



Rules for Coop's sustainability declaration

Version 5 • October 2024



UPDATES IN VERSION 5

Coop's rules for the sustainability declaration have been reviewed. This version (version 5) includes updates to the weightings and sources used in the calculation model together with minor text edits. The updates to the different sections are presented below.

Method and calculation model

Added information on how the ingredients in a product are weighted in the sustainability declaration, 50-20-10-10-10, and a note that in cases where source data are unavailable for the country of origin, the mean value for other countries in the same region is used (regions as defined by the World Bank).

Certifications and standards

IP Sigill Crops added as a third-party certification.

Biodiversity

The Physical Risk by country aspect of the WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter has replaced the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) as the assessment criterion. The WWF Seafood Guide has replaced Coop's Seafood List.

Climate

The source RISE (Research Institutes of Sweden) Food Climate Database has been updated to version 2023.

Soil fertility

The source of the assessment criterion soil organic carbon content has been changed from the share of C in the topsoil (FAOSTAT) to the Soil Condition risk indicator of the Physical Risk aspect of the WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter.

Water

The Basin Physical Risk and Basin Regulatory Risk aspects of the WWF Basin Water Risk Filter have replaced the Overall Basin Risk Score. The outcome of this parameter is determined by the aspect with the highest risk.

Pesticides

The source EFSA residue levels statistics has been updated to the years 2020–2022.

Eutrophication

The source World Bank data on mineral fertiliser sales has been updated to the years 2007–2021.

Animal welfare and antibiotics

The outcome of this parameter is determined by the higher of the animal welfare and use of antibiotics outcomes and not, as was previously the case, the mean value.

Working conditions

The World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) Overall Risk has replaced the Amfori BSCI Overall Risk, which no longer exists.

Local population

The World Bank's WGI indicator Rule of Law has replaced the Amfori BSCI RoL, which no longer exists.

Legal compliance and traceability

The Control of Corruption and Regulatory Quality indicators of the World Bank's WGI have replaced the Amfori BSCI CoC and RQ, which no longer exist. The outcome of this parameter is determined by the higher of the CoC and RQ outcomes.



CONTENTS

Background	4
The purpose of Coop's sustainability declaration	4
The sustainability declaration as a purchasing tool	4
The sustainability declaration as communication	4
Method and calculation model	4
Raw materials and ingredients	4
Water as an ingredient	4
Game, wild berries and risk-free products	5
Country of origin	5
Weighting for several countries of origin	5
EU and other regions as country of origin	5
Unknown origin	5
Source data unavailable	5
Wild-caught seafood	5
Country of manufacture	5
Certifications and standards	5
Updating the rules and sources	5
Parameters in the sustainability declaration	6
1. Biodiversity	6
Data sources and score allocation	7
2. Climate	7
Data sources and score allocation	7
3. Soil fertility	8
Data sources and score allocation	8
4. Water	9
Data sources and score allocation	9
5. Pesticides	10
Data sources and score allocation	10
6. Eutrophication	11
Data sources and score allocation	11
7. Animal welfare and antibiotics	12
Data sources and score allocation	12
8. Working conditions	13
Data sources and score allocation	13
9. Local population	14
Data sources and score allocation	14
10. Legal compliance and traceability	15
Data sources and score allocation	15
APPENDIX 1: Summary of the results for all standards/certifications for each parameter	16
APPENDIX 2: Approved calculations and other own climate calculations	17
APPENDIX 3: EFSA residue levels statistics	18
APPENDIX 4: Risk production working conditions	19

BACKGROUND

Sustainability is a complex issue and encompasses more than just the climate. Sustainable food production also entails, for example, not depleting water resources and soil fertility, the responsible use of pesticides, decent animal welfare, minimal use of antibiotics and favourable conditions for employees at every stage of the supply chain.

In 2015, Coop was involved in starting Hållbar Livsmedelskedja (Sustainable Food Chain), an initiative involving 15 of the largest companies and organisations in the Swedish food industry. The initiative was coordinated by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), and the goal is to by 2030 contribute to considerably more sustainable food production and consumption in the Swedish food chain. Hållbar Livsmedelskedja has defined ten areas considered essential to sustainable products: biodiversity and ecosystems, climate and air, soil fertility and erosion, water, chemicals and pesticides, eutrophication, animal welfare, working conditions, local population, and legal compliance and traceability.

Coop's sustainability declaration is based on these ten areas, and we have developed a methodology for how we are to use the available science and data sources to assess each area. In this way, we can visualise a product's sustainability performance and illustrate the inherent complexity.

