

## Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2020 Company Scoresheet

**Company Name** Archer Daniels Midland (ADM)  
**Industry** Agricultural Products (Supply Chain and Own Operations)  
**UNGP Core Score (\*)** 10.5 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
<b>Governance and Policy Commitments</b>		
1	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
2	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
0	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
0	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
<b>Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence</b>		
Embedding respect		
0	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
0.5	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
2	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
<b>Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms</b>		
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
<b>10.5</b>	<b>26</b>	

(\*) 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"> <li>Met: General HRs commitment: The Company explains on the website that 'we have a responsibility to respect human rights' and in their HR policy document it indicates that 'ADM colleagues are united through six values that demonstrate our insistence on achieving the right results, the right way: integrity, respect, excellence, resourcefulness, teamwork and responsibility. ADM's commitment to human rights embodies and reflects these company values, and specifically respect.' [Human rights policy, 15/09/2017: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: UNGPs: Its policy reads: 'This policy is based on company values and these external publications: [...] UN Guiding Principles.' However, 'to be based on' is not consider a formal commitment statement according CHRB wording criteria. [Human rights policy, 15/09/2017: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>Not met: OECD</li> </ul>
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"> <li>Met: UNGC principles 3-6: In its 2016 sustainability report, the CEO letter mentions that they are proud to be "participant in the UN Global Compact and remain committed to its Ten Principles, which are focused on upholding responsibilities in the areas of human rights. [Corporate sustainability report, 2016: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Corporate sustainability report 2018, 2019: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>Met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers: The supplier expectations document contains a explicit commitment to each ILO core area for suppliers, including freedom of association and collective bargaining, where the Company indicates: 'We expect suppliers to respect freedom of association and collective bargaining, [...]' In addition, in its Human rights policy the Company states the standards to be upheld and that will work to develop and strengthen relationships with contractors and suppliers who do so, which includes: Never use child labor, forced labor or bonded labor, do not discriminate in employment-related decisions, respect workers' rights, including freedom of association and collective bargaining. [Supplier expectation, 09/05/2018: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Human rights policy, 15/09/2017: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: HR policies explicitly mention all ILO core including: 'Respect workers' rights, including freedom of association and collective bargaining'. [Human rights policy, 15/09/2017: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>Met: Respect H&amp;S of workers: The Policy also refers to health and safety standard: 'Maintain systems and procedures designed to keep workers safe and protect them from occupational hazards, harassment and abuse.' [Human rights policy, 15/09/2017: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>Met: H&amp;S applies to AG suppliers: The Company states that 'expect suppliers to promote the health and safety of all parties'. [Supplier expectation, 09/05/2018: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul>
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	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"> <li>Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company commits to stakeholder engagement in the context of supply chains: 'work collaboratively with stakeholders to improve working, environmental and safety conditions in agricultural supply chains', and: 'ADM is committed to lowering sourcing risks in our supply chains'. Also, has a specific grievance mechanism for external stakeholders. However, no evidence found of a general commitment to engage with affected stakeholders (workers, their families, local communities, etc.)</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>including also its own operations. [Sustainability Progress tracker, 2020: <a href="#">adm.com</a> &amp; Human rights policy, 15/09/2017: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company discloses in its CSR report that 'In 2017, ADM engaged Deloitte Advisory to undertake a formal materiality assessment to help inform our Corporate Sustainability Report. We asked Deloitte to apply its knowledge of the GRI methodology and our industry to select stakeholders for engagement. Working with ADM, Deloitte included and surveyed a variety of internal and external stakeholders and conducted secondary research that included a review of documents published by a variety of parties. The process revealed that several key topics were consistent across all stakeholder groups, with deforestation, human rights, and our environmental footprint criteria among the primary concerns raised. We intend to conduct another formal materiality assessment at the end of 2020 to ensure that we maintain a comprehensive and long-term focus on our sustainability efforts. In the meantime, we have ongoing stakeholder engagement via customer feedback, NGO inquiries, and