

Company Name Barrick Gold Corporation
Industry Extractives
UNGP Core Score (*) 17.0 out of 26

| Score | Out of | For indicators |
|---|-----------|--|
| Governance and Policy Commitments | | |
| 1 | 2 | A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights |
| 2 | 2 | A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers |
| 1 | 2 | A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders |
| 1 | 2 | A.1.5 Commitment to remedy |
| Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence | | |
| Embedding respect | | |
| 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) |
| 1 | 2 | B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action |
| 0 | 2 | B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts |
| 0.5 | 2 | B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed |
| Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms | | |
| 1.5 | 2 | C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers |
| 1.5 | 2 | C.2 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities |
| 2 | 2 | C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned |
| 17.0 | 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: In its Human Rights Policy, the Company states: 'It is Barrick's policy to respect the human rights of all individuals impacted by Barrick operations, including employees and external stakeholders. ' Furthermore, the company state that "Barrick does not tolerate violations of human rights committed by its employees, affiliates, or any third parties acting on its behalf or related to any aspect of a Barrick operation." [Human Rights Policy, 01/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: In its Annual Information Form 2018, the Company indicates: 'Barrick has been a member of the UN Global Compact's ("UNGC") Human Rights and Labour Working Group since 2013, [...]' [Annual Information Form, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGPs: In its Human Rights Policy the Company indicates: 'Barrick strives to act in accordance with the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises.' However, 'to strives to act in accordance' is not considered a formal commitment following CHRB wording criteria. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: OECD: See above [Human Rights Policy, 01/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |
| A.1.2 | Commitment to respect the human rights of workers | 2 | <p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: ILO Core: In its Human Rights Policy the Company states: 'Barrick does not tolerate the use of child labour, prison labour, forcibly indentured labour, bonded labour, slavery or servitude, and adheres to the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.' In addition, it indicates that: 'This Policy is applicable to every employee of Barrick Gold Corporation or its subsidiaries, including senior executive and financial officers, and to members of the Barrick Board of Directors. The reporting requirement of this Policy is also applicable to Barrick's contractors and suppliers. The Policy is not applicable to Acacia Mining and the Porgera Joint Venture, which maintain their own human rights policies, or to Jabil Sayid, and may not be applicable at other locations in which Barrick holds a significant interest but does not exercise operational control.' [Human Rights Policy, 01/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs: In its Supplier Code of Ethics, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers are expected to comply with the International Labor Organization's Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, as well as any contractual terms with respect to work conditions in its contract with Barrick. Suppliers should uphold: The freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; The elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labor; The effective abolition of child labor; The elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation' [...] 'For the purpose of this document, a "Supplier" is defined as a third party individual or entity Vendor that provides goods and/or services, and receives payment, for any aspect of the Company's operations including exploration, development, construction, operations and reclamation. [...] Excluded from this definition of "Suppliers" are all transactions involving land purchases, royalties, or leases, government agencies and/or utilities, financial institutions, other Barrick entities, joint venture partners and other mining companies'. In addition, in its Sustainability Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'We encourage our joint venture partners to adopt sustainability-related policies and procedures that are at least as strong as those that we apply to our own operations.' (Human Rights Policy is part of the Sustainability Policies). [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, 09/2016: barrick.q4cdn.com & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com] |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|--|------------------|---|
| | | | <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: In its Policy with respect to the Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, the Company states: '[...] Barrick has created this policy to respect the International Labour Organization (ILO) Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, which are: freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; 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.' In addition, it indicates: 'This Policy applies to all employees and workers for offices of and entities operated by Barrick Gold Corporation (Barrick), and includes temporary employees, employees of Barrick-operated joint ventures and affiliates, and all third party-employed workers (including contractors) who perform work on Barrick premises or otherwise on behalf of Barrick. It does not apply to entities or joint-ventures that Barrick does not operate.' [Policy with respect to the Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, 10/2015: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: In its Human Rights Policy, the Company states: 'Barrick recognizes and respects the freedom to join or refrain from joining legally authorized associations or organizations, and respects the safety and health of workers.' [Human Rights Policy, 01/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: H&S applies to EX BPs: In its Supplier Code of Ethics, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers must be committed to respecting the safety and health of workers and creating safe working conditions and a healthy work environment for all of their workers who provide goods or services to Barrick.' On the other hand, in its Sustainability Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'We encourage our joint venture partners to adopt sustainability-related policies and procedures that are at least as strong as those that we apply to our own operations.' (Human Rights Policy is part of the Sustainability Policies). [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, 09/2016: barrick.q4cdn.com & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com] |
