

Company Name BP
Industry Extractives
UNGP Core Score (*) 21.5 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
2	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
2	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence		
Embedding respect		
1.5	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
2	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)
2	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
2	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
1.5	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
1.5	2	C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned
21.5	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 code of conduct states 'We seek to conduct our business in a manner that respects the human rights and dignity of people'. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com] • Met: International Bill of Rights: The Company indicates that 'We respect internationally recognized human rights as set out in the International Bill of Human Rights'. [2019 - Business and human rights policy, 05/2020: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: UNGPs: The Company indicates that 'We recognize our responsibility to respect human rights and avoid complicity in human rights abuses, as stated in the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) and reiterated in the human rights chapter of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises'. It also states that 'We will meet our responsibility to respect human rights by implementing the UNGPs and incorporating these principles into the internal processes, policies or guidance that support our business activities'. [2019 - Business and human rights policy, 05/2020: bp.com] • Not met: OECD: See above.
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"> • Met: ILO Core: The Company indicates that 'We respect internationally recognized human rights as set out in (...) the core labour standards recognized by the International Labour Organization (ILO), as set out in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. [2019 - Business and human rights policy, 05/2020: bp.com] • Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs: The Company indicates, in its Labour Rights & Modern Slavery Principles, that 'our expectation is that workers in our operations, joint ventures and supply chains are not subject to abusive or inhumane practices, such as child labour, forced labour, trafficking, slavery or servitude, discrimination, or harassment'. Also, Freedom of Association is one of the principles intended to assist its businesses: 'In conformance with local law, where workers choose to be represented by trade unions or works councils, employers will cooperate in good faith with the bodies that the employees collectively choose to represent them'. Commitment to freedom of association is indicated to be 'in conformance with local laws', no details found on alternatives for those countries where there are legal restrictions to the exercise of these rights. No mention of respecting the right of collective bargaining found. No further evidence found on its Supplier expectations webpage. [Labour rights and modern slavery principles 2019, 2019: https://bp.com & Supplier expectations, N/A: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company indicates that 'Consistent with our commitment to respect ILO core labour standards, we respect freedom of association and collective bargaining. We support the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour, the effective abolition of child labour and the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation'. It also indicates that 'in situations where freedom of association restricted or prohibited by law, we will be open to and supportive of alternative means of worker representation engagement'. [2019 - Business and human rights policy, 05/2020: bp.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company Code of Conduct covers health and safety requirements. This includes expectations to comply with HSSE requirements. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: H&S applies to EX BPs: The Company Code of Conduct covers health and safety requirements. This includes expectations to comply with HSSE requirements. The Code of Conduct applies to joint ventures and third parties - the Company also states 'we expect and encourage all our contractors and their employees to act in a way that is consistent with our code. The Company also states on their website 'Our standard model contracts include health, safety and security requirements. through bridging documents, we define how our safety management system co-exists with those of our contractors to manage risk on a site. And for our contractors facing the most serious risks, we conduct quality, technical, health, safety and security audits before awarding contracts.' [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.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: Regular stakeholder engagement: On its website Community Engagement, the Company indicates that 'We engage with local people and their representative bodies, listening to their concerns and learning from them. (...) Our social engagement strategies respect local circumstances and the needs of communities at different stages of the project lifecycle. We engage through our community liaison officers (CLOs), who play a key role in building trust at a local level. (...) We engage with local communities from the early stages of projects and as an ongoing process, always respecting local legislation and culture'. Also, on its website 'All Rights Preserved', the Company indicates that 'In Mauritania and Senegal, the local team has consulted with local communities near our Tortue project to try to understand their needs and the impact of our activities'. [Community engagement, N/A: bp.com & All rights preserved, 11/06/2020: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: The Company indicates that 'We will continue to take a constructive and progressive role in human rights-related multi-stakeholder initiatives and believe that multi-stakeholder efforts are an effective means of promoting reasonable standards for human rights practices at an operational level'. However, it is not clear the Company commits it to engaging with affected stakeholders and their legitimate representatives in the development or monitoring of its human rights approach. [2019 - Business and human rights policy, 05/2020: bp.