THE PURPOSE OF COOP'S SUSTAINABILITY DECLARATION

The sustainability declaration is Coop's tool for implementing the guidelines for sustainable production that the industry has developed together under the aegis of Hållbar Livsmedelskedja. The sustainability declaration presents a product's sustainability performance based on the information we have on the country of manufacture, the component raw materials and their origin, certifications and production methods. In order to produce a declaration for a product, we need to know about its component ingredients and their origins. This information has been gathered from each supplier.

The sustainability declaration was originally developed as a purchasing tool to transition towards a more sustainable product range. We have now chosen to also use the sustainability declarations for our products to inform consumers and to further increase opportunities for more sustainable consumption.

The sustainability declaration as a purchasing tool

The sustainability declaration was developed as a pur-

chasing tool to guide Coop's buyers and product range managers when selecting suppliers and product ranges. Each product receives a sustainability declaration for its total footprint, as well as for each ingredient. In this way, we can see the contribution of each individual ingredient and whether it is possible to replace any of them to achieve a more sustainable product.

The sustainability declaration as communication

Many of our customers and members would like more information about the environmental and social impact of different goods. By presenting sustainability declarations for all of our food items, we want to help our customers and members to make informed decisions. As a customer, you will be able to see the sustainability declarations of all our food items, a total of about 17,000 different products. Our sustainability declarations encompass a broad range of areas related to sustainable development, not just climate impact. This gives the customer a picture of the various aspects of sustainability and greater opportunities to make more sustainable choices.

METHOD AND CALCULATION MODEL

Raw materials and ingredients

The sustainability declaration is based on the five largest ingredients comprising more than 10% of the product. These are weighted using the ratios 50-20-10-10-10. Accordingly, seasoning, salt and additives are excluded in most cases. In this version, we do not use the products exact recipes but rather the list of ingredients in descending order of size and information from the suppliers.

Water as an ingredient

Water as an ingredient in a product has a very favourable outcome as in the calculation model it does not, for example, impact biodiversity, soil fertility, eutrophication or pesticide use. We have decided to include water as an ingredient in the calculation of the sustainability declaration so as to assign the other ingredients the correct percentages and to make relevant products comparable with each other. Without water as an ingredient, carbonated beverages, for instance, would contain 100% sugar and the sustainability declaration would be misleading. In the calculation, water as an ingredient is allocated a fixed score of 1 for the parameters biodiversity, soil fertility, water, pesticides and eutrophication.

For the parameters working conditions, local population, and legal compliance and traceability, water is assessed based on the country of origin. The country

of origin for water is assumed to be the same as the country of manufacture unless otherwise stated.

Game, wild berries and risk-free products

Game and wild berries are allocated a score of 1 for several parameters as they do not burden the concerned ecosystems in the same way as other production and are instead a part of them. There are also other products assessed to have no impact on a particular parameter, such as wild-caught seafood in relation to soil fertility. These are also allocated a fixed score of 1.

Country of origin

Weighting for several countries of origin

The origin of a raw material can vary throughout the year. If a raw material has several different origins, such as in the case of pork, which can come from Germany, Denmark or Sweden, these are weighted equally in the calculation. For fresh fruit & vegetables where the origin varies over the year, a weighted value is calculated based on the proportion of the year in which the different origins occur.

EU and other regions as country of origin

In some cases, the information we have is that a raw material has its origin in the EU. This is then calculated as the country within the EU with the highest score for each parameter. The same principle also applies to other regions, such as if the origin is stated as South America.

Source data unavailable

In cases where source data are unavailable for the country of origin, we use the mean for the other countries in the same region (as defined by the World Bank).

Unknown origin

In cases where the origin is unknown, regardless of reason, the product does not receive a sustainability declaration.

Wild-caught seafood

For wild-caught seafood, the flag state of the boat is the country of origin. If information about the flag state is unavailable, country of manufacture accounts for 100% of the score.

Country of manufacture

Country of manufacture provides 25% of the score for the parameters Working Conditions and Legal Compliance & Traceability. The country of manufacture is not considered when calculating the other parameters. If the country of manufacture is unknown, the product does not receive a sustainability declaration.

Certifications and standards

Third-party certifications mean that the production process has been inspected by a third party based on the criteria set out in a standard. This can, in turn, result in a sustainability label, or simply be used to better facilitate business-to-business trade. We have selected a number of common third-party certifications for the primary production of food that are also associated with a sustainability label. These are reviewed based on which of the ten parameters they encompass and whether they include criteria that regulate the risk of a negative impact. In cases where we have assessed this to be true, this is seen in the outcome.