| A.1.4 | Commitment to engage with stakeholders | 1 | <p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: In its Social Performance Policy, the Company states: 'Barrick is committed to: Building trust and fostering genuine collaboration with stakeholders through constructive two-way engagement and dialogue. Working with government and other partners to mitigate the impacts of our operations and ensure that the benefits and costs associated with mining activities are equitably distributed. Developing partnerships with host governments and communities to deliver long-term sustainable benefits, built on a model of shared responsibility and accountability to ensure these benefits endure beyond the life of the mine. Giving account of our social performance to internal and external stakeholders. In its Sustainability Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'Through regular stakeholder- and issues-mapping exercises we identified eight key stakeholder groups of strategic importance to our business. [...] Our stakeholders include: [...] Our employees and their unions; [...] Our local communities; Civil society organizations; Our suppliers and contractors; Our joint venture partners; [[Social Performance Policy, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.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 | 1 | <p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to remedy: In its Human Rights Policy, the Company states: 'In instances in which Barrick determines that its employees, affiliates or third parties acting on its behalf have caused adverse human rights impacts, it will consider appropriate mechanisms to mitigate such impacts and remediation. Where violations by employees are proven, Barrick will consider appropriate sanctions and remedies to victims.' We expect our employees, directors, and third party suppliers and contractors to understand and follow our Human Rights Policy and its implementing procedures.' [Human Rights Policy, 01/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies: The Company states in its Sustainability Report that 'we have zero tolerance for human rights violations wherever we operate. We avoid causing or contributing to human rights violations and to facilitate access to remedy'. No evidence found of statement of commitment to not obstructing access to other remedies. [Sustainability Report 2019, 2020: barrick.q4cdn.com] |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with EX BPs 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 | 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 [Human Rights Policy, 01/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: In its Sustainability Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'The Environmental & Social (E&S) Oversight Committee is a senior management-level committee that meets quarterly to review the Company's sustainability performance and compliance with its sustainability policies. This committee aims to identify concerns and opportunities at the Company's operations at an early stage and foster continual improvement. This committee is chaired by our CEO and includes each of the regional Chief Operating Officers, Mine General Managers and health, safety, environment and community leads, as well as the Group Sustainability Executive and an independent sustainability consultant in an advisory role.' According to the same document human rights are included in its Sustainability Policies. [Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: In addition, it adds: 'Day-to-day ownership of sustainability risks and opportunities is in the hands of individual sites – where our core business is. [...] The work of each mine's environmental, safety and community team is supported by regular interaction and weekly reporting with the Group Sustainability Executive and leads for our three regions: North America, LatAm and Australian Pacific and Africa and Middle East. All three regions have specialist leads in environment, health and safety and community engagement and development. Management of our mines' sustainability performance is supervised by our Group Sustainability Executive, supported by regular interaction with regional Chief Operating Officers (COOs). The Group Sustainability Executive reports on sustainability-related issues to the Board on a quarterly basis.' [Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs: In its Human Rights Report, the Company states: 'Like other companies in our sector, we have entered into joint ventures and other arrangements in which we may hold a significant ownership interest, but which are operated by independent entities and third parties. We try to select partners who largely share our approach, and where possible, incorporate into relevant contracts and agreements our human rights expectations. While our human rights program does not formally extend to those sites and operations, we do attempt to influence management action through contractual rights and Board membership, and are finalizing a set of internal protocols to assist us in that effort. That may be through conducting or advocating for audits and assessments, pressing for compensation structures to reflect human rights goals, seeking reports on incidents, engaging over aspects of their human rights programs, seeking regular progress updates, asking for details on trainings and stakeholder engagements, and through other efforts.' 'In addition to our human rights assessments, we conduct a variety of internal and external audit and assurance activities that bear upon the human rights program. The results are examined over a multiyear period to identify trends and changes. We also consider the findings in conjunction with information generated by other processes, such as through our enterprise risk management process, internal audits, grievances, hotline reports, our third-party annual social assurance process, community and stakeholder engagement programs, engagements with site and functional leads, and our investigations into incidents.' However, it is not clear how responsibility for managing this is allocated within the Company's structure. [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|--|------------------|---|
| 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: The Company explains it its Sustainability Report 2018, its due diligence process: 'Part of our human rights compliance is a human rights risk assessment program that operates on a two-year cycle. In each initial year every mine conducts self-assessments, under the supervision of the SVP Assurance and Risk, to evaluate the actual, potential and perceived human rights risks and impacts on the operation. In the second year, a stand-alone, independent human rights assessment program is conducted on sites exposed to high and medium levels of risk for human rights incidents. Previous assessments were conducted by Avanzar, a respected independent consulting organization. In 2018, independent assessments were conducted at the Lumwana mine in Zambia and the Lagunas Norte and Pierina mines in Peru.' [Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: identifying risks in EX business partners: As indicated above, the Company has a due diligence process in place to identify its human rights risks. In addition, it states: 'we conduct due diligence on all entities receiving funds from Barrick, including suppliers, service providers and civil society groups. This includes baseline human rights due diligence. The on-boarding process covers the Supplier Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and Barrick's human rights program, as well as adherence to the Company's safety and environmental standards.' However, it is not clear whether the risk identification process cover all its extractive business partners. [Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: In addition, in its Human Rights Report, the Company describes its global system in place to identify its salient human rights: 'Our human rights program, and our engagement with internal and external experts and stakeholders, provides many of the important inputs and processes to help us identify these potential impacts. In identifying our salient risks, we undertook three sets of activities: Analysing the past results of our internal processes. These include results from third-party human rights assessments, internal and external audits and assessments, hotline reports and investigations, grievances and our enterprise risk management process, which includes root cause analysis; Analysing sectoral risks and the risks in the countries and communities where we operate. Our participation in multi-stakeholder initiatives like the Voluntary Principles, in cross-sector working groups like BSR's Human Rights Working Group, and in industry associations like the Mining Association of Canada and the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) are