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: Regarding its updated Business and Human Rights Policy, the Company indicates that it 'In carrying out this update, we spoke with a wide range of external organizations including NGOs, academics and investors, to understand their expectations of us'. Moreover, on its website, the Company states that 'We also participate in a number of global collaborative initiatives in support of human rights. Our participation in these initiatives helps us engage with stakeholders across society to better understand emerging issues and improve how we manage potential human rights impacts at an operational level'. Some of these human rights-related initiatives include The Fair Labour Alliance (FLA), The Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, The UN Global Compact (UNG), Business for Social Responsibility (BSR), among others. However, it is not clear that the Company regularly engages with affected stakeholders and their legitimate representatives in the development or monitoring of its human rights approach. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: bp.com & Human rights, N/A: bp.com]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	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 remedy: The Company indicates that 'Where bp identifies that we have caused or contributed to adverse impacts on the human rights of others, we provide for or co-operate in the remediation of the adverse impacts through legitimate processes intended to deliver effective remedy while not preventing access to other forms of remedy if justified'. [2019 - Business and human rights policy, 05/2020: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives: In its Sustainability Report 2018 additional information on Human Rights, the Company indicates: 'If we do cause, or contribute to, adverse impacts on the human rights of communities near our operations, we are committed to providing for, or co-operating in, the remediation of those impacts. This may include, for example, co-operating in good faith in the provision of remedy through state-led mechanisms, such as Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development national contact points'. [Human Rights - additional information, Apr 2019: bp.com] • Met: Work with EX BPs to remedy impacts: The Company indicates that 'Where adverse impacts are directly linked to our activities through our business

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			relationships, we will support our business partners in the remediation of those impacts through their own grievance management processes, or support collaboration to provide for non-judicial remediation through third parties'. [2019 - Business and human rights policy, 05/2020: bp.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	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: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. The Company is committed to ILO Declaration • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company indicates in its Business and Human Rights Policy that 'At the executive management level, the group operations risk committee reviews progress on human rights implementation'. [2019 - Business and human rights policy, 05/2020: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: The Company indicates that 'Our human rights working group, which is made up of representatives from across the business, considers current and emerging human rights risks of potential group significance. The group reviews existing and proposed management of such risks and escalates identified human rights risks to executive team level as necessary. Business functions and local operations are responsible for implementing actions to help us meet our human rights policy commitments and relevant group requirements, such as providing channels for local communities to raise concerns'. [2019 - BP Sustainability Report, 27/03/2020: bp.com] • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	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: Identifying risks in own operations: In the 2018 report, the Company indicates: 'We are developing a more systematic approach to managing the risk of modern slavery and other labour rights issues by building it into our management systems, processes and procedures. Some of our business activities and parts of our supply chain may pose a higher risk of labour rights and modern slavery issues than others. Since 2016 we have been taking a risk-based approach to monitoring our contractors and suppliers by considering: Countries that pose a high degree of risk, as identified by risk analytics firm Verisk Maplecroft and other data sources; Activities that rely on manual labour, such as construction, catering, cleaning and certain types of manufacturing; Factors related to the vulnerability of the workforce, such as poverty levels, ethnic, religious or gender minorities and migrant workers'. In 2017 report, the Company indicated that 'focus areas include the recruitment, working and living conditions of contracted workforces at our sites, responsible security, community grievance mechanisms and channels for workforces to raise their concerns. We launched guidance on assessing socio-economic factors, including human rights aspects such as resettlement and modern slavery, as part of our group risk process in 2017. The Company prioritised 17 business for modern slavery risk reviews in 2017. [Human Rights - additional information, Apr 2019: bp.com & Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] • Met: identifying risks in EX business partners: The Company discloses how it identifies contractors Modern Slavery Risks . There is also an example of the Company working together with a joint venture in Oman to identify and assess labour rights risks. [Human Rights - additional information, Apr 2019: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: See above. In addition, the Company also states that in preparing their sustainability report (which covers human rights) the Company met with around 100 different organisations, to hear what issues matter most to their stakeholders. The Company states that they included issues in the sustainability report if they were highlighted as high importance in terms of business impact and stakeholder concern, the company then discusses how human rights was highlighted as a material