

Company Name BRF
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
UNGP Core Score (*) 5.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
1	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
0.5	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
0	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
0	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence		
Embedding respect		
0	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
0	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.2 HRDD - Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)
0	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
0	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed
Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms		
1.5	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
5.0	26	

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

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

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

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

Detailed assessment

Governance and Policies

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: General HRs commitment: The company states that 'BRF respects, protects and fulfils the enjoyment of human rights, internationally agreed and provided for in both national and international legislation applicable to the Company and People'. [Transparency Guide, N/A: brf-global.com] • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The company is a signatory of the UNGC since 2011. Furthermore, the Company states 'In 2018, we reaffirmed our commitment to the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (ODS) and to the principles of the United Nations Global Compact, [...]' [Annual and sustainability report 2018, 31/05/2019: brf-global.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGPs: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. • Not met: OECD: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator.
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: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company indicates that "Created to encourage companies to adopt policies for corporate social responsibility and sustainability, we have been signatories to the UNGC since 2011." [Annual and sustainability report 2018, 31/05/2019: brf-global.com] • Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers: The Code of Conduct for suppliers contains statements on child labour, non-discrimination, forced labour, and freedom of association. No evidence found on respecting the right to collective bargaining, the Company indicates that suppliers shall 'assure the right of employees to be members of class associations and workers unions and to organize themselves into entities of their own choice, without retaliation, under the terms established in the applicable standards'. [Code of conduct for suppliers, 08/2018: brf-global.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company indicates it is signatory of voluntary pacts and initiatives addressing corporate social responsibility and forced or slave/child labor. Moreover, it indicates: 'We communicate openly and regularly with labor unions, federations, and other associations representing our employees across different professional categories. In 2019 we negotiated collective bargaining agreements with 76 unions throughout Brazil [...] In countries outside Brazil, we observe local legislation and, where any employee categories are represented by unions, we extend collective bargaining agreement coverage to 100% of employees. With the exception of the Middle East, where labor unions are not a part of the local culture, our employees are all represented by unions'. Regarding discrimination, it states: 'We promote diversity, fair and equitable business and a zero tolerance stance against harassment, discrimination or misconduct in all markets where we operate'. However, the indicator requires a formal statement of commitment to each ILO core area. [Integrated Report 2019, 12/05/2020: brf-global.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company states that "Through the Health, Safety, and Environment program (HSE) and its global policy, implemented in 2006, we developed and carried out actions that enable safe behavior and value life in our operations. We extend our health and safety management practices to all stakeholders, through control and/or influence actions, when appropriate." [Annual and sustainability report 2018, 31/05/2019: brf-global.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: The Code for suppliers contains requirements and guidelines on health and safety [Code of conduct for suppliers, 08/2018: brf-global.com]
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"> • Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company indicates: 'Our risk management focuses on policies and programs that demonstrate commitment towards employees and stakeholders'. Moreover, it states: 'There is a technical team directed only to the activities of the association that maintains a constant dialogue with stakeholders and leaderships of the BRF itself'. The Company also indicates engaging with local communities through volunteer work and community empowerment. However, no evidence found of a statement of policy committing it to engage with its potentially and actually affected stakeholders, including in local communities where relevant. [Annual and sustainability report 2018, 31/05/2019: brf-global.com & Integrated Report 2019, 12/05/2020: brf-global.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company indicates there are periodic meetings to align on guidelines for volunteer engagement and mobilization campaigns. However, no evidence found that the Company regularly engages with potentially and actually affected stakeholders beyond volunteering. [Integrated Report 2019, 12/05/2020: brf-global.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy: The Company indicates that 'Our global operation implies responsibilities that go beyond mitigation of the negative impacts of the operation. The purpose of our actions is to establish a long-term relationship with communities, creating a positive and inclusive agenda aimed at developing solutions that promote local development'. However, no specific statement of commitment to remedy found in public policies. Moreover, on the Company's FORM 20-F 2019, it mentions remediation or compensation for environmental damage, security incidents, including those associated with cybersecurity attacks. However, there is no evidence of commitment to remedy the adverse impacts on individuals, workers and communities that it has caused or contributed to. [Annual and sustainability report 2018, 31/05/2019: brf-global.com & Formulary 20-F – 2019, 24/04/2020: s3.amazonaws.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with AG suppliers to remedy impacts