The standards have been evaluated with the aid of the Standards Map tool, which compares different standards. We have identified which criteria are relevant to each parameter in the sustainability declaration and whether the standards include these criteria. In some cases, we have also used previously conducted reviews, such as the evaluation of soy certifications conducted by Svenska sojodialogen (The Swedish Soy Dialogue) and the WWF report Strengthening Water Stewardship in Agricultural Sustainability Standards. Only in cases where a third-party certification can alter the outcome for a raw material/product is it included in the tables (see the section Parameters in the sustainability declaration). The certifications are given either a fixed score per parameter or an adjustment of -1 from the ingredient or the product's original score. A summary of the results of all certifications/standards can be found in Appendix 1.

Companies/suppliers can even have their own quality assurance systems that are relevant to the outcome in the sustainability declaration. The assessment of such systems, and the verification of the information received from these systems, is conducted by Coop's sustainability experts and, in some cases, external experts.

Updating the rules and sources

The rules will be reviewed, and any updates implemented, on an annual basis. During this review, consideration will be given to new research, updated standards and whether the data sources remain relevant.

Once every six months, checks will be made to see whether new versions of the data sources being used are available.

PARAMETERS IN THE SUSTAINABILITY DECLARATION

1. Biodiversity

Food production is a major contributing factor to the loss of biodiversity through, for example, the use of pesticides/plant protection products, deforestation, monoculture, changes in land use, overfishing and tools that damage the seabed.

Food production can also have a positive impact on biodiversity, such as grazing animals that keep natural grazing lands open and thereby promote local biodiversity. Many certifications and agricultural systems, both national and international, include criteria to protect and sometimes even promote biodiversity and ecosystems.

As an assessment criterion for the outcome of this parameter, we use the Physical Risk aspect of the WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. As a complement, we use certifications and production systems that ensure the protection or promotion of biodiversity in production as well as in production that entails a high risk of a negative impact.

Data sources and score allocation

The WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter is a map-based risk filter for biodiversity. The tool is based on global data sources from WWF, IUCN, the World Bank and NASA. In the sustainability declaration assessment, we have

chosen to only use the Physical Risk by country aspect as this is the most relevant for primary food production. The tool gives each country a risk score between 1 and 5, which we then use. A more precise geographical location can be used as supplementary information.

Production that entails a high risk of ongoing deforestation or change in land use, and that has not undertaken to conserve all forests and/or natural ecosystems and other high conservation value (HCV 1–6) areas, is allocated a fixed score of 5. This includes, for example, meat production in Brazil and prawn farming in Vietnam. This risk has been identified by Hållbar Livsmedelskedja as production that we need to phase out. If the supplier can verify that they are managing this risk in an acceptable manner, they can be allocated a -1 in the outcome.

The cultivation of soy and palm oils in many places around the world causes losses of biodiversity through deforestation and, in some cases, heavy pesticide use and monoculture farming methods. By far the largest share (80%) of soy is cultivated as animal feed. Palm oil, soy and all animal (meat and dairy) products are assessed as risk products within the parameter and are allocated a +1 in addition to the outcome for the country of origin.

Parameter	Assessment criterion	Data source	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Biodiversity	Selection from WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter WWF Seafood Guide Type of production based on risk of negative impact receives a fixed score or a +1. Palm oil, soy and animal products are allocated a +1.	WWF BRF – Physical risk, risk score, country profile (2023)	1.0–1.8 Green light according to WWF Seafood Guide Game, wild berries, water	>1.8–2.6	>2.6–3.4 Yellow light according to WWF Seafood Guide	>3.4–4.2	>4.2–5.0 Red light according to WWF Seafood Guide Production that entails a high risk of ongoing deforestation or changed land use

Parameter	Certifications	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	Score -1
Biodiversity	KRAV	1					
	EU organic	1					
	Fairtrade		2				
	Rainforest Alliance/UTZ		2				
	IP Sigill Fruit & Vegetables/combinable crops		2				
	IP Sigill Natural Pasture Beef	1					
	GLOBAL G.A.P. Crops		2				
	Sustainably Grown		2				
	FSA SAI						-1
	MSC (wild-caught seafood)	1					
	ASC (aquaculture)			3			
	BAP (aquaculture)			3			
	GLOBAL G.A.P. Aquaculture			3			
	RSPO (palm oil)						-1
	RTRS (soy)						-1
	ProTerra (soy)						-1
	Donausoja (soy)						-1
	Bonsucro (sugar)						-1

2. Climate

In order to limit climate change and global warming, we need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Carbon dioxide equivalents enable us to measure greenhouse gas emissions in a way that accounts for different gases contributing to the greenhouse effect and global warming to different extents. In assessing the climate impact parameter, we use the metric carbon dioxide equivalents per kilo product.

of Sweden), which has a database spanning some 3,500 products. The public version of this database contains 750 products. Climate compensation does not result in a better score in the sustainability declaration. To achieve a better score within the climate parameter, one must provide verifiable data showing the product's climate impact (Appendix 2).