issues in 2017, and in particular worker welfare, the rights of people in communities, and security and human rights. The Company then breaks down these issues and our they addressed them. In 2017 it prioritised 17 businesses to evaluate modern slavery risks. [Human Rights - additional information, Apr 2019: bp.com & Our Stakeholders and Issues, 06/06/2018]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: Furthermore the Company indicates: 'Using this approach, we have been reviewing the risk of modern slavery at selected businesses, including mapping supply chains to identify high-risk contractors. This initial screening has led to further due diligence through questionnaires or on-site labour rights assessments, including worker interviews.' [Human Rights - additional information, Apr 2019: bp.com] • Met: In consultation with HR experts: The Company utilises Verisk Maplecroft analytic data. The Company also uses third party experts, such as Verité, for their labour rights audits. The Company states in its Human Rights additional information 2017: 'We conduct labour rights audits or assessments when appropriate. Focus areas tend to be working hours, recruitment processes, freedom of movement, employment contracts and channels for workers to raise complaints.' [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com & Human Rights - additional information, Apr 2019: bp.com] • Met: Triggered by new circumstances: The Company indicates: ' Since 2016 we have been taking a risk-based approach to monitoring our contractors and suppliers by considering: Countries that pose a high degree of risk, as identified by risk analytics firm Verisk Maplecroft and other data sources; Activities that rely on manual labour, such as construction, catering, cleaning and certain types of manufacturing; Factors related to the vulnerability of the workforce, such as poverty levels, ethnic, religious or gender minorities and migrant workers.' [Human Rights - additional information, Apr 2019: bp.com] • Met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): The Company includes human rights in impact assessment requirements for certain projects. The Company states that they screen their 'major projects to identify and manage any potential impacts, including human rights....These findings inform our impact assessments and the mitigation measures we put in place during project design, construction and operations.' [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com]
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"> • Met: Salient risk assessment (and context): In its Human Rights -additional information document, the Company states: 'We are developing a more systematic approach to managing the risk of modern slavery and other labour rights issues by building it into our management systems, processes and procedures. Some of our business activities and parts of our supply chain may pose a higher risk of labour rights and modern slavery issues than others. Since 2016 we have been taking a risk-based approach to monitoring our contractors and suppliers by considering: Countries that pose a high degree of risk, as identified by risk analytics firm Verisk Maplecroft and other data sources; Activities that rely on manual labour, such as construction, catering, cleaning and certain types of manufacturing; Factors related to the vulnerability of the workforce, such as poverty levels, ethnic, religious or gender minorities and migrant workers. Using this approach, we have been reviewing the risk of modern slavery at selected businesses, including mapping supply chains to identify high-risk contractors. This initial screening has led to further due diligence through questionnaires or on-site labour rights assessments, including worker interviews. In 2018 18 businesses were under review. The assessments focus on key warning signs, such as passport retention, recruitment or other fees, wage deductions, employment contracts, working hours, shift patterns and living conditions.' In addition, the Company highlights that their material human rights risks in 2017, as identified by their stakeholders, include worker welfare, rights of people in communities and security and human rights. The Company states that subject matter experts from across BP complete the initial prioritization of these issues. [Human Rights - additional information, Apr 2019: bp.com & Our Stakeholders and Issues, 06/06/2018] • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company discloses the risk assessments that came from members of the board field visits to BP operations. This includes information with regards to the hiring of contractors and health and safety. The Company also publishes case study's regarding risk-assessments of operations. For example, the Company publishes a case study of 'assessing the risk of modern slavery at our UK retail stations'. The review included 19 contractor companies who provide construction, maintenance and facilities management services. [Assessing the risk of modern slavery at our UK retail stations, 06/06/2018] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	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: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company highlights that their material human rights risks in 2017, as identified by their stakeholders, include worker welfare, rights of people in communities and security and human rights. The Company states that subject matter experts from across BP complete the initial prioritization of these issues. The company then has addressed these three core human rights issues with how they have addressed these issues. This has been validated by Ernst and Young and the Company's sustainability committee. [Our Stakeholders and Issues, 06/06/2018] • Met: Including amongst EX BPs [Human Rights - additional information, Apr 2019: bp.com] • Met: Example of Actions decided: In its latest Human rights-additional information document, the Company discloses information about the independent assessments of labour conditions in its contractor workforce in Oman, where it works with contractors that employ migrant workers: 'The assessments, which included terms of recruitment and employment, identified issues related to working practices, passport retention, recruitment fees and worker grievance mechanisms. Since the initial assessments three years ago, we've made significant progress by working with our contractors to: Develop action plans to reduce the risk of modern slavery on site and in their supply chains; Put in place policies that prohibit forced labour, including specifically requiring employers to pay recruitment fees and preventing restriction on workers' freedom of movement; Improve how we communicate our expectations on labour rights to our contractors, including hosting management forums to raise awareness and share good practices.' [Human Rights - additional information, Apr 2019: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	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: System to check if Actions are effective: The Company indicates, in its 2019 Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, that 'we are developing a measurement framework to help us assess, through the use of key performance indicators (KPIs), the quality and effectiveness of the actions we are taking to manage labour rights risks – including modern slavery – and to track the completion of corrective or remedial actions. In 2019, we developed draft internal KPIs and tested them with priority bp businesses. Once these are finalized and adopted by our priority businesses, we expect them to help us to start measuring more effectively our progress in identifying, managing and remediating labour rights and modern slavery risks'. [2019 Slavery and human trafficking statement, 06/2020: bp.com] • Met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness: The Company indicates, on its Labour Rights webpage, that 'In our 2018 report, we highlighted concerns related to workforce welfare and labour rights standards that were identified through onsite assessments undertaken as part of our risk-prioritized modern slavery risk management. We used the learnings from the 2018 assessments to inform the development of a more systematic approach to managing labour rights and modern slavery risk. In 2019 we developed and issued the bp labour rights and modern slavery principles, which have been approved by our group operating and risk committee. New requirements and guidance on identifying and managing labour rights and modern slavery risks have been introduced into our operating management system to support conformance to the principles'. Moreover, in its 2019 Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, the Company states that 'We continue to learn from our risk assessments and our engagement with our business partners (...). Many of the key warning signs that our assessments address, such as recruitment or other fees, wage deductions and lack of freedom of movement, are symptomatic of systemic challenges in the countries where we work – such as, widespread outsourcing of recruitment. Other issues, including resource constraints and low levels of contractor or supplier resource and capability to prevent and remedy issues, are common to a number of countries and supply chains. Where systemic and supply chain management issues coincide – for example in respect of the reimbursement of recruitment fees paid by workers to secure employment, where there are multiple layers of sub-contracting – they can present particular difficulties. Our experience of remedying issues we have identified through our risk assessments demonstrates that many will require sustained and collaborative efforts to resolve, including helping contractors and suppliers to develop their capability and business processes and systems'. [2019 Slavery and human trafficking statement, 06/2020: bp.com & Labour Rights, N/A: bp.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • Met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Comms plan re identifying risks: See indicator B.2.1 • Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See indicator B.2.2 • Met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: See indicator B.2.3 • Met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans: See indicator B.2.4 • Met: Including EX business partners: See indicator B.21 to B.2.4 Score 2 • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns: The Company indicates that 'Most of the communities surrounding Tangguh LNG rely on fishing, so we engage with fishermen and local authorities to minimize disturbances to their fishing grounds. From 2018 to 2019 Tangguh also purchased local produce and fish worth \$2.1 million from the local community for catering in its operations'. Moreover, 'In Azerbaijan, throughout the Shah Deniz 2and South Caucasus Pipeline Expansion (SCPX) projects and subsequently in the operations phase, we've worked closely with the communities affected by our activities, engaging with them to communicate and explain the processes we use to manage community concerns and social risks. This and the completion of project activities in mid-2018 has resulted in a significant decrease in the number of SCPX community complaints, from 47 in 2018 to 25 in 2019. All complaints have been addressed and closed'. However, it is not clear how it has responded to specific human rights concerns raised by, or on behalf of, affected stakeholders. [2019 - BP Sustainability Report, 27/03/2020: bp.com] • Met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications: The Company indicates that 'In many cases our community engagement and grievance management mechanisms are open to stakeholder monitoring, such as project leaders' consultant reports and site visits. In addition, information on our social performance is widely shared with the relevant communities, as well as local and international NGOs'. Also, 'We engage through our community liaison officers (CLOs), who play a key role in building trust at a local level'. [2019 - BP Sustainability Report, 27/03/2020: bp.com]