important sources of information. [...]; Formal and informal consultation with senior management, external experts and civil society organizations, our CSR Advisory Board and ongoing engagement with internal and external stakeholders, at our mine sites, in our host countries and communities, at the corporate level, and through workshops and meetings as well as one-on one conversations. In addition, in 2017 and 2018 we have done extensive internal and external stakeholder surveys which have informed our salient risks.' [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: See above [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: In consultation with HR experts: The Company engages with different organisations and worked with the consulting organisation Avanzar in the process. [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Triggered by new circumstances: See above. In addition, the Company indicates: 'We continuously evaluate this list in light of issues we see in our operations, changes in the industry, and feedback from stakeholders.' [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'All of our higher risk sites have undergone human rights assessments as part of our global Human Rights Assessment Program. These assessments are conducted by Avanzar, a respected third-party consultancy. The tool used to guide those assessments evaluates, in detail, whether Barrick has processes in place to prevent forced and slave labor for itself and third parties, and whether evidence of forced or slave labor is present.' [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|--|------------------|---|
| B.2.2 | Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks) | 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): Its Human Rights Report is dedicated: detail the philosophy of its human rights program and detail its salient human rights risks and how we are managing them. For each one of its 6 salient human rights risks the Company explains why it is a risk, its approach to managing this risk and its performance and progress made until the moment. The section 'Why it is a risk' summarize the assessment made and context. [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company has identified and assess 6 salient human rights risks, which are developed in its Human Rights Report: Security, Water Management, Safety and Health, Non-discrimination, Working Conditions, Resettlement. [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met: See above [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |
| 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"> • Met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: Its Human Rights Report is dedicated: detail the philosophy of its human rights program and detail its salient human rights risks and how we are managing them. For each one of its 6 salient human rights risks the Company explains why it is a risk, its approach to managing this risk and its performance and progress made till the moment. Its Action Plan is summarized in the section 'Approach to Managing this risk'. [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Including amongst EX BPs • Met: Example of Actions decided: With respect its salient risk 'Security': 'Barrick has developed a Security Policy and Security Management System designed to respect human rights while protecting persons and property associated with our mines. We categorize our operations according to the security risk and, based on the security threat and the location of the operation, we determine which procedures and what type of protective equipment and infrastructure are required. Recognizing the risks that security-related matters pose to human rights and other areas of sustainability, security is subject to partial oversight from Barrick's legal governance and compliance function. All security personnel receive human rights training on an annual basis. [...]We will continue to consider approaches to vetting and training private security providers, including through collective action; the International Code of Conduct for Private Security Contractors Association (ICOCA) and activities within the VPs are both potential avenues. We also will consider ways, through the VPs, home governments and other approaches, to help enhance the human rights training for public security, and avoid having public security officers with credible human rights violation accusations assigned to provide security around our sites. We will continue to work with leading civil society organizations, companies, and governments to identify best practices and practical solutions to the continued risks that security forces pose. In 2017, Barrick's Security team also conducted external benchmarking and research into step-change opportunities for the Company's security performance, particularly in terms of security structures and operating models. In 2018, compliance personnel are engaging with the security team in different locales to identify further areas of improvement.' [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met: See above |
| 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: Although the Company reports on measuring how effectively grievance mechanism is as part of human rights assessments, and indicates that in response to findings of assessments it has strengthened its processes regarding contractors no evidence found of a general system to track how effective its action plans are being in handling human rights risks that it faces (beyond the particular problems that may arise with a specific supplier contractor). This indicator does not look for how it handles non-compliances but how effective the company is in mitigating the salient issues is generally faces. [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|---|------------------|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness: Although it indicates that 'in response to findings from human rights assessments, we have actively sought to strengthen our processes regarding contractors..'. However, this indicator looks for evidence of lessons learnt from checking effectiveness of specific measures to tackle specific human rights issues faced by the Company. [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Score 2 |
| B.2.5 | Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed | 0.5 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Comms plan re identifying risks: See indicator B2.1 • Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See indicator B2.2 • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: See indicator B.2.3 • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans: Although the Company provided evidence of reviewing effectiveness of grievance mechanisms including room for improvement the approach in non-operated sites and debate on the remedy framework implemented at one operation, no evidence found of measuring the effectiveness of action plans to mitigate specific human rights salient issues, including lessons learned. [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including EX business partners • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns: In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'The Porgera Remedy Framework was launched in October 2012 to provide remedy to the victims following 18 months of extensive consultation with local, national, and international experts in human rights. Operating in an extremely difficult context, the Framework – the first of its kind – ran for more than two years and provided remedies to 119 women. While an independent review found the Framework had several implementation challenges, it also found the Framework's design was "meticulous" in its attention to claimants' rights and described the remedies provided as "generous ... rights-compatible, and from the perspective of compensation under human rights law, complete." ' However, this refers to a case that took place between 2012 and 2014. [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • 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 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company indicates that 'has provided the Compliance Hotline for you to report unethical behavior and policy violations securely and confidentially by telephone or via the Internet. [...]The Compliance Hotline is operated by EthicsPoint, a third-party provider.' In addition in the Compliance Hotline FAQ, the Company adds: 'Hotline [...] is available to all employees as well as Barrick's contractors and suppliers to report concerns relating to the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and related policies'. [Barrick's Compliance Hotline, N/A & Compliance Hotline FAQ, N/A: secure.ethicspoint.