How we create the Chocolate Scorecard

Click [here](#) if you’d rather view videos of the methodology behind the Chocolate Scorecard.¹

The 2023 Chocolate Scorecard ranks and grades chocolate companies on key sustainability issues. The Chocolate Collective is coordinated by [Be Slavery Free](#), with universities, consultants, and civil society groups² engaging in transforming the chocolate industry.

We are grateful to the companies who participated and the staff who took the time to engage with us.

The research explores contemporary developments in policy and practices that companies in the chocolate supply chain are undertaking towards improving their sustainability performance. The Chocolate Scorecard is a resource for consumers seeking information about the chocolate they purchase from companies along the supply chain and for investors and stakeholders seeking to understand a company’s performance. It was developed to evaluate the participating companies’ performance in addressing human rights and environmental challenges and facilitate a productive dialogue to enhance their policies and practices towards improving the whole industry. Many companies use the scorecard to develop their own roadmaps.

The Chocolate Scorecard uses the Brundtland Commission’s definition of sustainability.

> “meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

Additional components of the methodology in 2023 included:

- Using subject matter experts to undertake the scoring in each section;
- Aligning the survey with the [Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi)](#), the [Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP)](#), and the [Accountability Framework (AFi)](#).

1. Participation and Data Collection

Company participation

A survey was developed (see section 2) and sent to all the participating companies. In 2023, 43 companies were invited to participate in the Chocolate Scorecard, compared to 38 in 2022. The companies selected included all the largest cocoa traders and chocolate manufacturers in the industry and some smaller, innovative companies. These companies

---

¹ Click [here](#) to see last year’s methodology for the 2022 Scorecard
² Also called Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s)
purchase over 90% of the world’s cocoa. They can either take a large toll or make a big positive impact on people and the planet.

Following the survey distribution, five companies, namely FrieslandCampina, General Mills, Krüger Group, Unilever, and Mondelēz, opted not to participate. This is the second year General Mills has not participated. Unilever and Mondelēz have participated previously. This is the first year the Krüger Group opted not to participate. We view their non-participation as a lack of transparency. We believe that all companies selling chocolate products should be able to provide the information requested in the survey. Consumers and investors have a right to be informed about the conditions under which chocolate is produced.

Starbucks and Storck agreed to participate in 2023 after declining in 2022. We welcome them on board and genuinely appreciate their participation.

Several new companies have already confirmed participation in 2024, including Divine Chocolate, Guan Chong, JB Cocoa and Delica, with more companies to be added.

**Retailer participation**

The survey was also sent to 29 retailers. It has been our practice to include retailers every two years. Retailers were requested to respond concerning their proprietary (own) branded private-label chocolate. We believe that when a retailer places their brand onto a chocolate product, they have the same obligations as other participants in the supply chain.

**Confidentiality and data protection**

The survey first received ethics approval in 2022 from the Humanities and Social Science (HASS) Human Research Ethics committee from Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia (The Open University, UK and University of Wollongong, Australia also participated and were part of the ethics approval process). This process ensures the research is honest, rigorous, transparent, respectful, protects participants, and demonstrates that the research team has adhered to the highest contemporary ethical standards of a genuine research study involving human participants. Sensitive research data is stored on a secure SharePoint platform per the Research Data Sensitivity, Security and Storage Guidelines of Macquarie University.

This research has been conducted following Human Research Ethics Committee guidelines under the project titled,

- The Chocolate Scorecard, project ID 10917, 2022, from Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia;
- Open University (UK) HREC/4275/Bernardi;
- The University of Wollongong HREC, project title: Chocolate Scorecard, number: 2022/009.

A link to the online survey was emailed to key personnel within participating companies. Participants held roles which include, but are not limited to, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Managers; Project Managers; Environmental, Health & Safety Managers; Chief
Operating Officer; Chief Executive Officer; and Sustainability & Human Rights Directors/Managers. Participants were asked to complete the survey between November 26, 2022, and February 3, 2023. Participants were given a detailed outline of the research project and asked to consent to their involvement before starting the survey. They were also advised of the grievance mechanism should participants consider the research breached the ethics standard.

Support

Support was offered to participants in various ways. The research team created explanatory videos, published the full survey, glossary and relevant research on the Resources page, held group Q&A Zoom meetings with companies (offered in different time zones) and offered individual Zoom meetings with companies to answer any possible questions. More than 30 companies chose to meet (some more than once) individually with some or all of the research team. The Scorecard team was also available for numerous email interactions with companies.