dialogue with shareholders.' However, no evidence found about direct engagement regarding the actual relevant issues identified during the materiality assessment. [Corporate Sustainability Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: The Company has a grievance mechanism specifically for external stakeholders in relation to human rights and deforestation; however this is a passive mechanism. [Grievances and Resolutions - Protocol, N/A: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: Although the Company discloses a log of the cases reported by external stakeholders through the Grievance mechanism, and it invites stakeholders who have concerns related to the implementation of its policies through a message on its website, no evidence found of regularly engagement with affected stakeholders and legitimate representatives in the development or monitoring of the policy approach, as this seems a passive mechanism. [Grievances and resolutions log, 21/01/20: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Grievance and Resolutions, N/A: <a href="#">adm.com</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Commits to remedy: Although the Company provides some examples of social initiatives in communities, such as the case of assessment of vanilla supply chain and the access to water for communities in Peru and India, there is no statement of a commitment to remedy the adverse impacts on individuals, workers and communities that it has caused or contributed to. [Corporate Sustainability Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies</li> <li>• Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives</li> <li>• Not met: Work with AG suppliers to remedy impacts: Although through the Issues and resolutions protocol (grievance mechanism for external stakeholders related to human rights issues connected to the Company or its supply chain) the Company works with the supply chain, it is not clear if it is committed to work with suppliers to remedy adverse impacts through the suppliers own mechanisms or through the development of third party non-judicial remedies. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 09/05/2018: <a href="#">s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com</a>]</li> </ul>

## 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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. The Company is signatory to the UN Global Compact.</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company indicates that 'sustainability efforts are led by our Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO). The CSO is supported by a Sustainability Council made up of senior management and company officers representing our strategy, law, human resources, technology and operations teams. Regular reports on implementation efforts and progress are given to the Board of Directors'. In its CSR report 2019, the Company describes that the CSO is responsible for lead ADM's sustainability efforts, reports metrics quarterly to ADM Board of Directors, meets quarterly with ADM Board of Directors' Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility Committee and report regularly to ADM leadership. However, no further evidence found to confirm that 'Sustainability' covers human rights issues. [Corporate sustainability report 2018, 2019: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Corporate Sustainability Report 2019, 2020: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility: In addition to the corporate group mentioned above, the Company states that 'we have regional teams in North America, South America and EMEA supporting sustainability initiatives and implementation on the ground.' In addition, the Company discloses in its CSR Report 2019 that the regional teams support business units to drive transformation and help create value across the supply chain, support sustainability initiatives and implementation on the ground, Engage and interact with stakeholders located in North America, South America and EMEA.</li> <li>• However, as mentioned above, it is not clear whether these teams deal also with human rights-related issues. [Corporate sustainability report 2018, 2019: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Corporate Sustainability Report 2019, 2020: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for AG in supply chain</li> </ul>
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	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"> <li>• Not met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company indicates in its CSR report that 'For the past two years, ADM has worked with ELEVATE to support its Human Rights Action Plan to conduct a supply chain risk analysis. ELEVATE initially took a two-phased approach to segment ADM's complex and expansive supply chain to gain deeper insight into inherent risks and challenges with sourcing based on country and commodity. In the third phase, the analytical scope was expanded to include the vanilla bean supply chain after acquisition of Rodelle. This partnership supported our ability to prioritize resources based on risk and leverage. The results of the analysis allowed us to refine our responsible sourcing program and utilize new tools to direct investment where ADM can have the biggest impact for risk management and supplier improvement'. However, no evidence found describing how the Company identifies risks in its own operations, as evidence seems to refer only in the supply chain. [Corporate Sustainability Report 2019, 2020: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers: In its 2019 Progress Report on Human Rights Policy Implementation, the Company reports: 'ADM worked with ELEVATE to support its Human Rights Action Plan to conduct a supply chain risk analysis in 2018-2019. ELEVATE initially took a two-phased approach to segment ADM's complex and expansive supply chain. In the third phase, the analytical scope was expanded to include the