Data sources and score allocation

Data for carbon dioxide equivalents per kilo product are obtained from RISE (Research Institutes

Parameter	Assessment criterion	Data source	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Climate	kg CO ₂ e/kg product	RISE Food Climate Database (2023)	0–0.5	>0.5–3	>3–10	>10–20	>20

3. Soil fertility

Soil fertility is an ecosystem service that is maintained by, among other things, a diversity of decomposers, mixers and other lifeforms that convert organic material and break down minerals. Soil fertility is reduced due to changes in the micro-environment and the consequence is that the organisms which maintain good soil quality die. Reduced soil fertility can be caused by, for example, the inappropriate use of pesticides and mineral fertilisers (altered carbon-to-nitrogen ratio), insufficient new organic material, drought, too much or too little grazing, and monoculture. Erosion is a consequence of reduced soil fertility and can arise when the soil lacks protection for part of the year, such as due to ploughing or monoculture harvesting. Wind and precipitation can then erode the nutrient-rich soil that is left unprotected.

The soil organic carbon content by country is used as the assessment criterion for this parameter. As a complement, we use certifications and production systems that ensure the protection or promotion of soil fertility in production.

Data sources and score allocation

The Soil Condition risk indicator of the Physical Risk aspect of the WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter (BRF) is used as a data source, with the country receiving a risk score between 1 and 5. More precise geographical location, certifications and the type of production can be used as supplementary information.

Parameter	Assessment criterion	Data source	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Soil fertility	Soil condition by country	WWF BRF – Physical risk – Soil condition (2021)	1.0–1.8	>1.8–2.6	>2.6–3.4	>3.4–4.2	>4.2–5.0
	Production based on risk of negative impact		Game, wild berries, seafood, water				

Parameter	Certifications	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	Score -1
Soil fertility	KRAV	1					
	EU organic	1					
	Fairtrade		2				
	Rainforest Alliance/UTZ		2				
	IP Sigill Fruit & Vegetables/combinable crops		2				
	IP Sigill Natural Pasture Beef	1					
	GLOBAL G.A.P. Crops		2				
	Sustainably Grown		2				
	FSA SAI		2				
	ASC (aquaculture)						-1
	BAP (aquaculture)						-1
	GLOBAL G.A.P. Aquaculture						-1
	RSPO (palm oil)		2				
	RTRS (soy)		2				
	ProTerra (soy)		2				
	Donausoja (soy)		2				
	Bonsucro (sugar)		2				

4. Water

Food production can cause major problems with the water supply in an area. To achieve sustainable production, one ought to be restrictive with water-intensive foods from areas with water shortages.

A product's water footprint can be divided into green, blue and grey water. The green water is primarily rainwater that falls on the crops. Blue water is water sourced from lakes, waterways and groundwater to irrigate the crops. And grey water is the pollution that the product causes in, for example, waterways, lakes and the sea.

As assessment criteria for the outcome of the parameter, we use the water risk in a country and products that have a considerable water footprint. As a complement, we use certifications and production systems that ensure the protection or promotion of the water footprint in production.

wherein we use the higher of the Basin Physical Risk and Basin Regulatory Risk scores to take into account the country's circumstances as well as its governance. A more precise geographical location can be used as supplementary information.

Water Footprint Network is a platform for companies and organisations that promotes sustainable water use. The water footprint that we use is the amount of blue water that is used to produce one kilo of a product. The water footprint is based on data from 1995 to 2005 published in articles from 2010 and 2011. We use data for the global average per crop or animal. Products with a water footprint of more than 2,000 m³/tonne are allocated a +1 on top of the outcome for the country of origin.

Data sources and score allocation

The water risk in a country is assessed using the WWF Basin Water Risk Filter map-based risk filter,

Parameter	Assessment criterion	Data source	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Water	Water risk by country	WWF WRF – the higher of the Basin Physical Risk and Basin Regulatory Risk scores (2021)	1.0–1.8	>1.8–2.6	>2.6–3.4	>3.4–4.2	>4.2–5.0
	A water footprint over 2,000 m ³ /tonne is allocated a +1	Water Footprint Network					
	Production based on risk of negative impact		Game, wild berries, wild-caught seafood, water	Seafood from aquaculture			

Parameter	Certifications	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	Score -1
Water	Fairtrade						-1
	Rainforest Alliance/UTZ						-1
	GLOBAL G.A.P. Crops		2				
	Sustainably Grown		2				
	FSA SAI						-1
	RSP0 (palm oil)						-1
	RTRS (soy)						-1
	ProTerra (soy)						-1
	Donausoja (soy)						-1
	Bonsucro (sugar)						-1

5. Pesticides

The use of pesticides that are hazardous to health and the environment in the production of food can entail risks for the people and the environments exposed to them. In countries and productions with heavy pesticide use and less strict requirements for safe pesticide use, the risks are even greater. As an assessment criterion for the outcome of this parameter, we use the statistics on pesticide residues in food available within the EU.