2. Question Development

The survey covered six categories:

- traceability and transparency;
- living income;
- child labor;
- deforestation and climate;
- agroforestry; and
- agrichemical management.

These were chosen because they are some of the most pressing, fundamental sustainability issues facing the chocolate industry today.

Question development was determined on several factors, including assessing and editing the previous year’s questions. You can find the 2022 Chocolate Scorecard and methodology here. The core team undertook a thorough review of past questions, which included consultation with NGO’s and subject matter experts. We offered all participating companies an opportunity to comment on the questions to ensure we were asking the right questions and questions which companies could answer.

The survey has been aligned with the Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi), the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) and the Accountability Framework (AFi).

Questions were edited, while the overall categories from 2022 remained the same.

As in 2022, we again provided companies with the option to provide any other information at the end of each category. We called this the ‘wild card’ – an opportunity for companies to showcase any ambitious or innovative approaches they wished to highlight. In each section, the wildcard contributed 20% of the total score for that category.
3. Scoring Process

The scoring team consisted of multiple subject matter experts for each topic, including Category scorers (evaluating a single category) and Overall scorers (determining the overall score). All scorers are considered experts in their field of expertise. You can find the full list of scoring team members here.

The scoring process was rigorous and underwent several stages of grading and review. A workshop was initially held with the research team on scoring each category, including suggested responses for each question and grading consideration.

A four-step approach was taken:

1. Each Category scorer first evaluated all participant responses individually.
2. Category scorers compared their scores and agreed on one final score per participant.
3. Category scorers discussed with scorers from other categories and adjusted scores if needed.
4. The Overall scorers determined the overall score for each participant based on their category scores.

We asked the participants for clarification when answers were unclear and/or Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) provided were broken or irrelevant.

Each company received a ‘color score’ for each individual category; the scores of each category were then compiled to determine a composite ‘overall score’. Low scores on one category could result not only in a ‘red’ (meaning the company is falling behind the industry) for a specific issue but could also drag down a company’s overall score. This explains how companies with similar colors can still have divergent final scores.

The core research team who made the final decision received all grades and feedback from the subject matter experts.

Raising the bar on scoring

To acknowledge the evolving nature of the industry and the increasing performance of some companies, demonstrating how much can be achieved, we raised the scoring bar. This is particularly pertinent regarding what it takes to earn a ‘green’ (‘leading the industry’) score. As top-performing companies improve, what it takes to be considered an industry leader is also evolving.

4. An Explanation of the Categories

4.1 Traceability and Transparency
According to the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, a business is responsible for any and all adverse human rights impacts either through their own activities or due to their business relationships with other parties. It is not appropriate to ‘outsource’ this responsibility or to shift the responsibility to the next or another tier in the supply chain. To do so may create the unthinkable situation where eventually, the shifting of responsibility ends up at the top of the chain with the farmer.

A company that lacks knowledge of its cocoa’s origin (an issue of traceability) cannot genuinely ensure it is not tainted by extreme poverty, child labor, deforestation, or other abuses. Without transparency on this traceability, civil society cannot hold companies accountable. Transparent traceability is a crucial bedrock for all other reforms. Traceability and transparency constitute 20% of the total overall score. We analyzed responses in the following areas for this category:

1. Traceability methodology used;
2. Traceability of cocoa to the country, farm group and farmer level for both direct and indirect sourcing, and how much of the cocoa is traceable;
3. Certification and other methods (such as a company’s own program) are being used;
4. Transparency of the company’s reporting on its traceable supply chains, including publicly sharing cooperatives/supply chains; and
5. Tools used to verify traceability.