vanilla bean supply chain after acquisition of Rodelle. This partnership supported our ability to gain deeper insight into inherent risks and challenges with sourcing based on country and commodity.' In addition, in its Modern Slavery Statement, the Company states: 'ADM engaged ELEVATE to conduct a supplier risk assessment of human rights compliance in our supply chain. The analysis mapped the supply chain for key commodities based on inherent sourcing risks and business leverage insights to determine which segments have the highest risk profiles and which provide the greatest opportunity for ADM to influence positive change. Assessment consists of two phases: Macro (country and commodity) level risks – this phase was designed to identify high-risk and high-leverage suppliers to assess in phase two. From a pool of over 300,000 suppliers, 15 commodities (based on procurement spend and stakeholder concern) sourced from more than 100 countries were assessed at a macro level. Micro (site/farm) level risks– using the results from phase one, ELEVATE is assessing eight commodities (corn, soy, wheat, palm, apples, macadamias, peanuts and pecans) in 20 countries from 1,132 suppliers'. [Human Rights Policy Implementation - Progress Report 2019, 2019: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Modern Slavery Statement 2018, 28/03/2019: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Ongoing global risk identification: The Company started a 6 phase process. The first two were reported completed in the first half of 2016, including analysing global human rights issues and identification of high risk geographies, and analysing the supply chain, identifying priority geographies, activities and facilities with respect to issues and risks. According to its latest Progress Report 2019 the Company keeps working on its human right risk assessment: 'After completing a macro-level supply chain risk assessment, ELEVATE worked with ADM to conduct an in-depth supplier analysis. This second part of the assessment focused on specific commodities. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: <a href="http://adm.com">adm.com</a> &amp; Human Rights Policy Implementation - Progress Report 2019, 2019: <a href="http://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with HR experts: The Company discloses that hires a not-for-profit organization dedicated to driving improvements in responsible and ethical business practices – including labor standards – in global supply chains in order to make a self assessment questionnaire and periodically host and complete 3rd-party SEDEX audits. The human rights portion of these audits includes assessments of facility conditions, child labor, forced/bonded labor, eligibility for employment, ethical recruitment, safety, discrimination, harassment and abuse, compensation, freedom of association and collective bargaining, and indigenous populations and communities. However, this indicator looks for evidence of human rights expert consultation as part of the due diligence carried out to identify potential human rights risks and impacts. [Statement on the California Transparency in Supply Chains Act and UK Modern Slavery Act 2019, 23/03/2020: <a href="http://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Triggered by new circumstances: The Company explains how its human rights assessment was expanded when a new business was acquired: 'In the third phase, the analytical scope was expanded to include the vanilla bean supply chain after acquisition of Rodelle [...]. The results of the analysis allowed us to consider a new tool selection strategy for a responsible sourcing program that would direct investment where ADM can have the biggest impact'. [Human Rights Policy Implementation - Progress Report 2019, 2019: <a href="http://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)</li> </ul>
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	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"> <li>• Met: Salient risk assessment (and context): As indicated in the previous indicator, the Company conducted a supply chain risk assessment of human rights in two phases: 'Macro (country and commodity) level risks – this phase was designed to identify high-risk and high-leverage suppliers to assess in phase two. From a pool of over 300,000 suppliers, 15 commodities (based on procurement spend and stakeholder concern) sourced from more than 100 countries were assessed at a macro level. Micro (site/farm) level risks– using the results from phase one, ELEVATE is assessing eight commodities (corn, soy, wheat, palm, apples, macadamias, peanuts and pecans) in 20 countries from 1,132 suppliers'. Analysis of the vanilla supply chain resulted in suppliers' scores being categorized into four quadrants based on inherent risks in the country-commodity combination and the leverage ADM has based on factors such as procurement volume and spend. Based on the sourcing geography vanilla suppliers are considered high or extreme risk. Based on ADM's relative leverage, vanilla suppliers are considered high leverage. ELEVATE recommended focus on the highest risk and highest leverage segment for risk management and mitigation. In 2020, ADM is committed to focusing first on these suppliers, particularly with regards to developing vanilla-specific sourcing policies and piloting supplier visibility and monitoring programs.' [Modern Slavery Statement 2018, 28/03/2019: <a href="http://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Human Rights Policy Implementation - Progress Report 2019, 2019: <a href="http://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company used the United Nations Human Development Index to prioritise countries at risk for human rights abuses. Particularly, it indicates in its CSR 2018 that 'agricultural production, particularly in countries with lower HDI values, has a higher risk of using slave and child labor, not paying living wages, having unsafe working conditions and violating additional rights. These practices threaten the development and livelihood of local communities'. [Corporate sustainability report, 2016: <a href="http://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Corporate sustainability report 2018, 2019: <a href="http://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	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"> <li>• Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material (and not supported by public sources).