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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company's code of conduct refers to 'Open Talk', which it describes as 'BP's global helpline, is a confidential way to get answers to your questions and to raise concerns. It is administered by an independent company, is available every day of the week at any time, day or night, and can accommodate calls in more than 75 languages. You can contact Open Talk anonymously from most locations'. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com] Score 2 • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company does disclose in 2017, in its Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, that the company did not receive any third party complaints about any incidents related to excessive use of force. Moreover, in its 2019 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates that 'In Azerbaijan, throughout the Shah Deniz 2and South Caucasus Pipeline Expansion (SCPX) projects and subsequently in the operations phase, we've worked closely with the communities affected by our activities, engaging with them to communicate and explain the processes we use to manage community concerns and social risks. This and the completion of project activities in mid-2018 has resulted in a significant decrease in the number of SCPX community complaints, from 47 in 2018 to 25 in 2019. All complaints have been addressed and closed'. However, no data about the practical operation of the channel(s)/mechanism(s), including the total number of grievances about human rights issues filed, and addressed or resolved for the entire Company. [Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2017: bp.com & 2019 - BP Sustainability Report, 27/03/2020: bp.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The Company publishes their code of conduct in 23 languages. Complaints against the code of conduct can be made through the Open Talk grievance mechanism. The Company publishes a list of local numbers, and a 'collect call' number which will accept calls without any charges to the caller. The Code of conduct states that Open talk 'is administered by an independent company, is available every day of the week at any time, day or night, and can accommodate calls in more than 75 languages.' [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com] • Met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system: The Company indicates, in its document 'BP's expectations of its suppliers' that suppliers 'Provide a workplace which: (...) Has mechanisms to allow workers to speak up or raise grievances without fear of retaliation'. 'Suppliers' include contractors, service providers, suppliers and other contingent labour. [Supplier expectations, 2017: bp.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: The Community can access Open Talk, BPs independently operated grievance mechanism. In addition to having Open Talk, the Company requires each of their operating sites to document how they manage community complaints. The Company has clarified to CHRB 'Yes: any employee, contractor or other third party can contact BP's confidential helpline, OpenTalk. This includes complaints from communities in relation to impacts associated with activities of BP's extractive business partners, where BP is not the operator'. Furthermore, in its 2019 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates that 'We have operational-level community grievance mechanisms in place to capture feedback, including complaints. This can come through direct engagement with BP employees, especially community liaison officers, and by email or telephone'. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com & Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: The grievance mechanism Open Talk can accommodate calls in 'more than 75 languages.' The grievance mechanism is independently operated, and can be accessed anonymously. Furthermore, there is the option of a 'collect call' number which will accept calls without any charges to the complainant. Furthermore, the Company OMS requires that BP entities establish and implement a process to receive communications from key communities and stakeholders, respond to their concerns, identify and manage impacts and record and act on their external commitments. No new relevant evidence in latest report. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com & Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] • Met: EX BPs communities use global system: The Company states that they 'encourage employees, contractors, communities and other third parties to speak up if they see something they think could be unsafe or unethical...anyone can ask questions and raise concerns anonymously in Open Talk.' The Company OMS requires that BP entities establish and implement a process to receive communications from key communities and stakeholders, respond to their concerns, identify and manage impacts and record and act on their external commitments. Community members can make grievances related to operated joint venture BP operations. No new relevant evidence found in latest report. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com]
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	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: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Company states 'If we do cause, or contribute to, adverse impacts on the human rights of communities near our operations, we are committed to providing for, or co-operating in, making it right.' The Company then describes case study examples of how they have negotiated grievances with communities. For example, in Trinidad & Tobago, the Company conducted seismic surveys to develop the Juniper gas field which affected people working in the local fishing industry as it meant they could not work in the area for safety reasons. Following consultations with fishing associations and communities, we made payments for temporary loss of livelihood to those affected.' [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Changes introduced to stop repetition: The Company indicates that 'We used the learnings from the 2018 assessments to inform the development of a more systematic approach to managing labour rights and modern slavery risk'. Also, 'In 2019 we continued working with our contractors and suppliers in response to the labour rights issues and modern slavery indicators identified during modern

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			slavery risk reviews in previous years. (...) At Oman's Khazzan and Ghazeer fields, systematic monitoring processes have been put in place, including pre-deployment checks and site walkovers and worker surveys. The number of workers charged recruitment fees in the last two years when mobilized to the site has been significantly reduced. In addition, a contractor self-verification process to assess conformance with BP Oman's worker welfare and human rights policy has been put in place and is regularly reviewed by BP'. [2019 - BP Sustainability Report, 27/03/2020: bp.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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