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company reports: 'During 2019 we received a total of 802 grievances across the group, including at our new assets. This is a significant reduction on the number of grievances received in 2018. Notably, during 2019 we resolved a number of longstanding legacy grievances at the Porgera Joint Venture. During 2020 we will continue to work to resolve the remaining legacy grievances'. In addition, the Company discloses figures about the number of grievances received by type, including: resettlement and land compensation, land access, behavior (employee, contractor or security), among others; and the total number of grievances closed during the year (980) and also outstanding grievances (383). However, no further information found about the detail of how many human rights grievances were addressed or resolved during the year. [Sustainability Report 2019, 2020: barrick.q4cdn.com] |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The Company's Code of Conduct states: 'The Hotline is: A confidential reporting service operated by an outside service provider; Available to all employees, as well as contractors, suppliers and community members; Available 24 hours a day, 365 days per year; Available via the company's Intranet page or by phone. Reports can be made by phone or online in English, French or Spanish. Phone interpreters are available in other languages.' In its FAQ, the Company indicates: 'If you do not speak English, or prefer to have an interpreter assist you in speaking with the EthicsPoint representative, please immediately inform the EthicsPoint representative which language you speak. The representative will then begin conferencing in an interpreter if one is available. As this happens, you will hear music, please remain on the line. You will then hear a recorded message in your language to confirm that an interpreter will come on line shortly. An interpreter will then join your conversation to assist you and the representative in completing the call.' However, no evidence found of access to the channel, in all appropriate languages, as the contact information and the Hotline instructions are only in three languages. [Code of Business Conduct, 2020: barrick.q4cdn.com & Compliance Hotline FAQ, N/A: secure.ethicspoint.com] • Met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system: In its Suppliers Code of Ethics, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers are expected to have an internal process whereby complaints can be raised and investigations can be undertaken for violations of this Supplier Code of Ethics. When complaints relating to the Supplier Code of Ethics are raised, Suppliers must promptly investigate.' Its Suppliers Code also includes information of Grievance channels for Company's Joint Ventures. [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, 09/2016: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers: In the Compliance Hotline FAQ, the Company adds: 'The Compliance Hotline [...] is available to all employees as well as Barrick's contractors and suppliers to report concerns relating to the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and related policies.' [Compliance Hotline FAQ, N/A: secure.ethicspoint.com] |
| C.2 | Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities | 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: Grievance mechanism for community: In its Social Performance Policy the Company commits to 'Maintain an effective grievance mechanism at each site to address community grievances in a fair, timely and consistent manner.' In addition, in its Sustainability report 2018, the Company indicates: 'all Barrick's local community engagement activities include: [...] Grievance mechanisms to enable communities to formally lodge grievances should they feel they have been treated in an unfair manner or if they have been negatively impacted by the mine's activities. [...] Our grievance mechanism is approved by the mine's General Manager and we aim to widely publicize it. For example, we may use local radio stations, posters, social media or notice boards to explain how to register a grievance.' [Social Performance Policy, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: As indicated above: 'all Barrick's local community engagement activities include: [...] Grievance mechanisms to enable communities to formally lodge grievances should they feel they have been treated in an unfair manner or if they have been negatively impacted by the mine's activities. [...] Our grievance mechanism is approved by the mine's General Manager and we aim to widely publicize it. For example, we may use local radio stations, posters, social media or notice boards to explain how to register a grievance.' [Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Expects EX BPs to have community grievance systems: In its Supplier Code of Ethics, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers under contract with Barrick are encouraged to engage the community to help foster social and economic development and to contribute to the sustainability of the communities in which they operate.' However, no evidence found of a grievance mechanism available for business partners' communities. [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, 09/2016: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: EX BPs communities use global system |
| C.7 | Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned | 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"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided: In its Human Rights Report 2018, the Company describes the approach it took for the case Porgera: 'The Porgera Remedy Framework was launched in October 2012 to provide remedy to the victims following 18 months of extensive consultation with local, national, and international experts in human rights. Operating in an extremely difficult context, |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|
| | | | <p>the Framework – the first of its kind – ran for more than two years and provided remedies to 119 women.' However, the example correspond to 2012-2014. [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks: In addition, it states: 'In assessing when remediation may be appropriate and the nature of the remediation to be provided, we are particularly sensitive to the importance of victim participation, stakeholder input, as well as the potential need for independence from the operational unit that may be involved in the negative impact. While remedies for negative human rights impacts will naturally differ depending on the circumstances, in-kind remediation is often preferred to cash, and sites have adopted guidelines that consider such factors, including: the degree and nature of the harm suffered, whether mine personnel were involved and on duty, whether third-party perpetrators used mine resources or committed an act related to their contracted duties, the nature of the evidence in support of the claim, the individual's age and personal circumstances, and local laws. Examples of remedies provided include apologies, cash compensation, remediation of the underlying problem, focused training and strengthening of processes. Where negative human rights impacts are caused or contributed to by entities in our value chain or