</li> <li>• Not met: Including in AG supply chain: Although examples refer to the supply chain, it is not clear that the Company has a comprehensive system to take action about salient human rights issues globally. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: <a href="#">adm.com</a> &amp; Human rights progress report H2 2017, 2018: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Example of Actions decided: The Company provides examples of actions taken at specific places following the implementation plan of its policy. It includes workshops with suppliers in Sabah, Malaysia, to protect children from child labour, in which attendees were informed of the risks related to children in plantation work and possible strategies to reduce the participation of children, including how to strengthen access to education, and an agreement in Brazil with a monitoring service to ensure suppliers in Brazil are not part of the Slave Labor List issues by the Brazilian Ministry of Labor. [Human rights progress report H2 2017, 2018: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	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"> <li>• Not met: System to check if Actions are effective: The Company discloses that 'hosted audits at 13 locations spanning the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Poland, and Turkey. At the facilities visited, there were no fees charged to job-seekers in exchange for employment, and no collateral was taken in the form of money, identification or other personal belongings without workers' consent as a condition of employment by ADM or contracted companies'. However, no details found regarding a system for tracking the actions taken in response to human rights risks and impacts assessed and for evaluating whether the actions have been effective. [Corporate Sustainability Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	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"> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company needs to achieve at least 1,5 points in B.2.1</li> <li>• Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See indicator B.2.2 [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: <a href="#">adm.com</a> &amp; Corporate sustainability report 2018, 2019: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns: The Company has a procedure to handle issues and resolutions for concerns raised by 'any external parties, including individuals, government organizations and non-governmental organizations, regarding the implementation of and compliance with our Commitment to No Deforestation and our Human Rights Policy'. It discloses a document with the log of the cases reported, including date received, topic (deforestation and/or human rights), subject matter, stakeholders involved and the progress made/status of the grievance. [Grievances and resolutions log, 21/01/20: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Grievances and Resolutions - Protocol, N/A: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications: Although the Company has a public record of cases on its website including a summary of the status/progress, it's not clear how it progress is communicated to stakeholders in the field. [Grievances and resolutions log, 21/01/20: <a href="#">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul>



## 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"> <li>• Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Code of conduct describes different channels for communicating grievances and raise concerns for employees, including local resources, appropriate representatives, the Compliance and the ADM Helpline. The helpline is operated by a third party and is available worldwide on the website and it provides a list of phone numbers and online reporting. For employees in EU countries, the helpline is only available for reporting financial and corruption issues. If the report comes from these countries, and the employee wishes to report other type of matters, then the contact point is the regional compliance team, the human resources, or the legal department. In addition, the Company discloses on its website the contact of the VP of compliance. [Code of Conduct, 02/2017: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company reports every year a document with data about the practical operation of the grievance mechanism, including allegations of violations of commitment to No Deforestation or Human Rights Policy. This document informs if the issue is filed, addressed or resolved and last update. Also, the Company discloses that 'In 2019, there were two allegations of human rights violations in our palm supply chain in relation to indirect suppliers. Each was investigated and addressed in accordance with our protocol, and the outcomes were published in our log'. However, evidence seems to refer to external complaints. No evidence found of the number of human right related complaints filed and addressed or resolved including Company's employees. [Statement on the California Transparency in Supply Chains Act and UK Modern Slavery Act 2019, 23/03/2020: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Grievances and resolutions, 03/06/20: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: Although the Helpline is available in more than 20 languages, in the European Union, employees can't use this line and need to contact regional teams. It is not clear whether there are teams in every relevant EU country or employees contact points are available in all appropriate languages. [External helpline on website, 07/2018: <a href="https://admway.alertline.com">admway.alertline.