The questions in this category were scored in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What percentage is traceable to the country of origin? | 96-100%: 3 points  
91-95%: 2 points  
86-90%: 1 point  
0-85%: 0 points |
| What percentage is traceable to farmer group/cooperative level? | 76-100%: 3 points  
61-75%: 2 points  
41-60%: 1 point  
0-40%: 0 points |
| What percentage is traceable to farmer?       | 61-100%: 3 points  
46-60%: 2 points  
31-45%: 1 point  
0-30%: 0 points |
| For what percentage are unique farmer ID’s recorded? | 71-100%: 3 points  
51-70%: 2 points  
31-50%: 1 point  
0-30%: 0 points |
| What percentage is GPS or polygon mapped?     | 71-100%: 3 points  
51-70%: 2 points |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the company’s approach or roadmap for traceability on cocoa derivatives (including liquor, butter, powder and chocolate)?</td>
<td>31-50%: 1 point 0-30%: 0 points Clear roadmap for 100% with a date for all cocoa products = 3 points Clear roadmap for only part of cocoa products = 2 points No clear roadmap but working on a strategy = 1 point No clear roadmap or strategy = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the company made public a list of all cooperatives they source cocoa from in their direct supply chain?</td>
<td>Yes, for all countries = 3 points Yes, for specific countries = 2 points Partially, for specific countries = 1 point No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a target date or roadmap for 100% traceability in its <strong>direct</strong> supply chain?</td>
<td>Already achieved = 3 points Commitment is 2023-25 = 2 points Commitment is 2026-30 = 1 point No commitment = 0 points Points can be subtracted if the commitment is only for part of the supply chain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a target date or roadmap for 100% traceability in its <strong>indirect</strong> supply chain (or for a full transition to a direct supply chain)?</td>
<td>Same as above. Scores adjusted based on ratio of direct/indirect supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What percentage of cocoa purchased in the company’s direct supply chain is verified as coming from the location claimed?</td>
<td>Maximum 1 point if significant efforts are made to verify traceability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What tools are being used for cocoa traceability?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points for evidence of strong efforts made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild card question</td>
<td>Companies could score as many as 8 points for innovative or ambitious projects or targets and/or showing strong leadership for the industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When scoring the respondents on traceability, the scorers take into account that:

- Traceability is more difficult to achieve for buyers further down the supply chain.
- There are multiple levels of traceability beyond mass balance, segregated and Identity Preserved. This includes working with dedicated farmer groups, origin matching on mass balance cocoa, traceability from farmer-to-farmer group/exporter/supplier/factory, and other ways to achieve traceability in only part of the supply chain.
100% traceability is difficult to accomplish with constant changes in the supply chain. Even after reaching 100%, it may still be 97-98% in some years. This would be considered 100% for scoring.

- Regulation and legislation apply equally to all participating companies and are therefore not included in the scoring.

**4.2 Living Income**

A **living income** is:

> The net annual income required for a household in a particular place to afford a decent standard of living for all members of that household.

> Elements of a decent standard of living include food, water, housing, education, healthcare, transportation, clothing, and other essential needs including provisions for unexpected events.

This is not a reality for cocoa farmers and their families in West Africa. Many live in extreme poverty, making them more vulnerable to hunger, malnutrition, health crises, and other social challenges, including exposure to child labor.

We recognize that some farmers may already earn a living income, but this is not the case for the vast majority. Given the tremendous suffering embedded in the low price of cocoa, and the important reforms afoot, we set aside an entire category for the issue of living income. We analyzed the responses in three areas for this category:

1. A policy of paying a credible living income reference price (LIRF) (either set by Fairtrade, the VOICE network or any equivalent credible calculation or higher price\(^4\)) for cocoa in West Africa and globally; and/or have a calculation and is committed to paying (or are paying) an additional premium to farmers they source from;
2. Company programs, determined in consultation with sourcing communities, that work to achieve a living income for farmers and/or address poverty; and
3. Measuring the impact of such programs and sharing the results.

The highest scores were achieved by companies that are:

- using an actual living income calculation to benchmark their programs; and/or
- making payments to farmers on top of Living Income Differential (LID) set by the Governments of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire and certification premiums; and/or
- investing in development projects determined in consultation with the communities they are sourcing from.

The Living Income category contributed 20% to the total overall score.