Data sources and score allocation

The residue data encompass both food produced within the EU and food imported from outside the EU.

The table in appendix 3 is a compilation of the EFSA residue levels statistics for the years 2020, 2021 and 2022, which encompass a large number of analyses of products from different countries. Products from countries where pesticide residues are less commonly found are allocated a lower score than those from countries where pesticide residues are more commonly found. The model assumes that a high frequency of residues is associated with more extensive pesticide use. The greatest risk/highest score is allocated to countries where pesticide residues are found in more than 70% of cases or where the maximum residue limit (MRL) is exceeded in more than 10% of cases.

Parameter	Assessment criterion	Data source	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Pesticides	Percentage of tested products with pesticide residues Production based on risk of negative impact. Palm oil and soy products are allocated a +1. Production that does not use undesirable pesticides, as per the Swedish Food Retailers Federation's List of Hazardous Pesticides, is allocated a -1.	EFSA residue levels statistics (2020–2022)	Game, wild-caught seafood, wild berries and water	0–30% pesticide residues	>30–50% pesticide residues	>50–70% pesticide residues	>70–100% pesticide residues >10% above MRL

Parameter	Certifications	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	Score -1
Pesticides	KRAV	1					
	EU organic	1					
	Fairtrade		2				
	Rainforest Alliance/UTZ		2				
	IP Sigill Fruit & Vegetables/combined crops		2				
	GLOBAL G.A.P. Crops		2				
	Sustainably Grown		2				
	FSA SAI						-1
	RSP0 (palm oil)						-1
	RTRS (soy)						-1
	ProTerra (soy)						-1
	Donausoja (soy)						-1

6. Eutrophication

Eutrophication is caused by the release of too many plant nutrients on land and into water, with agriculture and forestry currently responsible for the largest share. The result of the increased nitrogen and phosphorus content is that waterways, lakes and coastal ecosystems are altered, with an increased production of plant material among other things. One example of this is the unnatural and extensive algae blooms in the Baltic Sea, where a small number of adaptable species take over and are bolstered by the nutrients that are added, with rapidly increased biological production as a result.

There are forms of cultivation/farming in compliance with certifications and cultivation systems that minimise the accidental release of plant nutrients into the surrounding environment, such as by means of precision fertilisation, protection zones, application timing, plough-free cultivation and catch crops.

As an assessment criterion for the outcome of the parameter eutrophication, we use the World Bank's data on mineral fertiliser sales by country.

Data sources and score allocation

The data source, the World Bank's data on mineral fertiliser per hectare of arable land, is an average for sales during the period 2007–2021. At present, there is no overall metric for fertiliser use by country. Instead, the data on mineral fertiliser sales are the closest we can get to measuring fertiliser use. Error sources for this metric include the lack of quality measurements as to which crops the fertiliser has been used on and the fact that farmyard manure is not included.

Wild-caught seafood is assessed not to affect eutrophication as these species move over a larger area and do not eat farmed feed while seafood from aquaculture is assessed to have a high risk of affecting this parameter negatively.

Parameter	Assessment criterion	Data source	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Eutrophication	Mineral fertiliser use by country (kg/ha)	World Bank (2007–2021)			Kg/ha: 0–300	Kg/ha: 300–600	Kg/ha: >600
	Production based on risk of negative impact		Game, wild berries, wild-caught seafood, water			Seafood from aquaculture	

Parameter	Certifications	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	Score -1
Eutrophication	KRAV	1					
	EU organic	1					
	Fairtrade						-1
	Rainforest Alliance/UTZ						-1
	IP Sigill Fruit & Vegetables/combinable crops		2				
	IP Sigill Natural Pasture Beef	1					
	GLOBAL G.A.P. Crops		2				
	Sustainably Grown		2				
	FSA SAI						-1
	ASC (aquaculture)						-1
	BAP (aquaculture)						-1
	GLOBAL G.A.P. Aquaculture						-1
	RSPO (palm oil)						-1
	RTRS (soy)						-1
	ProTerra (soy)						-1
	Donausoja (soy)						-1
	Bonsucro (sugar)						-1

7. Animal welfare and antibiotics

Coop's animal welfare policy is based on the five freedoms defined by the EU Farm Animal Welfare Council and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), and Coop wants to promote improved animal welfare and responsible antibiotics use. In assessing animal welfare, we use the Animal Protection Index developed by several established animal protection organisations and evaluate the existence of legislation in 50 countries and the strength of that legislation. In assessing the risk of the irresponsible use of antibiotics, we look at the sales of antibiotics in each country.