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers: The supplier expectations document includes human rights. For reporting potential misconducts, the code document provides several options for suppliers, including postal mail, email, telephone, and the external helpline services which is provided through internet. [Supplier expectation, 09/05/2018: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Grievance mechanism for community: In the company's 'Grievances and Resolutions Protocol' individuals/communities can raise concerns. The document states the following: 'We welcome correspondence from any external parties, including individuals, government organizations and non-governmental organizations, regarding the implementation of and compliance with our Commitment to No-Deforestation and our Human Rights Policy.' [Grievances and Resolutions - Protocol, N/A: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: 'The ADM Way Helpline telephone service is free. It is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week to those of us located in countries that have available access codes (see the back of our Code for details). Its operators speak nearly all languages'. [Code of Conduct, 02/2017: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Expects AG supplier to have community grievance systems: Though the company does publish its allegation phone number on the supplier code, it does explicitly explain that it expects the suppliers to have the same [Supplier expectation, 09/05/2018: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: AG supplier communities use global system: The supply code mentions an address/phone number for complaints [Supplier expectation, 09/05/2018: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Company provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material/supported by publicly available sources.</li> <li>• Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition</li> <li>• Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts</li> <li>• Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism</li> </ul>

### 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"> <li>• Headline: ADM supplier Wilmar involved in alleged violations of community land rights in Indonesia</li> <li>• Area: Land rights</li> <li>• Story: Archer Daniels Midland (ADM) is a shareholder in Singapore-based Wilmar International Ltd (through Archer Daniels Midland Asia-Pacific Limited). According to ADM, Wilmar is its largest supplier of palm oil and palm kernel (providing 93% of its supply in N. America and 18% in Europe between July 2014-June 2015).</li> </ul> <p>Since 2006 the NGO Forest People Programme (FPP) has issued two reports claiming Wilmar acquired the lands of the Minangkabau communities in Pasaman Barat without respect for their customary land rights and traditional authorities and systems of land allocation. On May 20, 2015 the FPP wrote to the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) Complaints Panel, alleging that since a meeting between the community, the NGO and Wilmar, the company has failed to engage the Kapa community to resolve the dispute over use of their lands or reach an agreement on a way to recognise the Kapa land rights in Indonesia (despite reportedly agreeing to do so in the meeting). Moreover, the FPP says that PT.PHP (a Wilmar subsidiary) acquired an HGU (temporary right to cultivate) over the Kapa community lands despite the known objections of the community and their complaint to the RSPO. Moreover, the FPP raises concerns about the intimidation and attempted criminalisation of leaders of the Kapa community and urges the RSPO to raise this matter directly with the Wilmar group. In November 2019, Forest Peoples Programme published a follow-up report claiming widespread human rights violations in Wilmar's palm oil operations in West Sumatra. According to the report, 'communities reported loss of access and control of their customary lands which were taken over by the companies without their consent. Many communities also reported suffering intimidation and criminalisation after raising concerns and complaints with the companies affecting them.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources: [Financial Times - 23/08/2017: <a href="http://ft.com">ft.com</a>][RSPO website - Status of complaints - accessed 03/04/2016: <a href="http://askrspo.force.com">askrspo.force.com</a>][Forest People Programme, 2/2/2017: <a href="http://forestpeoples.org">forestpeoples.org</a>]</li> </ul>
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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"> <li>• Not met: Public response available: Wilmar reports transparently on this allegation and has engaged with the RSPO complaints panel as well as the complainants to cooperate on resolving this case. However, a response from ADM was not visible.</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Response goes into detail</li> </ul>
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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"> <li>• Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: In the HR policy, it mentions 'Respect land-tenure right and the rights of indigenous and local communities to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent to operations on lands to which they hold legal rights'. And in Article 4.2 – they expect their suppliers to do the same. [Human rights policy, 15/09/2017: <a href="http://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: See above [Human rights policy, 15/09/2017: <a href="http://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: Though the company has a policy on respecting land tenure, there is no information on how it identifies legitimate rights of tenure [Corporate Sustainability Report 2019, 2020: <a href="http://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul>



