidelines)

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

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

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

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

OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct

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

OECD-FAO Guidance for Responsible Agricultural Supply Chains

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

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

Due Diligence Process

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

1. Integrating responsible business behaviour into policies and management systems
2. Identifying and assessing adverse impacts in operational process, supply chains and business relationships

3. Stopping, preventing or mitigating adverse effects
4. Monitoring implementation and results
5. Communicating how adverse effects have been addressed
6. Facilitating or collaborating on improvement where possible

Ethical Trading Initiative Guide to Buying Responsibly

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

Unfair Trading Practices (UTPs) in the agricultural supply chain

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

The black unfair trading practices are:

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

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

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

UN Women's Empowerment Principles

Principle 1: Establish high-level corporate leadership for gender equality

Principle 2: Treat all women and men fairly at work - respect and support human rights and nondiscrimination

Principle 3: Ensure the health, safety and well-being of all women and men workers

Principle 4: Promote education, training and professional development for women

Principle 5: Implement enterprise development, supply chain and marketing practices that empower women

Principle 6: Promote equality through community initiatives and advocacy

Principle 7: Measure and publicly report on progress to achieve gender equality

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

Definitions

Engagement of Stakeholders

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

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

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

Certifications

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

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

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

Collaborations

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

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

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

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

High-risk food chains

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

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

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

Own brand factor

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

The own brand factor depends on the proportion of own brand products in relation to the entire product range according to the table below.

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

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