---

\(^4\) This particular scorecard is agnostic concerning the type of LIRF adopted. However, using the World Bank’s extreme poverty line or the minimum wage of the country sourced from, is not credible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a published policy or publicly available statement that states that a living income is a basic human right?</td>
<td>Yes = 2 points  No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a time-bound living income action plan that includes purchasing practices – explicitly addressing farm gate pricing?</td>
<td>Yes, if implemented already = Maximum 3 points  Yes, if credible and before 2025 = 2 points  Yes, if credible and after 2025 = 1 point  No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the company calculated (or adopted a credible independent calculation of) a living income reference price?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points for a calculation which is not reliant only on increased productivity or diversification by the farmer but actually increases the price.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate the country, price calculated (including its source) and the percentage of farmers who are receiving the living income reference price for their beans</td>
<td>80-100% = 5 points  60-79% = 4 points  40-59% = 3 points  20-39% = 2 points  1-19% = 1 point  &lt;1% = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the company made any commitment to pay a higher farmgate price for cocoa?</td>
<td>Yes = 2 points  No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company consider how many labor days are needed per hectare farmed for cocoa for the farmers in the company’s supply chain to effectively manage their farm?</td>
<td>Yes = 1 point  No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a system to makes it possible to distribute the income of producers over the year, thereby reducing the vulnerability in the lean months?</td>
<td>Yes = 2 points if credible  No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What percentage of farmers in the company’s direct supply chain receive a price above the farm gate price, through the use of premium mechanisms or other mechanisms?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if providing increased farmgate price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company seek to engage in long-term contracts with their suppliers, defining specifically the long-term purchasing responsibilities of the company and selling rights of the farmer/cooperative, so that sellers are less at risk from season to season?</td>
<td>Yes = 2 points  No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which mechanisms are used? (see the Chocolate scorecard survey for details)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>No such program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the company know the average household income (or have any data on the household income) of the cocoa farmers the company is working with or sourcing from?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No, but we are researching</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please specify the percentage of cocoa farmers that the company knows the household income for.</td>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>60-79%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a method for verifying payments to farmers such as e-payment systems?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No, but we are investigating</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild card question</td>
<td>Companies could score as many as 13 points for innovative or ambitious projects or targets and/or showing strong leadership for the industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Child Labor

The NORC Final Report: Assessing Progress in Reducing Child Labor in Cocoa Production in Cocoa Growing Areas of Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana, funded by the US Department of Labor, found the following:

- 1.56 million children exposed to child labor in cocoa production (including approximately 790,000 children in Côte d’Ivoire and 770,000 in Ghana);  
- 1.48 million children were exposed to at least one component of hazardous child labor in cocoa production; and  
- Between 2008/09 and 2018/19, the exposure to agrichemicals became more common, with the proportion of children exposed to agrichemical products increasing approximately five-fold from 5% to 24% in aggregate.

Despite voluntary corporate efforts promising to eradicate it, the prevalence of child labor has increased by 14% over the past decade. While no specific research has been conducted on the matter, it is possible that the adverse impacts of COVID-19 on economies, supply chains, and schools have increased some children’s exposure to child labor. Poverty and extremely low incomes are linked to children’s exposure to child labor and hazardous child labor,
depriving them of their future and subjecting them to abuse. It is particularly disheartening given that chocolate is often considered a treat for children, especially around Easter or Halloween.

The NORC Report (2020), revealed a significant increase in the number of children in child labor exposed to harmful pesticides (from 10% to 27%) along with an increase in injuries, impacts on health and level of care needed (including hospitalization). Exposure of children to chemicals is regarded as the “worst form of child labor.”

We analyzed responses in three areas for this category:

1. Any child labor policy, monitoring and remediation system or equivalent (Child Labor Monitoring and Remediation Systems - CLMRS);
2. Percentage of farms covered by the scheme; and
3. Presence of a plan to scale up programs and processes to address child labor.

A CLMRS is the most common way of addressing child labor. However, it is early days for some companies to address child labor through specific interventions and we believe it is premature to assess its long-term effectiveness.

The Child Labor category contributed to 20% of the total overall score.