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"> <li>• Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders: Though Wilmar has engaged in the past with the community via RSPO, the FPP claim that it stopped doing so despite earlier commitments.</li> <li>• Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims</li> <li>• Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders</li> </ul>
E(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Headline: Wilmar International accused of land grabbing and pollution by local communities in Nigeria</li> <li>• Area: Land Rights/Environmental damage</li> <li>• Story: ADM owns 24.5% of Wilmar and therefore is linked to this allegation even ADM does not get palm oil from Nigeria. Nigerian communities impacted by the business activities of Wilmar have taken it to the Nigerian State House of Assembly for alleged pollution and land grabbing. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co. holds 24.5% shares in Wilmar and therefore linked to this allegation (regardless if it gets palm oil from Nigeria or not)</li> </ul> <p>The affected communities which include Mbarakom, Ekong Anaku, Ibogo, Umai, Betem, Uwet, Attan Odot Akamkpa Urban and Ayuk Aba communities among others, led by the Chairman of Forest Watch, said "the continuous land grab by the firm is likely to generate tension and pitch the government against several thousands of farmers from Wilmar impacted communities across Akamkpa, Biase, Odukpani and Akpabuyo local government areas, if there was no urgent intervention".</p> <p>The drainage channels introduced as embankment by Wilmar has not only caused lot of devastation to crops but has further disrupted and contaminated the streams in the area. Subsistence farmers in these communities have been displaced and denied access and ownership to the land and cultural heritage without compensation. Their rich biodiversity has been altered and the environment degraded particularly with the use of pesticides and chemicals fertilizers.</p> <p>The communities made a 4 point demasayaing that "Wilmar should enter fresh consultation with the communities on how to implement the mandatory CSR law of the state, and that they should be made to halt further expansion into individual, families and communities lands as well as conduct a FPIC (Free, Prior Informed Consent) before expansion commence. That the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of Wilmar be reviewed and the existing Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and other laws should be enforced and Wilmar made to comply accordingly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources: ["Business &amp; Human Rights website" - August 2018: <a href="https://business-humanrights.org/">business-humanrights.org</a>][The Guardian - 27/08/2018: <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/business/2018/aug/27/wilmar-international-land-grabbing-nigeria">guardian.ng</a>][Wilmar website: <a href="https://www.wilmar-international.com/">wilmar-international.com</a>]</li> </ul>
E(2).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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"> <li>• Not met: Public response available: Archer Daniels Midland has not publicly responded to the allegations against Wilmar International.</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Response goes into detail: Archer Daniels Midland has not publicly responded to the allegations against Wilmar International.</li> </ul>
E(2).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"> <li>• Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: Archer Daniels Midland's (ADM) Human Rights Policy dictates that it must "respect land-tenure right and the rights of indigenous and local communities to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent to operations on lands to which they hold legal rights." In addition, ADM's makes a clear commitment to meeting its environmental obligations, while pursuing ways to continually improve its efforts in both protecting the environment and enhancing environmental sustainability. Wilmar International also has a policy of respecting land tenure rights as explained in its Human Rights policy. [Human rights policy, 09/05/2018: <a href="https://www.adm.com/human-rights-policy">adm.com</a> &amp; Environmental Policy, 04/04/2013: <a href="https://www.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/...">s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: Archer Daniel Midlands' (ADM) policies apply to "to all employees, officers, directors, contract workers and agents of ADM, our divisions and our affiliates in all countries." In addition, ADM's environmental policy applies to all ADM operations, company employees, and any person or entity for which ADM has responsibility or control." [Human rights progress report H2 2017, 2018: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> &amp; Environmental Policy, 04/04/2013: <a href="https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com">s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: Archer Daniels Midland's policy specifically addresses the issue of respecting land-tenure rights and the rights of indigenous and local communities to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent to operations on lands to which they hold legal rights. Additionally, the company has committed to performing periodic evaluations to ensure that the ADM environmental programs and practices established to support these requirements are working effectively." [Human rights progress report H2 2017, 2018: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a>]</li> </ul>