The outcome of this parameter is determined by the higher of the animal welfare and use of antibiotics outcomes. In the case of a combined product, the animal ingredients comprise 100% of the outcome for the parameter, even if they do not comprise 100% of the product.

Data sources and score allocation

At present, the Animal Protection Index (API) classifies 50 countries throughout the world in terms of their commitments to protect animals and improve animal welfare through government policies and legislation. The API was developed in a collaboration between the animal protection organisations World Animal Protection (WAP), Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA), Eurogroup

for Animals, International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), Humane Society International (HS) and Compassion in World Farming (CIWF). Its development involved consultations with several academic experts to ensure its suitability in terms of design, international applicability and completeness as regards the matters encompassed by the index. The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) was also consulted at each stage of the work with the index.

Coop's sustainability declaration uses the API indicator Protecting animals used in farming. The API divides this indicator into seven levels from A to G. Since not all countries have been evaluated in the API, we have supplemented our assessment with a shared outcome for within the EU (4) and outside the EU (5), respectively.

The annual ESVAC report compares sales of antibiotics in 31 European countries. We have used the table showing sales in tonnes of active ingredient of veterinary antimicrobial agents marketed mainly for food-producing animals, by country. The farming of lamb and beef (does not apply to milk production) generally uses less antibiotics than the average for other food-producing animals. Accordingly, they are automatically allocated a -1 deduction from the country's outcome as per the table.

Parameter	Assessment criterion	Data source	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Animal welfare and antibiotics	Animal Protection Index	API (2020)		API A-B		API C-D or EU origin	API E-G or non-EU origin
	Production based on risk of negative impact		Game and wild-caught seafood				
	Sales of antibiotics by country	ESVAC Sales of veterinary antimicrobial agents in 31 European countries in 2022, table 4	Antibiotics: 0–20 mg/PCU	Antibiotics: >20–50	Antibiotics: >50–100	Antibiotics: >100–200	Antibiotics: >200
	Production based on risk of negative impact. Lamb and beef (not dairy products) are allocated a -1						

Parameter	Certifications	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	Score -1
Animal welfare and antibiotics	KRAV	1					
	EU organic (Sweden)	1					
	EU organic (imported)						-1 (not pork)
	IP Sigill Natural Pasture Beef	1					
	GLOBAL G.A.P. Livestock						Antibiotics score for pork, chicken and dairy allocated a -1
	Aenor			3			

8. Working conditions

The products sold by Coop shall be produced in a manner that ensures decent, safe working conditions throughout the entire food supply chain. Accordingly, Coop has requirements for its suppliers to ensure this.

As an assessment criterion for the outcome of the working conditions parameter, we use the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI). The Worldwide Governance Indicators were developed in 1999 by two World Bank researchers, Daniel Kaufmann and Aart Kraay. WGI data encompass six aggregated governance indicators for over 200 countries and are updated annually. The indicators are determined from data collected from more than 30 think tanks, international organisations, NGOs and private companies around the world. The data must meet criteria regulating credibility, comparability and regular updates. A country's overall risk (OR) is calculated as an average of a number of indicators (see next section). This classification helps to reveal whether a product comes from a risk area.

Data sources and score allocation

The risk classification is based on the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI). The data are updated annually and are available on the World Bank website. WGI data encompass Voice and Accountability, Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, and Control of Corruption. The overall risk (OR) is the average score for these indicators, a number between 0 and 100, where 100 is best, that is, lowest risk. The limit for when a country is considered a risk country is 60.

There is also risk production as regards working conditions in countries not classified as risk countries, as presented in appendix 4. Examples of this are labour-intensive productions such as berry picking, which often involve seasonal and migrant labour. These productions are allocated a +1 to the country's general score. Production certified compliant with a third-party certification encompassing working conditions can improve the outcome of this parameter.

Parameter	Assessment criterion	Data source	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Working conditions	Overall risk (OR)	World Bank WGI (2022)	OR: >90	OR >80–90	OR: >60–80	OR: >40–60	OR: 0–40
	Production based on risk of negative impact. Risk production in non-risk country is allocated +1						

Parameter	Certifications	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	Score -1
Working conditions	KRAV						-1
	Fairtrade		2				
	Rainforest Alliance/UTZ						-1
	GLOBAL G.A.P. GRASP						-1
	Sustainably Grown						-1
	FSA SAI						-1

9. Local population

Coop's operations shall not contribute to any negative impact on the local population in the countries of production in such a way that their human rights are violated. Human rights are defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations and encompass, for example, everyone's right to food, accommodation, education, employment, childcare, healthcare, property ownership and freedom. Coop's responsibility covers the entire supply chain from raw material to consumer.