The questions in this category were scored in the following manner:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What is the company’s approach to ending child labor, forced labor and human trafficking? | The company has the goal of ending these practices in its entire supply chain = 1 point  
The company has a policy = 1 point  
The company is participating in industry programs to address these issues in the entire industry = 1 point |
| Does the company have a program that seeks to prevent, monitor, remediate children in situations of child labor? | Yes = 2 points  
No = 0 points  
Policy reflects this = 1 extra point |
| What is the total cost of support provided?                             | Assess based on demonstration of leadership actually making investments.  
(No points given for high numbers alone). |
| In the past year, how many cocoa farmer households were included in programs or schemes to address the situation where children are found to be in situations of child labor? | 80-100% = 3 points  
60-79% = 2 points  
40-59% = 1 point  
< 39% = 0 points |
| In the past year, how many cocoa farmer households in the company’s supply chain were covered in the CLMRS? | 80-100% = 3 points  
60-79% = 2 points  
40-59% = 1 point  
< 39% = 0 points |
| How many cases have been identified of worst forms of child labor in the past year? | For a realistic number = 2 points awarded for transparency. |
| How many children are no longer in worst forms of child labor after follow-up visits during the past year? | For a realistic number = 2 points awarded for transparency. |
| Has the company publicly communicated any numbers related to programs or schemes to prevent, monitor and remediate child labor during the past year? | Yes = 2 points  
No = 0 points  
Noting that there are circumstances (such as US companies) where making this public is not possible. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Credible evidence = 3 points (maximum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What evidence does the company have that the programs or schemes are reducing the prevalence of child labor situations?</td>
<td>Highest scores for impact evaluations and not just participation evaluations. Lowest scores for pilots with no evaluation processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the company reported on actions to prevent and address child labor to any national authorities in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Yes and URL link provided = 2 points Yes but no evidence = 1 point No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a policy to monitor, reduce or eliminate the exposure of children to pesticides?</td>
<td>Yes and URL link provided = 2 points Yes but no evidence = 1 point No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a policy to monitor, reduce or eliminate forced labor and human trafficking?</td>
<td>Yes and URL link provided = 2 points Yes but no evidence = 1 point No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the company found and successfully remediated any cases of forced labor and human trafficking in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Yes and URL link provided: 2 points Yes but no evidence 1 point No: 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild card question</td>
<td>Companies could score as many as 8 points for innovative or ambitious projects or targets and/or showing strong leadership for the industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When scoring the respondents on traceability, the scorers take into consideration that:

- There are some circumstances, such as US companies, where public reporting on cases of child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking is not feasible.
- Participants are not scored lower if cases of child labor, forced labor or human trafficking are found or reported. Scorers reward participants for transparency on these issues.

### 4.4 Deforestation and Climate

Cocoa is a major global driver of forest destruction. West Africa produces 75% of the world’s cocoa, with Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana being the largest producers. These two countries have lost most of their forest cover in the past sixty years - around 94% and 80%, respectively, with approximately one-third of forest loss from cocoa growing. In 2018, these two countries
also had the **highest rise in primary forest loss of any tropical country**. In 2020, another **47,000 ha of forest was lost** in cocoa growing areas of Côte d’Ivoire.

Almost everywhere cocoa grows worldwide, from Asia to Africa to Latin America, studies show it is **tied to deforestation**, which negatively impacts climate change. Forests absorb carbon, but when they die, they release carbon and no longer serve as a carbon sink. Forests are also a key habitat for some of the most endangered species in the world, including gibbons and great apes.

As such, this section also focuses on the industry’s contribution to global annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions leading to severe climate change.

To address this, the governments of Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana, 35 leading cocoa and chocolate companies, and farmers have joined together to end cocoa driven deforestation through the **Cocoa & Forest Initiative (CFI)**, and subsequently Colombia and Cameroon have developed similar Initiatives. There is more to do and CFI has not yet lived up to its promises.

Even beyond forest efforts like CFI, chocolate companies have taken a wide range of climate actions, with the chocolate sector being particularly active in the recent “Race to Zero” (aimed at zeroing out overall emissions).

In recognition of the immense challenges but also the broad range of actions taken to address these problems, deforestation and climate change actions contributed 20% of the total overall score.

We analyzed the responses in the following areas for this category:

1. Application of no-deforestation policy to global sourcing and percentage of cocoa purchased through a deforestation-free monitoring system;
2. Percentage of cocoa sourced from deforested areas since various cut-off dates;
3. Detailed plans for how to respond to evidence of suppliers sourcing cocoa from recently deforested land; and
4. Policy to achieve net zero carbon emissions company-wide or using **science-based targets**.

