

Company Name Anheuser-Busch InBev
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
UNGP Core Score (*) 14.5 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
2	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
2	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
1	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
1	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence		
Embedding respect		
2	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
1.5	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)
1	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
0.5	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed
Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms		
1.5	2	C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers
2	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
14.5	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	2	<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 describes the following: 'This Global Human Rights Policy ("Policy") outlines AB InBev's approach and commitment to respecting human rights across our global operations and our value chain.' [Global Human Rights Policy, 6/2019: ab-inbev.com] • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Global Human Rights Policy states that as 'a signatory to the United Nations ("UN") Global Compact, we are committed to business practices that respect human rights and that align with international standards of responsible business conduct.' [Global Human Rights Policy, 6/2019: ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: UNGPs: Under the "Our Commitment" section of the Company's Global Human Rights Policy the Company commits to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy (Updated March 2019), 3/2019: ab-inbev.com] • Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	2	<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: ILO Core: The Company's Code of Business Conduct and Global HR policy cover each of discrimination, forced labour, child labour, freedom of association and collective bargaining, as indicated below. [Global Human Rights Policy, 6/2019: ab-inbev.com & Global Responsible Sourcing Policy (Updated March 2019), 3/2019: ab-inbev.com] • Met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers: The Company states in its Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, 'we expect our Business Partners to respect the human rights of employees within their operations, and to promote human rights of all workers – whether directly engaged by the Business Partner or through third-party companies or agencies, and whether engaged formally or as casual or temporary workers – within their operations. We seek to work with our Business Partners to understand the challenges within our supply chain and work together to support improvements.' The Human rights principles are those which Anheuser-Busch InBev considers to be the most salient within its global value chain, and this includes Child Labour and Young People; Forced Labour and Freedom of Movement; Freedom of Association and the right to collective bargaining; and Discrimination and Harassment. With respect freedom of association and collective bargaining, the Policy says: 'Business Partners must support the right of all workers to choose whether to form or join lawful trade unions and other organizations of their choice, and to bargain collectively in support of their mutual interests. Business Partners must not discriminate in any way against workers that choose to form or join trade unions, or against those workers that choose not to form or join trade unions. In those countries and/or situations in which the legal system prohibits or severely restricts the right of freedom of association, Business Partners must support, within the framework of applicable laws and regulations, the establishment of alternative means to facilitate the effective representation of workers' interests and communication between workers and management.' [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy (Updated March 2019), 3/2019: ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Human rights policy contains explicit commitment to each labour area of child labour, forced labour, discrimination, freedom of association and collective bargaining. In relation to these last two, it says: 'AB InBev respects the right of all its workers to form and join lawful trade unions and other organizations of their choice, and to bargain collectively in support of their mutual interests. [...] In those countries and/or

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>situations in which the legal system prohibits or severely restricts the right of freedom of association, AB InBev will support, within the framework of applicable laws and regulations, the establishment of alternative means to facilitate the effective representation of workers interests and communication between workers and management' [Global Human Rights Policy, 6/2019: ab-inbev.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Human Rights policy states that 'AB InBev strives to ensure high standards of occupational health and safety throughout the organization, as articulated in our Health and Safety Policy'. [Global Human Rights Policy, 6/2019: ab-inbev.com] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: The Global Responsible sourcing policy contains a commitment to health and safety and a list of specific requirements. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy (Updated March 2019), 3/2019: ab-inbev.com]