entities we do not control, we try to use leverage to have them provided with appropriate remedy and design processes to prevent recurrence.' [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts: In its Human Rights Report 2018, the Company summarized the approach it would take: 'It takes persistent hard work and dedicated efforts to limit negative human rights impacts for any company, especially a multi-national enterprise like ours.; [...] we need to seek creative answers, be willing to try new approaches, seek advice from those who have addressed similar situations, share our experiences with others, and engage in collective action to pursue larger and more lasting changes. [...] We must listen to a range of voices. [...] Embracing a global human rights approach meant reviewing how each functional unit around the globe may impact human rights, both positively and negatively. It meant adjusting procedures in light of human rights concerns, educating relevant personnel about how they may affect human rights, and vesting personnel with relevant accountabilities and responsibilities' [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism: It adds: 'Our annual human rights assessments include a review of how effectively the grievance mechanisms escalate potential human rights concerns. Our grievance mechanisms are also internally audited for implementation and effectiveness during regular audits of our Community Relations Management System (CRMS), and externally assessed against the UNGPs effectiveness criteria. Barrick has also commissioned independent reviews of site grievance mechanisms to test if they are meeting the needs of the company, its mines and its host communities.' [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |

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

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|--|------------------|---|
| E(1).0 | Serious allegation No 1 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: Barrick Gold accused by Mining Watch Canada of human rights abuses in Papua New Guinea • Area: Right to security of persons • Story: On April 24, 2018, in a statement released during Barrick Gold's annual general meeting, Mining Watch Canada claimed that the company was violating human rights at its Porgera mine in Papua New Guinea. According to the NGO: "On March 25th, 2017, some 150 houses in the village of Wangima were burnt to the ground by Mobile Units of the Papua New Guinea police, according to reports from human right organization Akali Tange Association. The violent raid on the village occurred while people were sleeping. Barrick Gold confirmed the allegation. During the raid, police officers allegedly gang raped as many as eight women, and assaulted six men. In July, a dump of chemical waste material caused burns to the skin of some 150 men, women and children exposed to the caustic material." Additionally, the NGO reported on October 3rd, "15 year old Boi Nelson Nai, was run over and killed by one of the mine' s loader trucks." As of February 2018, the family was still seeking compensation for his death. " <p>Upon visiting the mine in December of 2017, MiningWatch Canada' s Catherine Coumans found that none of the victims of these serious mine-related harms, or their families, had received compensation. "'Barrick seems to think it is enough to hand out medicine to the burn victims, and pay for the funeral of the teenage boy'," says Coumans "'But these essentially humanitarian gestures do not constitute equitable compensation for the very serious harm done to the victims and their families.'</p> <p>In 2019, there were several news reports on continuing injuries in the mine. According to some media sources, the injured were shot by the police or the mine security. However, the companies denies that and claims that injuries were sustained by intruders after falling from extremely steep inclines of the mine</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources: [Mining Watch Canada - 24/14/2018: miningwatch.ca][Mining Watch Canada - 05/02/2018: miningwatch.ca][Mining Watch Canada - 28/03/2017: miningwatch.ca][Business and Human Rights resource centre - 20/9/2019: business-humanrights.org] |
| E(1).1 | The Company has responded publicly to the allegation | 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: Public response available: The company has responded to the allegations but disputes the details of the incident. [Response to Mr. Yapari, 04/2017: barrick.q4cdn.com & Statement on Policing Activities in the Porgera Region, 03/2017: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Response goes into detail: The company stated that it had no prior knowledge of a police raid on March 25, 2017 and disputes the allegation that 150 structures were burned, stating that only 18 structures were destroyed by police. The company provided aerial photographs of the site, before and after the alleged incident. Additionally, the company stated that it had received no evidence to support the claim of any sexual assaults or rapes that happened during the March 25, 2017 raid. The company stated that upon learning of the incidents, it "launched a formal inquiry to better understand the situation and have also urged senior police to investigate any complaints." <p>In regards to police activities surrounding the allegations, Barrick states the following: "At the request of community leaders and the government, the Porgera Joint Venture provides limited assistance for police activities in the region on the condition that participating law enforcement officers receive appropriate training in community engagement and human rights and adhere at all times to domestic and international obligations for law enforcement officers. Mine management confirms that mine personnel had no involvement in or prior knowledge of the police operation." [Response to Mr. Yapari, 04/2017: barrick.q4cdn.com & Statement on Policing Activities in the Porgera Region, 03/2017: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> |
| E(1).2 | The Company has appropriate policies in place | 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: Company policies address the general issues raised: Barrick's human rights policy states: 'A human right is a right to which all human beings are entitled. These rights are internationally defined and recognized, and identified in international conventions. For purposes of implementing this Policy, a human right shall be one recognized by the International Bill of Human Rights, or as otherwise identified or described in this Policy or its relevant implementing procedures.' The |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|--|------------------|--|
| | | | <p>company states that the International Bill of Human Rights includes the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. However, the company's human rights policy does not apply to the Porgera Joint Venture, which maintains its own human rights policy. [A Framework of Remediation Initiatives in Response to Violence Against Women in the Porgera Valley, 2012: barrick.q4cdn.com & Human Rights Policy, 01/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The company's human rights policy does apply to contractors and suppliers. However, Barrick's human rights policy does not apply to the operations at Porgera, the location of the alleged abuses. The company states that '...this Policy may not apply at other operations in which we own a significant interest but do not exercise operational control, such as Jabal Sayid and Porgera. In such instances, Barrick will seek in good faith to encourage the entities exercising operational control to institute an appropriate human rights policy and programs that strive to comply with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.'. This does not meet CHRB threshold [Human Rights Policy, 01/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: Barrick Gold is a Voluntary Principles (VPs) participant. In its Human Rights Policy, the company states: 'Barrick will seek to adhere to the requirements of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights in its dealings with private and public security providers, local communities, and potential victims of human rights violations.' The company is a member of the VPs Steering Committee. It also has a security policy in which the company states it will 'treat all people with respect and dignity, and to be guided in our approaches and actions by the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights.' [Human Rights Policy, 01/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |
| E(1).3 | The Company has taken appropriate action | 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: Denies allegations, but has engaged affected stakeholders: The company has denied the allegations and engaged with stakeholders - The company engaged BSR in June 2017 to "help enhance access to remedy for people living in the communities surrounding the mine". The BSR team was led by Dr. Margaret Jungk, former chair of the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights, and Bennett Freeman, former U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor. Over the course of 12 months, BSR undertook in-person consultations with a wide range of local, national and international stakeholders – including the ATA itself – with a focus on the needs of those seeking to raise and resolve grievances. The result is a comprehensive set of findings and recommendations aimed at addressing the complex and unique challenges that exist in the Porgera context." [In Search of Justice - BSR, 09/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & BSR Report "In Search of Justice – Pathways to Remedy at the Porgera Gold Mine", 17/09/2018: barrick.com] • Not met: Denies allegations, but reviewed systems to prevent such impacts <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims: There is no evidence to suggest that the company has provided remedies to the victims. • Met: Denies allegations, but implements review recommendations: In September 2018, the company stated that consistent with BSR's recommendations, Barrick (Niugini) Limited (BNL) will: "begin to develop a plan that is responsive to the report. In the coming weeks, the company will be seeking to engage meaningfully with other stakeholders in preparing an action plan to address the recommendations identified by the BSR researchers. These consultations will include discussions with rights-holders and their representatives about the structure and implementation of proposed company responses. It will also involve engagement with relevant Government authorities, given how central they are in the process. BNL intends to finalize that plan before the end of the year." Additionally, it stated: "both Barrick and BNL will continue to assess and try to improve not only our grievance mechanisms, but our wider interaction and engagement with communities and other important stakeholders where we operate." [BSR Report "In Search of Justice – Pathways to Remedy at the Porgera Gold Mine", 17/09/2018: barrick.com] • Not met: Denies allegations, and ensures systems prevent such impacts: The company states: "Barrick and BNL remain committed to respecting the rights of individuals and communities impacted by our respective operations." However, this statement does not suffice as evidence that the company ensures that its systems changed. [BSR Report "In Search of Justice – Pathways to Remedy at the Porgera Gold Mine", 17/09/2018: barrick.com] |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|--|------------------|--|
| E(2).0 | Serious allegation No 2 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: NGO still accusing Acacia Mining, owned by Barrick Gold, of violation of Human Rights in its Tanzanian Mara gold mine • Area: Right to security of persons • Story: In 2018, in a statement released during Barrick Gold's annual general meeting (majority owner of Acacia), Mining Watch Canada claimed that Acacia was still violating human rights at its Mara gold mine in Tanzania. The Company has been accused of violence and sexual violence against villagers and, between 2016 and 2017, at least four men drowned after a barrier wall was removed. It was also claimed that a large vehicle destroyed a home and ran over a child. <p>On June 18th, 2019, news outlets in several countries simultaneously released the results of investigations by a consortium of journalists, Forbidden Stories, into human rights and environmental abuses at Barrick Gold's North Mara gold mine in Tanzania, confirming six years of investigations, reported on yearly by MiningWatch Canada, into assaults on men, women and children by the mine's private security and by police contracted by the mine. There have been injury cases including loss of limbs, loss of eyesight, broken bones, and internal injuries. Additionally, the consortium highlighted attacks on journalists who have tried to report on human rights abuses at the mine. At least a dozen local and foreign reporters were censored or threatened, and this is why Forbidden Stories has decided to investigate Acacia Mining's activity in the mine. The consortium also exposed how the gold from this mine is refined in India and Switzerland before being sold to, among others, international electronic companies.</p> <p>In June 2019, at the annual shareholders meeting, human rights campaigners called for independent and transparent assessment of grievance claims and an end to the memorandum of understanding with police.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources: [Raid, 17/04/2018: raid-uk.org][Mining Watch Canada, July 2017: miningwatch.ca][Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 16/07/2018: business-humanrights.org][The Guardian - 18/06/2019: theguardian.com] |
| E(2).1 | The Company has responded publicly to the allegation | 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: Public response available: The Company states that "Acacia provided a detailed response to these allegations in July 2018, indicating that these are historical and that it is not aware of any new allegations of abuse. It also outlined the extensive action the company took in 2011 upon learning of these incidents, described that the remedy provided was developed in consultation with claimants and international experts, and invited any dissatisfied individual who received remedy to have that remedy reviewed." [Company response on various allegations, 07/2018: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Response goes into detail: In the response letter, Acacia states that "The Mine has been engaging for many years with the challenges facing the women of North Mara. As the Mine reported here and here in 2011 (with an update in 2013 here), the Mine heard disturbing allegations regarding sexual assaults committed by Mine security or members of the Tanzanian Police Force against women trespassing on the mine site or in neighbouring communities in 2011. The Mine took immediate and extensive action to seek to understand or discover the bases for the allegations; to seek to ensure that any illegal or abusive conduct that was identified was ceased immediately and future recurrences prevented; to urge the Tanzanian State to do the same; and to seek to provide proportionate and rights-appropriate remedies to the women allegedly affected". [Company response on various allegations, 07/2018: business-humanrights.org & North Mara Gold Mine Limited Response to a June 2018 blog post and video by MiningWatch Canada, 07/2018: business-humanrights.org] |
| 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"> • Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: The Company states that its "human rights program is grounded in international human rights norms, including the International Bill of Human Rights and the eight core conventions of the International Labor Organization". [2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The Company states that "Suppliers must comply with the International Bill of Human Rights in providing goods and/or services to Barrick". [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, 09/2016: barrick.q4cdn.com] |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|--|------------------|--|