The questions in this category were scored in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a policy or commitment to no-deforestation/no-conversion production or sourcing?</td>
<td>Credible policy/commitment = 5 points (maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy or commitment apply to all of the company’s sourcing or production?</td>
<td>Credible policy/commitment = 3 points (maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What percentage of the volume of the cocoa the company purchases is covered by a deforestation-free monitoring system?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| By which target date will the company cease or has the company already ceased sourcing from deforested areas? | Already ceased sourcing from deforested areas = 3 points  
Aim to have ceased sourcing from deforested areas in a specific year in the future = 2 points  
Do not have a target date = 0 points |
| What year did the company cease sourcing from deforested areas?          | Before 2014 = 5 points  
2014-16 = 4 points  
2017-18 = 3 points  
2019-20 = 2 points  
2021 or later = 1 point  
None = 0 points |
| What year does the company aim to cease sourcing from deforested areas?  | Maximum 3 points if credible |
| Does the company use/rely on external mechanisms (e.g. certification standards) to monitor compliance? If yes, which standards? | Maximum 3 points if credible |
| Does the above monitoring system use satellite, GPS monitoring or polygon mapping? | Yes, remote sensing = 2 points  
Yes, waypoint mapping = 2 points  
Yes, Polygon mapping = 2 points  
No = 0 points |
| Does the company have a time bound plan for working with suppliers and smallholders to map smallholder farms using GPS or polygons? | Yes, for all cocoa sourcing = 2 points  
Yes, for part of the company’s cocoa sourcing = 1 point  
No = 0 points |
| Which cut-off date does the company use to assess its deforestation baseline? | Before 2014 = 5 points  
2014-16 = 4 points  
2017-18 = 3 points  
2019-20 = 2 points |
### Question | Points
--- | ---
2021 or later = 1 point  
None = 0 points  
Up to 2 extra points if the goal is ambitious, clear, well-defined per country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a public grievance mechanism open to all stakeholders and a corresponding log for tracking company remediation of instances of non-compliance specifically including deforestation?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a clear noncompliance policy with clearly defined expectations for time bound improvement plans and thresholds for supplier exclusion based on noncompliance on deforestation?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Does the company set science-based targets that include land-related emissions and removals? | Yes = 2 points  
No = 0 points |
| Does this target include a public policy or commitment for getting to net-zero carbon emissions based on Scope 1 emissions? | Maximum 3 points if credible  
No = 0 points |
| Does the company have a public policy for getting to net-zero Scope 2 carbon emissions? | Maximum 3 points if credible  
No = 0 points |
| Does the company have a public policy for getting to net-zero Scope 3 carbon emissions? | Maximum 5 points if credible  
No = 0 points |
| Wild card question | Companies could score as many as 15 points for innovative or ambitious projects or targets and/or showing strong leadership for the industry |

### 4.5 Agroforestry

Though cocoa has been a major driver of deforestation worldwide, it can become the reverse - an agent of re-greening around the planet. **Agroforestry**, as opposed to pesticide-soaked monoculture, is a more ecologically sound way of growing cocoa and restoring farming landscapes. Scientific research demonstrates that robust agroforestry cocoa systems are better for the planet, carbon sequestration, soil and air moisture retention, and biodiversity. Studies show it is also better for farmers’ food security and income.
Diversification. When implemented correctly, it is a win-win for people, the planet, farmers, forests, and endangered species. Birds and animals also may return to agroforestry environments. The deforestation in Africa has destroyed much of the natural habitat of great apes, gorillas, chimpanzees and bonobo but there is some evidence that primates may be able to re-populate in agroforestry contexts. This has been the case in Madagascar for some of the 107 endemic species of endangered Lemur.

Agroforestry contributed 10% to the total overall score. We analyzed the responses in four areas for this category:

1. Any agroforestry policy and its definition;
2. Application of the agroforestry policy, either globally or to West Africa only;
3. Assessment and monitoring of the agroforestry policy;
4. Support and investment in farmers within the supply chain to transition to agroforestry growing methods.

The questions in this category were scored in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have an agroforestry policy or other publicly available commitments on agroforestry?</td>
<td>Maximum 2 points if credible. No = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In which counties?</td>
<td>Majority of their sourcing countries = 2 points Minor of sourcing countries = 1 point None = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a target year to source 100% of its cocoa grown in an agroforestry setting?</td>
<td>100% of cocoa is grown in an agroforestry setting = 2 points Aim to have 100% of cocoa grown in an agroforestry setting in the future = 1 point Do not have a target date for sourcing from an agroforestry setting = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What year did the company achieve 100% cocoa grown in an agroforestry setting?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What year does the company aim for 100% of cocoa grown in an agroforestry setting?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What percentage of the cocoa the company sources is grown in an agroforestry setting?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What percentage of native vegetation coverage is required?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the minimum number of shade trees required per hectare?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the minimum number of species per hectare required?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other indicators that the company uses to assess or define agroforestry?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Does the company provide any training and support for initial investments when farmers in the company’s supply chain are transitioning to growing in an agroforestry setting? | Yes, full compensation and in-kind support = 3 points  
Yes, some monetary support and in-kind support = 2 points  
Yes, monetary support only = 1 point  
Yes, in-kind support only = 1 point  
No = 0 points |
| Wild card question                                                      | Companies could score as many as 8 points for innovative or ambitious projects or targets and/or showing strong leadership for the industry |