E(2).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"> <li>Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders: Archer Daniels Midland does not appear to have engaged with any stakeholders and CHRB could find no evidence of Wilmar engaging with stakeholder despite having provided a detailed response.</li> <li>Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders: Archer Daniels Midland does not appear to have encouraged linked businesses to engage with any stakeholders.</li> <li>Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: Archer Daniels Midland does not appear to have provided any remedies and though Wilmar explain in their document about their CSR in the area, this does not meet CHRB's threshold</li> <li>Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: Archer Daniels Midland does not appear to have reviewed any management systems.</li> </ul> <p>There is no evidence of management review in Wilmar's response.</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims</li> <li>Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders</li> </ul>
E(3).0	Serious allegation No 3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Headline: Archer-Daniels Midland faces social allegations over its palm oil sourcing in Indonesia</li> <li>Area: Child labour/Forced labour</li> <li>Story: n November 30th 2016, Amnesty International (AI) published a report in which it accused Wilmar (in which Archer Daniels Midland (ADM) is a shareholder), as well as Wilmar's major clients including Unilever, Kellogg's, Reckitt Benckiser, Colgate-Palmolive and Nestlé of human rights violations in its palm oil supply chain processes in Indonesia. These companies are alleged to have been complicit in the use of child labour and forced labour, with workers subjected to poor working conditions. They are also accused of contributing to deforestation and the extinction of rare species in Indonesia, endangering workers' health through exposure to dangerous chemical herbicides and failing to provide safety equipment. In addition, labourers allegedly work for around 10 to 11 hours a day without adequate pay, while children allegedly work from the age of eight. Amnesty vowed to conduct a campaign to ask if the companies' products are issued from Wilmar activities in Indonesia</li> </ul> <p>Amnesty International has published an article in March 2017 claiming that it found no convincing evidence that Wilmar has addressed the issues. In addition, the organisation alleged that Wilmar has tried to intimidate staff into denying the claims.</p> <p>According to the article, in a meeting with trade union representatives in January 2017, Wilmar asked workers to sign a document which stated that the abuses outlined in Amnesty International's report were not taking place on their plantations. Wilmar reportedly resorted to such tactics following a media report that the Indonesian government would carry out a thorough investigation into the issues highlighted in the report.</p> <p>• Sources: [Forbes, 30/11/2016: <a href="https://forbes.com">forbes.com</a>][Amnesty International, 30/11/2016: <a href="https://amnesty.org">amnesty.org</a>][Amnesty International, 2016: <a href="https://amnesty.org.uk">amnesty.org.uk</a>][Amnesty International: companies response, 2016: <a href="https://amnesty.org">amnesty.org</a>]</p>
E(3).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"> <li>Met: Public response available: ADM responded to Amnesty's report in a letter to the organisation which was published by AI. In that letter the company details</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			its policy but does not specifically responds to the allegations. Wilmar responded to the Amnesty International report and it is publicly visible as an annex to the report. It has acknowledged the allegations stating "we recognize that these issues, including the ones raised in your letters, are systemic challenges shared by the industry". Regarding child labour, it refers to the issue in general in Indonesia. In its second letter to Amnesty, Wilmar reports on having started an investigation into the allegations in question. It has not responded on the issue of overtime in its response to Amnesty International. [Response to AI report, 2016: <a href="https://www.amnesty.org">amnesty.org</a> ] Score 2 • Not met: Response goes into detail
E(3).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: ADM has policies prohibits child labour and forced labour [Human rights policy, 15/09/2017: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> ] • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: This policies also applies to its suppliers [Supplier expectation, 09/05/2018: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> ] Score 2 • Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company does not have age verification process to prohibit Child labour. In addition, no evidence found of commitment to not interfering with the rights of workers. [Human rights policy, 15/09/2017: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> & Supplier expectation, 09/05/2018: <a href="https://assets.adm.com">assets.adm.com</a> ]
E(3).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders • Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders • Met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: In its response to Amnesty International, Wilmar says that 'in addition to the supplier compliance work and ART programme with our collaborative partner The Forest Trust (TFT), as well as the supply chain surveillance work by an international NGO partner on more than 40 palm oil companies at plantation, mill or group level, our grievance procedure is the other platform used to identify, address and monitor potential supply chain non-compliance'. [Response to AI report, 2016: <a href="https://www.amnesty.org">amnesty.org</a> ] Score 2 • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims • Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected 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](https://creativecommons.org)