As an assessment criterion for the outcome of the parameter, we use the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) ranking of countries based on the rule of law. The Worldwide Governance Indicators were developed in 1999 by two World Bank researchers, Daniel Kaufmann and Aart Kraay. WGI data encompass six aggregated governance indicators (see section 8. Working conditions) for over 200 countries and are updated annually. The indicators are determined from data collected from more than 30 think tanks, international organisations, NGOs and private companies around the world. The

data must meet criteria regulating credibility, comparability and regular updates. The rule of law indicator comprises a general and overarching metric for measuring how countries fulfil human rights and the structures of, for example, laws and courts in a country to support the equality of all citizens, ensure governance and prevent the abuse of power.

Data sources and score allocation

The World Bank's WGI ranking of countries based on the rule of law provides a number between 0 and 100, where 100 is best, that is, lowest risk. The limit for when a country is considered a risk country is 60.

Palm oil and soy products are assessed as risk products within this parameter as their cultivation in many places risks displacing the local population. Palm oil, soy, meat and dairy products are allocated a +1 on top of the outcome for the country of origin. Production certified compliant with a third-party certification encompassing impact on the local population can improve the outcome of this parameter.

Parameter	Assessment criterion	Data source	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Local population	Rule of Law (RoL)	World Bank WGI (2022)	RoL: >90	RoL: >80-90	RoL: >60-80	RoL: >40-60	RoL: 0-40
	Production based on risk of negative impact. Palm oil, soy and animal products are allocated a +1						

Parameter	Certifications	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	Score -1
Local population	KRAV						-1
	Fairtrade		2				
	Rainforest Alliance/UTZ						-1
	Sustainably Grown						-1
	RSPO (palm oil)						-1
	RTRS (soy)						-1
	ProTerra (soy)						-1
	Donausoja (soy)						-1

10. Legal compliance and traceability

The products that Coop sells shall be produced in a manner that complies with the applicable legislation in the country where production takes place. Production conditions and the supply chain shall be transparent so as to reduce the risk of legal infractions and fraud. Coop requires that its suppliers actively work with anti-corruption measures.

As an assessment criterion for the outcome of the legal compliance and traceability parameter, we use the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI). The Worldwide Governance Indicators were developed in 1999 by two World Bank researchers, Daniel Kaufmann and Aart Kraay. WGI data encompass six aggregated governance indicators (see section 8. Working conditions) for over 200 countries and are updated annually. The indicators are determined from data collected from more than 30 think tanks, international organisations, NGOs and private companies around the world. The data must meet

criteria regulating credibility, comparability and regular updates. In this case, we use the indicators Control of Corruption, which assesses the risk of corruption, and Regulatory Quality, which reflects the government's ability to implement sound policies and regulations. The outcome of this parameter is determined by the higher of the Control of Corruption and Regulatory Quality outcomes.

Data sources and score allocation

The World Bank's rankings of countries based on Regulatory Quality and Control of Corruption provide two numbers between 0 and 100, where 100 is best, that is, lowest risk. The limit for when a country is considered a risk country is 60.

Production certified compliant with a third-party certification encompassing both legal compliance and traceability can improve the outcome of this parameter.

Parameter	Assessment criterion	Data source	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
Legal compliance and traceability	Regulatory Quality (RQ)	World Bank WGI (2022)	RQ: >90	RQ: >80–90	RQ: >60–80	RQ: >40–60	RQ: 0–40
	Control of Corruption (CoC)	World Bank WGI (2024)	CoC: >90	CoC: >80–90	CoC: >60–80	CoC: >40–60	CoC: 0–40

Parameter	Certifications	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	Score -1
Legal compliance and traceability	KRAV	1					
	EU organic	1					
	Fairtrade	1					
	Rainforest Alliance/UTZ	1					
	IP Sigill Fruit & Vegetables/combinable crops	1					
	IP Sigill Natural Pasture Beef	1					
	GLOBAL G.A.P. Crops						-1
	Sustainably Grown						-1
	MSC (wild-caught seafood)	1					
	ASC (aquaculture)	1					