**4.6 Agrichemical Management**

As we face a mass extinction crisis, much of which is driven by chemicals in agriculture, chocolate companies need to reform their current approaches and adopt practices that do not rely on agrichemicals. Increased productivity via chemical inputs cannot be the primary means for companies sourcing increasing amounts of cocoa. Instead, the long-term sustainability of the industry, the health of the farming communities (who often rely on neighboring rivers for drinking and bathing), soil health, and the planet’s health must become a priority.

To achieve this, companies must eliminate the most hazardous pesticides entirely and move towards reducing the overall use of agrichemicals. They should support farmers in transitioning to agricultural practices that do not rely on dangerous chemicals while helping them maintain their yield and income.

Companies should emphasize non-chemical interventions such as grafting, pruning, hand pollination, and education around best agroecological practices and Integrated Pest Management (IPM) to increase yields for farmers.

We analyzed the responses in three areas for this category:

1. Any stated targets and policy to reduce pesticides;
2. Assessment and monitoring of hazardous pesticides in the supply chain and action to phase the use of hazardous pesticides out;
3. Support for the adoption of non-chemical alternatives.

Pesticides contributed 10% to the total overall score.

The questions in this category were scored in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the company source 100% certified organic cocoa?</td>
<td>100% awarded if the answer is yes (and credible/proven) with no need to answer any other questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide evidence confirming your company’s organic certification status.</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please explain what criteria are used to determine which active substances to prohibit, restrict or monitor.</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the company have a policy or commitment on synthetic pesticides (such as fungicides, herbicides, insecticides, acaricides, rodenticides etc.) and active substances that it monitors, prohibits, or restricts in its cocoa supply chain?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what percentage of the cocoa the company sources does this policy or commitment apply?</td>
<td>100% = 3 points 80-99% = 2 points 50-79% = 1 point &lt;49% = 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is included in the company’s pesticide policy or commitment? (General or specific pesticide goal, Education of farmers, Monitoring, evaluation and learning, Integrated Pest Management, Measures to protect and enhance beneficial insects, Safety and exposure, Restrictions on pesticides permitted, Preference for non-chemical methods, Grove renewal, Advocacy, Pilots, Other)</td>
<td>For each: Yes and credible = 1 point No (or 'yes' but not credible) = 0 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the company gathering data about pesticide use in its cocoa supply chains?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any of the active substances which the company has prioritized for phase-out or identified as causing a high incidence of harm, currently used widely in the company’s supply chains?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the company support suppliers to reduce pesticide use and adopt non-chemical alternatives to pesticides?</td>
<td>Maximum 3 points if credible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please provide details to the lists of active substances that are monitored, prohibited and/or restricted from the company’s supply chain.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum 3 points if credible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going beyond lists of RA/FT = 2/3 points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wild card question

| Companies could score as many as 9 points for innovative or ambitious projects or targets and/or showing strong leadership for the industry |

### 4.7 Overall score

The framework used for scoring retailers and companies are different for the overall score. If the same system was applied, as no retailer scored three greens in the categories, no retailer would have been awarded a green overall score. As we wished to differentiate between the retailers we used the same scoring for the categories as the companies but a different framework for awarding overall score.

The overall score were given in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companies</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Broken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading the industry on policy and implementation</td>
<td>Starting to develop and implement good policies</td>
<td>Needs more work on policy and implementation</td>
<td>Needs to catch up with the industry</td>
<td>Lacking in transparency either did not respond or complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 75% and at least 3 green scores</td>
<td>At least 50% and at least 3 yellow scores</td>
<td>At least 25% and at least 3 orange scores</td>
<td>1-24% or more than 3 red scores</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retailers</th>
<th>Developing their own programs and partnerships to address the issues</th>
<th>Doing something more than certification</th>
<th>Relying entirely on certification</th>
<th>No significant initiatives</th>
<th>Lacking in transparency either did not respond or complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-65%</td>
<td>22-39%</td>
<td>7-21%</td>
<td>3-6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information, please contact support@chocolatescorecard.com.