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"> • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for AG in supply chain
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company indicates: 'Risks are assessed and classified based on their impact and likelihood of occurrence, and then compiled into a Risk Map, which is revisited annually and regularly reported to our leadership team and committees advising the Board of Directors. Our leadership team monitors risk developments on a monthly basis and takes action to reduce exposure to those risks'. However, the description does not include process to identify human rights risks and impacts in specific locations or activities, covering its own operations. [Integrated Report 2019, 12/05/2020: brf-global.com] • Not met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) [Integrated Report 2019, 12/05/2020: brf-global.com] • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company indicates 'Compliance with labor laws and occupational safety' one of its most significant risks in 2019: 'We work to build relationships with our workforce based on partnership and mutual benefits, in compliance with local laws and regulations, collective labor agreements and regulations on employee representation by and relations with labor unions. We are also exposed to risks related to the safety of our facilities. If we fail to implement safety procedures or if the procedures we implement are ineffective, our employees and others may be injured, which could result in injuries and lost productivity.' Moreover, the Company discloses how it addresses it: 'We invest in relations based on transparency with labor unions and other organizations representing our employees, and we have occupational health and safety programs in place that are designed to eliminate risks and protect the integrity of our employees'. However, no evidence of the Company's process for assessing its human rights risks and what it considers to be its salient human rights issues beyond this context of safety. [Integrated Report 2019, 12/05/2020: brf-global.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including in AG supply chain • Not met: Example of Actions decided <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including AG suppliers <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The company states that 'Complaints may be reported to the immediate superior or through the BRF Transparency Hotline, made available by BRF on the corporate intranet and website. Complaints can be reported through phone, website or email. Complaints may also be reported on an anonymous basis, as far as permitted by the local legislation of the country.' In addition, in its Annual Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'Operating in eight countries (Brazil, Chile, Japan, China, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Singapore and Turkey), available to employees, suppliers, customers and other audiences, the BRF Transparency Channel aims to raise reports and complaints of suspected situations that may violate the Company's Transparency Manual, laws or internal policies'. [Transparency Guide, N/A: brf-global.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Annual Report 2018 includes information about the number of complaints received by the Transparency Channel (2016-2018), however the channel is operative only in 8 countries. Moreover, it indicates (2019 report) that 'More than 1,700 reports were received about suspected violations of Company standards and rules. All were adequately addressed by the departments responsible for investigating them'. However, it does not include the number of grievances about human rights issues filed, addressed or resolved. [Annual and sustainability report 2018, 31/05/2019: brf-global.com & Integrated Report 2019, 12/05/2020: brf-global.com] • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The Company state that 'the BRF Transparency Hotline is available for People, as well as to business partners, contractors, customers and direct or indirect suppliers, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, every day of the year, in several languages.' [Reporting Complaints and Non-Retaliation Corporate Policy, 08/2018: brf-global.com] • Not met: Expect AG supplier to have equivalent grievance systems • Met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers: As above [Reporting Complaints and Non-Retaliation Corporate Policy, 08/2018: brf-global.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 annual report states that "In order to report any claims regarding ethical non-compliance, we have made available to our audiences (employees, suppliers, contractors, clients, business partners, and the population in general) BRF's Transparency Channel." [Annual and sustainability report 2018, 31/05/2019: brf-global.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: The company state that 'The BRF Transparency Hotline is available, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, every day of the year, in several languages. [Reporting Complaints and Non-Retaliation Corporate Policy, 08/2018: brf-global.com] • Not met: Expects AG supplier to have community grievance systems • Met: AG supplier communities use global system: as above [Reporting Complaints and Non-Retaliation Corporate Policy, 08/2018: brf-global.com]
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		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