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: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company identifies stakeholder engagement in its Materiality Assessment. Furthermore, the Company states in its Global Human Rights Policy, that the Company is 'committed to engaging in meaningful dialogue with stakeholders to assess potential or actual human rights impacts, or their legitimate representatives.' It also states it 'believes that engaging with affected and potentially affected stakeholders is critical for building and maintaining a robust human rights approach.' [Materiality Assessment, 12/2017: ab-inbev.com & Global Human Rights Policy, 6/2019: ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: The Company 'believes that stakeholder engagement is important when this [Human Rights] Policy is periodically updated, and when the Company undertakes periodic human rights risk assessments.' However, this is not strong enough to be considered a formal commitment to engage stakeholders in the design, and no further evidence was found. [Global Human Rights Policy, 6/2019: ab-inbev.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: In developing its Human Rights policy, the Company 'consulted with both internal and external stakeholders.' However, it is unclear whether this includes affected stakeholders, and no evidence could be found of regular engagement in the design of the policy. [Global Human Rights Policy, 6/2019: ab-inbev.com]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	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: Commits to remedy: The Company is 'committed to the provision of effective remedy where AB InBev has not met the standards set out in' its human rights policy. This policy covers workers (including full time, part time, independent contractors and temporary), communities, and other stakeholders. The policy includes commitments to respect Human rights, UN Global Compact, UN Guiding principles and ILO Core areas, among others. [Global Human Rights Policy, 6/2019: ab-inbev.com] <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 • Not met: Work with AG suppliers to remedy impacts: The Company indicates that as part of its Responsible Sourcing program, 'for strategic suppliers we are building a benchmarking framework that will help us to identify how suppliers are managing responsible sourcing within their business and supply chains including what grievance mechanisms and remediation processes this group of suppliers have in place to support responsible sourcing and sustainability'. However, no evidence found of the Company working with its suppliers to remedy adverse impacts through suppliers' mechanisms (or collaborating with them in the development of third party non-judicial remedies). [Responsible Sourcing, N/A: ab-inbev.com]

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	2	<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: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. The Company is committed to each ILO core area.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: All employees are required to act in accordance with the principles of the Company's Global Human Rights Policy, and it is the responsibility of the Ethics & Compliance and People teams to ensure all employees comply with this policy. The Global Ethics & Compliance Team oversees this, under the stewardship of the VP Ethics & Compliance. Also, 'every Zone-level Compliance team in our business has regional accountability for the application of our Global Human Rights Policy and completion of human rights assessments and actions plans.' [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, 08/2018: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: See above. • Met: Day-to-day responsibility for AG in supply chain: The Company has disclosed the following to CHRB: 'Responsible Sourcing is led by the Global Procurement function due to its relationship with suppliers and their role in supplier selection and management. Our Chief Procurement and Sustainability Officer, and related Procurement function are accountable for the implementation of our Responsible Sourcing Policy into our supplier selection and management processes. Within our Procurement function, the Vice President of Supplier Value Creation and Sustainability leads the Responsible Sourcing Program, with the Global Sustainability Director and Global Sustainability Manager responsible for oversight on a day-to-day basis.' [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, 08/2018: business-humanrights.org]
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company describes a process that seems to include both identification and assessment. 'Compliance teams conduct comprehensive risk-based human rights assessments annually [...] During 2017, we conducted assessments in sixteen countries representing eight zones'. Assessments are conducted by Zone Ethics & Compliance teams and consider they human rights policy, the issues identified during the assessment and information from broader external engagement with stakeholders. [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, 08/2018: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers: The company has 'developed a supplier pre-qualification process that comprises of three pillars - financial stability, business integrity, and responsible sourcing and human rights', and is continuing to expand on this process. The Company describes the following: 'The supplier pre-qualification process (which includes Responsible Sourcing) is applied to both new suppliers and existing suppliers. All new suppliers are assessed as they enter supplier engagements. [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, 08/2018: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: 'Compliance teams conduct comprehensive risk-based human rights assessments annually across our operations to evaluate compliance with policy. During 2017, we conducted assessments in sixteen countries'. Although the Company refers to 'assessments' the process seem to include identification as it not only assessed against policy, as it also indicates that teams consider too 'issues identified during the assessment and information from broader external engagement with stakeholders'. [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, 08/2018: business-humanrights.org] • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: The Company states that the Zone Ethics & Compliance teams take into consideration 'information from broader external engagement with stakeholders', for instance, 'Africa Zone is working collaboratively with Partner Africa'. For each assessment, teams 'conducted inquiries with relevant management personnel, site inspections, and interviews with employees of varying seniority and