

Company Name Alimentation Couche-Tard
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain only)
UNGP Core Score (*) 3.5 out of 26

| Score | Out of | For indicators |
|---|-----------|--|
| Governance and Policy Commitments | | |
| 1 | 2 | A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights |
| 0.5 | 2 | A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers |
| 1 | 2 | A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders |
| 0 | 2 | A.1.5 Commitment to remedy |
| Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence | | |
| Embedding respect | | |
| 0 | 2 | B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions |
| Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD) | | |
| 0 | 2 | B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts |
| 0 | 2 | B.2.2 HRDD - Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks) |
| 0 | 2 | B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action |
| 0 | 2 | B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts |
| 0 | 2 | B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed |
| Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms | | |
| 1 | 2 | C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers |
| 0 | 2 | C.2 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities |
| 0 | 2 | C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned |
| 3.5 | 26 | |

(*) Instead of the full list of indicators in the 2020 CHRB Methodology, this year's assessment uses the CHRB Core UNGP Indicators. These are 13 non-industry specific indicators that focus on three key areas of the UNGPs: high level commitments, human rights due diligence and access to remedy.

The 13 indicators selected from the full CHRB Methodology are scored on a simple unweighted basis, with a maximum of 2 points for each indicator for a maximum total of 26 points.

In addition, allegations of severe human rights impacts (Measurement Theme E) were also assessed but do not impact overall final scores

Please note that the "Not met" labels in the Explanation boxes below do not necessarily mean that the company does not meet the requirements as they are described in the bullet point short text. Rather, it means that the analysts could not find information *in public sources* that met the requirements *as described in full* in the CHRB 2020 Methodology document. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

Detailed assessment

Governance and Policies

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|---|------------------|---|
| A.1.1 | Commitment to respect human rights | 1 | <p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: General HRs commitment: The Company indicates that 'Respect for human rights is an integral part of Couche-Tard values base.' [Ethics Code Of Conduct, 22/05/2018: corpo.couche-tard.com] • Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2 • Not met: UDHR • Not met: International Bill of Rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGPs • Not met: OECD |
| A.1.2 | Commitment to respect the human rights of workers | 0.5 | <p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: ILO Core • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company indicates that 'Couche-Tard is concerned about the health and safety and well being of its employees, its business partners and the public'. In addition, in its Sustainability Report, the Company states that 'Our strong safety mindset is a core value. We ensure safety is embedded into everything we do as we aspire to zero harm to our employees, customers and communities. We have strict health, safety and security policies and programs, which we communicate as part of onboarding and skills training. Our store managers receive training on operational and food safety, security, loss prevention, and harassment.' Also, 'We are committed to providing an inclusive and respectful workplace that supports and inspires our people to do their best, and perform in a safe and healthy environment'. [Ethics Code Of Conduct, 22/05/2018: corpo.couche-tard.com & Sustainability Report 2019, 07/2019: corpo.couche-tard.com] • Not met: H&S applies to AG suppliers |
| A.1.4 | Commitment to engage with stakeholders | 1 | <p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company states in its Sustainability Report 2019: 'Participating in an open dialogue with our stakeholders allows us to identify important issues, shape our responses, and continuously improve. We believe this is essential to promoting understanding and trust. Most of our engagement takes place during day-to-day interactions and we also carry out more structured engagements'. Stakeholder groups include: employees (Employee survey, on-the-job coaching and training, intranet, performance reviews), suppliers (meetings, conferences), communities and governments (Local charities, consultations, municipal, regional and national authorities) among others. [Sustainability Report 2019, 07/2019: corpo.couche-tard.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement |
| A.1.5 | Commitment to remedy | 0 | <p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|
| | | | • Not met: Work with AG suppliers to remedy impacts |

Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|---|------------------|---|
| B.1.1 | Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company has established a new position of Sustainability Executive Owner, however, it is not clear if the responsibility of this role includes human rights issues. [Sustainability Report 2019, 07/2019: corpo.couche-tard.com] Score 2 • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for AG in supply chain |
| B.2.1 | Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company indicates that 'prior to establishing a business relationship with a potential counterparty or starting an activity, Couche-Tard will, at its discretion, assess the risks involved in taking such a course of action in relation to human rights, corruption or health, safety and environment'. In addition, the Company lists its material issues in its Sustainability Report, however, it is not clear how they are related to the Company's operation in specific locations or activities. [Ethics Code Of Conduct, 22/05/2018: corpo.couche-tard.com] • Not met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers Score 2 • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR) |
| B.2.2 | Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met |
| B.2.3 | Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including in AG supply chain • Not met: Example of Actions decided Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met |
| B.2.4 | Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met |
| B.2.5 | Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including AG suppliers |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|
| | | | Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications |

Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|---|------------------|--|
| C.1 | Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers | 1 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Code of Conduct applies to all employees. The code indicates that 'If the individual has information about potential non-compliant behaviour or breaches of Couche-Tard's ethical requirements, these concerns must be reported immediately to the individual's superior or to the local legal counsel ("Designated Person") who will provide the individual with the appropriate guidance.' The Designated Person 'shall ultimately report their findings to Alimentation Couche-Tard Inc.'s Senior Director, Legal Affairs and Corporate Secretary who will provide the necessary guidance to the Designated Person and where the circumstances demand it, take over the investigation.' It also states that 'If, for any reason, the individual is uncomfortable using regular channels the concern can be reported in writing to complaint@couche-tard.com'. [Ethics Code Of Conduct, 22/05/2018: corpo.couche-tard.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect AG supplier to have equivalent grievance systems • Not met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers |
| C.2 | Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Grievance mechanism for community: The company does not clearly indicate whether these mechanisms are open to all external stakeholders [Ethics Code Of Conduct, 22/05/2018: corpo.couche-tard.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects AG supplier to have community grievance systems • Not met: AG supplier communities use global system |
| C.7 | Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism |

Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations (Not included in the overall score)

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| E(1).0 | Serious allegation No 1 | | No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found. |

Disclaimer

A score of zero for a particular indicator does not mean that bad practices are present. Rather it means that we have been unable to identify the required information in public documentation.

See the 2020 Key Findings report and the 2019 technical annex for more details of the research process.

The Benchmark is made available on the express understanding that it will be used solely for general information purposes. The material contained in the Benchmark should not be construed as relating to accounting, legal, regulatory, tax, research or investment advice and it is not intended to take into account any specific or general investment objectives. The material contained in the Benchmark does not constitute a recommendation to take any action or to buy or sell or otherwise deal with anything or anyone identified or contemplated in the Benchmark. Before acting on anything contained in this material, you should consider whether it is suitable to your particular circumstances and, if necessary, seek professional advice.

The CHRB is part of the World Benchmarking Alliance ('WBA'). The material in the Benchmark has been put together solely according to the CHRB methodology and not any other assessment models in operation within any of the project partners or EIRIS Foundation as provider of the analyst team.

No representation or warranty is given that the material in the Benchmark is accurate, complete or up-to-date. The material in the Benchmark is based on information that we consider correct and any statements, opinions, conclusions or recommendations contained therein are honestly and reasonably held or made at the time of publication. Any opinions expressed are our current opinions as of the date of the publication of the Benchmark only and may change without notice. Any views expressed in the Benchmark only represent the views of WBA, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither WBA nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers or employees accept any responsibility for or make any representation or warranty (either express or implied) as to the truth, accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information contained in this Benchmark or any other information made available in connection with the Benchmark. Neither WBA nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers and employees undertake any obligation to provide the users of the Benchmark with additional information or to update the information contained therein or to correct any inaccuracies which may become apparent (save as to the extent set out in CHRB appeals procedure). To the maximum extent permitted by law any responsibility or liability for the Benchmark or any related material is expressly disclaimed provided that nothing in this disclaimer shall exclude any liability for, or any remedy in respect of, fraud or fraudulent misrepresentation. Any disputes, claims or proceedings this in connection with or arising in relation to this Benchmark will be governed by and construed in accordance with Dutch law and shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Courts of Amsterdam.

As WBA, we want to emphasise that the results will always be a proxy for good human rights management, and not an absolute measure of performance. This is because there are no fundamental units of measurement for human rights. Human rights assessments are therefore necessarily more subjective than objective. The Benchmark also captures only a snap shot in time. We therefore want to encourage companies, investors, civil society and governments to look at the broad performance bands that companies are ranked within rather than their precise score because, as with all measurements, there is a reasonably wide margin of error possible in interpretation. We also want to encourage a greater analytical focus on how scores improve over time rather than upon how a company compares to other companies in the same industry today. The spirit of the exercise is to promote continual improvement via an open assessment process and a common understanding of the importance of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

COPYRIGHT

Our publications and benchmarks are the product of the World Benchmarking Alliance. Our work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit creativecommons.org