| | | | <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company states that it commits "to treat all people with respect and dignity, and to be guided in our approaches and actions by the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights". Based on the principle, the Company runs a dedicated committee and takes place assessment. [Security Policy, N/A: barrick.q4cdn.com & 2018 Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |
| E(2).3 | The Company has taken appropriate action | 0.5 | <p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders: CHRB did not find the evidence of the Company's engagement with affected stakeholders. [North Mara Gold Mine Limited Response to a June 2018 blog post and video by MiningWatch Canada, 07/2018: business-humanrights.org & Company response on various allegations, 07/2018: business-humanrights.org] Met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders: The Company states that Acacia have been engaging with affected stakeholders. Acacia states that "the Mine engages with local stakeholders and invests in a range of initiatives in the area around the mine site as part of the Mine's broader commitment to promote the development of sustainable communities at North Mara. " [North Mara Gold Mine Limited Response to a June 2018 blog post and video by MiningWatch Canada, 07/2018: business-humanrights.org & Company response on various allegations, 07/2018: business-humanrights.org] Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: The response letter by Acacia only mentions the remedies provided and reviewed for the women who experienced sexual violence at site, and does not mention if the remedies were provided to all the affected stakeholders. According to Acacia's own statistics, published in 2017, 93 per cent of victim's claims were rejected with no explanation provided. The Company states it has revised its remedy mechanism, however, it is not transparent. [North Mara Gold Mine Limited Response to a June 2018 blog post and video by MiningWatch Canada, 07/2018: business-humanrights.org & Raid article on security violation in Tanzania, 04/2018: raid-uk.org] Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company reviewing the system followed by the case. In addition, Acacia states that it has reviewed its system, however, it is not transparent. [North Mara Gold Mine Limited Response to a June 2018 blog post and video by MiningWatch Canada, 07/2018: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims: See above. Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company's improving the system. |
| E(3).0 | Serious allegation No 3 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Headline: Local communities protest against environmental impact of Pueblo Viejo gold mine in Dominican Republic Area: Environmental damage Story: On November 6th 2017, community members of Las Piñitas, Dominican Republic, began occupying space outside the Pueblo Viejo gold mine owned by Barrick Gold Corporation (60%) and Goldcorp (40%) in order to protest against the companies' causing the environmental damage to the Margajita River which is the community's water source. Community members claimed that more than 600 families impacted by the project. Since the start of commercial production in 2012, community members of Las Piñitas, Las Lagunas, El Naranjo, and La Cerca have expressed their concern regarding environmental impacts, which they believe has directly impacted their health and livelihoods. <p>The site was historically a small mining site, state-run from 1975 until 1999, by company Rosario Dominicana. The company's operations exposed enough sulfide ore to initiate acid mine drainage which left a community water source, the Margajita River, in an acidic state. However, the communities assert that the impacts of mining have significantly worsened since Barrick Gold Corporation began operating in the area.</p> <p>Individuals within the community, along with experts in the field, maintain that the alleged increased contamination within the area could be caused by the extensive use of cyanide at the Pueblo Viejo mine and the lack of suitable measures to dispose of the residue acid mine drainage.</p> |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|--|------------------|---|
| | | | <p>Members of nearby communities have lesions on their bodies. Most people indicated that these lesions appeared after having direct contact with the water in the area, leading them to believe it is due to mine contamination. Members of surrounding communities underwent blood testing; all five tested positive for cyanide traces above accepted safe levels." Great concern has also been raised in regards to a drastic decline in agriculture production. The communities allege that they have lost over 80 percent of cacao, a source of income on which many families depend.</p> <p>• Sources: [Axis of Logic, 05/12/2017: axisoflogic.com][El Caribe, 06/11/2017: elcaribe.com.do]</p> |
| E(3).1 | The Company has responded publicly to the allegation | 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: Public response available: The Company denied that it was responsible for the pollution and stated that the environmental impact that exists were left by the former Rosario Dominicana. [Axis of Logic article on environmental damage in DRC, 12/2017: axisoflogic.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Response goes into detail: In the 2018 Investor Sustainability Briefing, Barrick Gold Executive Director Juana Barcelo said that the water discharged into the Margajita River was safe and had been treated in line with the standards of the Dominican Republic and the World Bank guidelines. Additionally she claimed that since construction of the mine, a number of people had moved into the area surrounding the mine site, with the intention to be relocated and trying to benefit financially from the process. She said that most of those families claiming that the water had been contaminated were located upstream of the mines operations, and that allegations of pollution and sickness resulting from the mine site were inaccurate. [2018 Sustainability Briefing for Investors, 06/06/2018: webcast.fmav.ca & 2018 Sustainability Briefing for Investors slides, 06/06/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |
| E(3).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"> • Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: The Company states that it commits to "protect the environment by applying proven management practices to prevent pollution and mitigate impacts" by its operations. [Environmental Policy, N/A: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The Company states that "each supplier is expected to comply with Barrick's Environmental Policy and all related Standards and Procedures, as well as any contractual terms with respect to environment in its contract with Barrick." [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, 09/2016: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company has Barrick's Water Management Framework which is aligned with the ICMM Position Statement on Water Stewardship. However, this does not meet the CHRB requirement of UN Global Compact CEO Water Mandate [Water management: barrick.com] |