employment tenure'. [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, 08/2018: business-humanrights.org] • Met: In consultation with HR experts: See above. For each assessment, inquiries are conducted with internal personel , including: 'The Human Rights Legal Review Protocol provides guidance to Compliance teams on how to identify and undertake site-level assessments within our direct operations, ensuring consideration of the type of operation, stakeholders to engage, geographic location, potential for human rights issues amongst other criteria' (internal human rights expertise). [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, 08/2018: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances: However, new suppliers go through a pre-qualification process. [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, 08/2018: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company states in its Materiality Assessment that human rights is one of the material aspects considered, however it does not provide details on what aspects of human rights are critical, nor is human rights one of the eight material aspects prioritised in its assessment. The Annual Report states that in 2017 it conducted a risk-based global analysis to assess enforcement of its human rights policy, but it does not disclose which issues are considered and addressed. No further evidence found in its 2019 Annual Report. [Materiality Assessment, 12/2017: ab-inbev.com & 2017 Annual Report, 12/2017: ab-inbev.com] • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including in AG supply chain • Met: Example of Actions decided: The company provides the following example: 'in 2017, our Latin America North Zone identified security as a potential human rights issue as a result of their risk assessment process and reported it through the appropriate channels. This led to a number of changes such as recruiting a Security Manager for the region to improve security processes and resources at several at-risk operations.' [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, 08/2018: business-humanrights.org] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness: The Company indicates, in its 2019 Annual Report, that 'We are continually evolving and strengthening our approach to respecting human rights. Through the policy refresh process, we recognized there was an opportunity to improve our company-wide approach to human rights due diligence. We analyzed existing internal and external good practices and designed a new model for testing. The model was piloted in India and involved cross-functional participation from commercial, operational and corporate affairs functions. The model is being refined based on pilot results and will be scaled into other markets in 2020 through a Due Diligence Implementation Toolkit'. However, this indicator looks for evidence of specific lessons learnt as consequence of checking effectiveness of actions on specific salient human rights risks. [2019 Annual Report, 27/02/2020: ab-inbev.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Comms plan re identifying risks: See indicator B.2.1. The Company carries out a global risk identification and assessment process that includes both its own operations and business partners, and describes at least some features of the process. • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.2 • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.3 • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.4 • Not met: Including AG suppliers: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.2/B.2.3/B.2.4 and at least 1,5 points in B.2.1 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	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company states 'Our Compliance Helpline is a secure means of reporting, provided by an independent company. It is available anywhere in the world and 24/7, and you can file your report in your language. It is available to all colleagues, where you can CONFIDENTIALLY and, if you choose and local laws permit, ANONYMOUSLY, report any concern in relation to potential violations of applicable laws or regulations, this Code or our policies'. [2020 Code of Business Conduct, 05/2020: ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: As above, different languages are available. [2020 Code of Business Conduct, 05/2020: ab-inbev.com] • Met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers: The Company states in its Responsible Sourcing Policy that grievances mechanisms are available for suppliers to report any gaps or breaches of the policy. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy (Updated March 2019), 3/2019: ab-inbev.com]
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	2	<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: Grievance mechanism for community: In the Company's Global Human Rights Document, under the heading "Grievance Mechanisms and Non-Retaliation" the Company states that 'Any and all violations of this Policy must be reported through AB InBev's Compliance Helpline, online at talkopenly.ab-inbev.com, or by phone at 1-844-780-9959 or a local number available on the website. The Compliance Helpline is available 24 hours and is toll-free. It is available to anyone, and reports can be made confidentially and anonymously.' [Global Human Rights Policy, 6/2019: ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: The online compliance helpline is available in 12 languages. [Compliance helpline, N/A: ab-inbev.gan-compliance.com] • Met: Expects AG supplier to have community grievance systems: The Company's Responsible Sourcing Policy states that 'Business Partners must have systems in place to enable anonymous grievance reporting by workers and external individuals.' In addition, the policy states that expects business partners to undertake, among others, the following step: 'Communicate the Policy to their employees and, cascade throughout their supply chain'. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy (Updated March 2019), 3/2019: ab-inbev.com]