APPENDIX 1

Summary of the results for all certifications for each parameter

Certification	Biodiversity	Climate	Soil fertility	Water	Pesticides	Eutrophication	Animal welfare & antibiotics	Working conditions	Local population	Legal compliance & traceability
KRAV	1		1		1	1	1	-1	-1	1
EU organic	1		1		1	1	1 (from Sweden) -1 other countries except pork			
RA/UTZ	2		2	-1	2	-1		-1	-1	1
Fairtrade	2		2	-1	2	-1		2	2	1
GLOBAL G.A.P. Crops	2		2	2	2	2				-1
IP Sigill Fruit & Vegetables/Crops	2		2		2	2				1
IP Sigill Natural Pasture Beef	1		1			1	1			1
Sustainably Grown	2		2	2	2	2		-1	-1	-1
FSA SAI	-1		2	-1	-1	-1		-1		
RTRS/ProTerra/Donausoja	-1		2	-1	-1	-1			-1	
RSPO	-1		2	-1	-1	-1			-1	
Bonsucro	-1		2	-1		-1				
MSC	1									1
ASC	3		-1			-1				1
BAP	3		-1			-1				
GLOBAL G.A.P. Aquaculture	3		-1			-1				
GLOBAL G.A.P. GRASP								-1		
GLOBAL G.A.P. Livestock							-1 on antibiotics for pork, chicken and dairy			
Aenor							3			

APPENDIX 2

Approved calculations and other own climate calculations

Calculations that are approved for the climate parameter:

- According to ISO 14067:2018
- Use characterisation factors with feedback (AR5 with feedback, IPCC 2013)
- The calculation includes all types of land use and changed land use (LU, dLUC, iLUC)

For other own calculations, the following must be met in order to be approved as a basis for the climate parameter:

- How the calculation is done (methodology) must be documented and available to Coop (public or sent from supplier)
- The calculation must follow and/or be in line with ISO 14040:2006 and ISO 14044:2006 and include the environmental impact category climate
- AR4 (IPCC 2007) or AR5 without feedback (IPCC 2013) must be used
- The climate contribution from land use and/or changed land use (LULUC) must be included if it is significant. If this is omitted from the calculation, there must be a justification.

Important criteria must be in line with ISO 14040/44

- The calculation must include a life cycle perspective
- The scope of the calculation must be clearly stated and justified in the documentation
- Allocation must be made on the basis of the rules contained in ISO 14040/44 (mass allocation, economic allocation, system expansion) and clearly documented.

APPENDIX 3

Compilation of the EFSA residue levels statistics for the years 2020, 2021 and 2022.

Country	Residues
Albania	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Argentina	30–50% Residues
Austria	30–50% Residues
Australia	30–50% Residues
Bosnia and Herzegovina	30–50% Residues
Bangladesh	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Belgium	50–70% Residues
Bulgaria	0–30% residues
Bolivia	50–70% Residues
Brazil	50–70% Residues
Canada	30–50% Residues
Côte d'Ivoire	30–50% Residues
Chile	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Cameroon	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
China	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Colombia	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Costa Rica	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Cyprus	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Czechia	30–50% Residues
Germany	50–70% Residues
Denmark	30–50% Residues
Dominica	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Dominican Republic	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Ecuador	50–70% Residues
Estonia	0–30% residues
Egypt	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Spain	50–70% Residues
Ethiopia	50–70% Residues
Finland	0–30% residues
France	0–30% residues
United Kingdom	30–50% Residues
Ghana	50–70% Residues
Greece	50–70% Residues
Guatemala	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Honduras	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Croatia	30–50% Residues
Hungary	30–50% Residues
Ireland	0–30% residues
Israel	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
India	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Iran	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Italy	30–50% Residues
Japan	0–30% residues
Kenya	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Cambodia	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Sri Lanka	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Lithuania	0–30% residues
Luxembourg	30–50% Residues
Latvia	0–30% residues
Morocco	50–70% Residues
Moldova	30–50% Residues

Country	Residues
Madagascar	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Republic of North Macedonia	30–50% Residues
Malta	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Mexico	30–50% Residues
Nigeria	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Netherlands	0–30% residues
Norway	0–30% residues
New Zealand	0–30% residues
Panama	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Peru	50–70% Residues
Pakistan	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Poland	30–50% Residues
Portugal	50–70% Residues
Paraguay	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Romania	0–30% residues
Serbia	50–70% Residues
Russia	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Sweden	0–30% residues
Slovenia	0–30% residues
Slovakia	30–50% Residues
Senegal	50–70% Residues
Thailand	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Tunisia	30–50% Residues
Türkiye	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Ukraine	30–50% Residues
Uganda	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
United States	50–70% Residues
Uruguay	30–50% Residues
Vietnam	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
South Africa	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL
Zimbabwe	>70% Residues or >10% above MRL

APPENDIX 4

Risk production working conditions

Productions with a high risk of poor working conditions.

Risk production
Blueberry
Lingonberry
Raspberry
Blackberry
Strawberry
Tomato