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	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: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks: In its Whistleblowing Policy, the Company indicates that 'if misconduct has been confirmed through an investigation, the Company will take prompt and appropriate remedial action proportionate to the seriousness of the misconduct, in accordance with its established procedures and practices, including the Investigation Guidelines. Such remedial action may include disciplinary action against the accused party, up to and including termination of employment'. It is not clear the Company's approach to provide or enable a timely remedy for its possible adverse human rights impacts. [Whistleblower Policy, 12/2019: ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: AB InBev accused of anti-union activity in Sonapat, India • Area: FoA & CB • Story: Since February 2018, AB InBev Sonapat workers and their families continue their protest at the factory gate in support of their right to union recognition and collective bargaining, free from harassment and victimization. They are insisting on the Company to act to remedy alleged human rights abuses by reinstating with full rights of all dismissed and suspended Haryana Breweries Limited Mazdoor Union (HBLM) union leaders and members and withdrawing the police charges against union leaders. The strike was apparently prompted by the firing of Union President Anil Kumar Saini from the factory, after he took earned time off after working for 16 hours on a public holiday. Since 2016 the workers allege that local managers have refused to negotiate a collective bargaining agreement with the HBLM. The managers of AB InBev India have allegedly coordinated physical assaults on union members and sought to undermine the rights of workers at the Sonapat factory to impede workers ability to freely associate and bargain collectively. The IUF urges AB InBev to exert whatever pressure is necessary on local management at Sonapat factory to ensure they reinstate the suspended and terminated union committee members, "Local managements at AB InBev India facilities must be instructed to stop harassing union members for engaging in legitimate union activities and must enter into good faith negotiations with the unions to reach collective bargaining agreements." In comments to 'Good Beer Hunting' Ingvild van Lysebetten, global external communication director for AB InBev, said that a "couple" of people have been protesting as they await legal proceedings in a labor court. Ms van Lysebetten said that the root of the issue comes from three employees whose jobs were terminated, but couldn't provide details on why they lost their jobs. She said that operations at the factory haven't been impacted and that "the welfare of our people is our top priority." Van Lysebetten adds that there are no plans for restructuring at the plant or for mass layoffs. • Sources: [IUF - 05/06/2018: iuf.org][Beerworkers.org - 08/03/2018: beerworkers.org][Goodbeerhunting.com - 19/04/2018: goodbeerhunting.com]
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response available: The website Goodbeerhunting.com quoted Ingvild van Lysebetten, global communications director for AB InBev, saying a "couple" of people had been protesting as they await legal proceedings in labor court, and that the root cause of the issue comes from 3 employees whose jobs were terminated - however she failed to give any further details. [Goodbeerhunting.com, 19/04/2018: goodbeerhunting.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response goes into detail: The response from Ingvild van Lysebetten does not provide sufficient detail. [Goodbeerhunting.com, 19/04/2018: goodbeerhunting.com]
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	2	<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: Company policies address the general issues raised: The Human Rights Policy states that AB InBev supports the right of all workers to join lawful trade unions and other organizations of their choice and to bargain collectively. It also states that "In those countries and/or situations in which the legal system prohibits or severely restricts the right of freedom of association, AB InBev will support, within the framework of applicable laws and regulations, the establishment of alternative means to facilitate the effective representation of workers interests and communication between workers and management." [Global Human Rights Policy, 12/2016: ab-inbev.com] • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The company's Human Rights Policy states that commitment to human rights applies to all AB InBev operations and to full, part time, temporary AB InBev employees and independent contractors. It also applies to any subsidiaries or joint ventures where AB InBev has a majority interest or management control. [Global Human Rights Policy, 12/2016: ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Human Rights Policy says "AB InBev prohibits all forms of physical, verbal, and written harassment, and will not engage in corporal punishment or take disciplinary-related deductions from workers' pay". [Global Human Rights Policy, 12/2016: ab-inbev.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	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: Engages with affected stakeholders: No evidence that AB InBev has meaningfully engaged with affected stakeholders. • Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders: No publicly available evidence that AB InBev has encouraged linked businesses to engage with affected stakeholders. • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: No publicly available evidence that AB InBev has provided remedy to affected stakeholders. • Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: No publicly available evidence that AB InBev has improved systems. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims: No publicly available evidence that AB InBev has provided remedy to the victims, nor that the remedy provided is satisfactory. • Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders: No publicly available evidence that AB InBev has improved its systems or engaged with affect stakeholders.

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