| E(3).3 | The Company has taken 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"> • Met: Denies allegations, but has engaged affected stakeholders: The Company said it has been speaking with the representatives of the community regarding the environmental damage and the remedies. Additionally the company said in a webcast briefing, that they have provided compensation or relocated more than 400 families who were living around the mine site and that approximately 35 families chose to remain and made it clear they had no interest in relocation. [Axis of Logic article on environmental damage in DRC, 12/2017: axisoflogic.com & Webcast (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: webcast.fmav.ca] • Met: Denies allegations, but reviewed systems to prevent such impacts: In the webcast, Juana Barcelo, the Executive Director of Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo, said that all pollution to the Margajita River was historical (prior to Barrick's operations), and that the water now discharged into the river was treated with "a state of the art technology, and complies with the Dominican standard and also the World Bank guidelines". She said allegations of pollution are false, and that since 2012 the company has conducted 25 monitoring events, including water sampling, the last of which was completed in March 2018, with more than 100 members from communities around the mine to ensure there was transparency. [Webcast (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: webcast.fmav.ca & Slide show (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|--|------------------|--|
| | | | <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Denies allegations, but implements review recommendations: In the webcast, Juana Barcelo, the Executive Director of Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo, said allegations of pollution are false and that the water now discharged into the river was treated with "a state of the art technology, and complies with the Dominican standard and also the World Bank guidelines". She said since 2012 the company has conducted 25 monitoring events, including water sampling, the last of which was completed in March 2018. However there is no evidence provided that the company has reviewed its broader waste water management systems. [Webcast (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: webcast.fmav.ca & Slide show (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Denies allegations, and ensures systems prevent such impacts: In the webcast, Juana Barcelo, the Executive Director of Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo, said allegations of pollution are false and that the water now discharged into the river was treated with "a state of the art technology, and complies with the Dominican standard and also the World Bank guidelines". She said since 2012 the company has conducted 25 monitoring events, including water sampling, the last of which was completed in March 2018, with more than 100 members from communities around the mine to ensure there was transparency. However there is no evidence provided that the company has reviewed its broader waste water management systems to prevent future risks of chemical contamination in the river system. [Webcast (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: webcast.fmav.ca & Slide show (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] |
| E(4).0 | Serious allegation No 4 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: Barrick Gold to face lawsuit regarding subsidiaries' contaminating mining operations in Marinduque island • Area: Environmental damage • Story: Marinduque residents reveal the damage that has been done to their livelihoods by Marcopper. In 2006 Barrick Gold acquired mining company Placer Dome, which had open cut mining operations on Marinduque, a small island in the Phillipines. Between 1975 and 1991 an estimated twenty million cubic meters of toxic mine effluent was dumped into a bay on the Island by the company Marcopper Mining (which was part owned by Placer Dome). Then, following a regulatory crackdown, the tailings and mining effluent were no longer permitted to be dumped in the ocean and had to instead be stored in former mine pits on the island. In 1996 one of Marcopper's drainage tunnels collapsed, releasing the tailings and mining waste and poisoning the river systems. For a number of years after the residents on Marinduque reported strange illnesses, including cancers and skin diseases, believed to be from the high lead levels in the water. The Marinduque provincial government, in 2005, filed a \$100-million class suit against the mining company Placer Dome at the Nevada district court in the United States, for the devastation caused by the rupture of the drainage tunnel in 1996 . In 2015 the Nevada State Supreme Court threw out the case on the basis that the US was the wrong jurisdiction to hear the claim. As of 2017, the provincial government had been preparing to file a new case against Placer Dome and Barrick Gold for environmental damage in the municipalities of Boac and Mogpog • Sources: [Vera Files - 03/04/2019: verafiles.org][Barrick Gold response - 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org][Manila Bulletin - 27/10/2016: news.mb.com.ph][Enquirer.net - 09/11/2016: newsinfo.inquirer.net] |
| E(4).1 | The Company has responded publicly to the allegation | 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: Public response available: The company says that "When Barrick took over Placer Dome in 2006, the company inherited litigation related to the historic mining activities at the Marcopper mine. The litigation seeks a range of remedies for alleged un-remediated harm from the tailings spill in 1996. Although Placer Dome relinquished its indirect minority stake in Marcopper in 1997, it voluntarily funded and ensured that extensive reclamation, compensatory and other measures to address the effects of the spill were taken. The consequences of this unfortunate incident were remediated long before Barrick acquired Placer Dome." [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRR), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Response goes into detail: The response Barrick Gold provides goes into detail regarding the history of ownership of the Marcopper mine and the harms caused by the tailing spill in 1996, it further states that "Over the past three years, Barrick has made a good faith effort to settle these matters in a principled way. As this is currently before the courts, we are unable to comment further on any settlement discussions related to this case, except to say that we are disappointed |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|---|------------------|--|
| | | | that an out-of-court settlement has not been reached." [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRRC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org] |
| E(4).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"> • Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: The company says it is committed to "Fully comply with all applicable environmental laws, regulations, and other environmental obligations; Protect the environment by applying proven management practices to prevent pollution and mitigate impacts; Continuously improve its environmental systems and performance; and Communicate openly and transparently with internal and external interested parties to develop a mutual understanding of environmental issues, needs, and expectations." [Environmental Policy, N/A: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: Barrick Gold took over Placer Dome in 2006 and therefore inherited the litigation related to the Marcopper mine. In Barrick Gold's environmental policy it says that it will "Ensure that our leadership and our people understand, support, and maintain our EMS through appropriate training and periodic evaluations of the system's performance." Additionally the policy says that it will "Insist that those who provide services or products adhere to our environmental policy and practices". The environmental policies apply to the type of business relationship involved as Barrick owns the Placer Dome mining company, which owns the Marcopper Mine. [Environmental Policy, N/A: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: Though the company has a water policy which aligns with the ICMM Position Statement on Water Stewardship, this is not sufficient to meet CHRB threshold on water. [Environmental Policy, N/A: barrick.q4cdn.com & Code of Business Conduct, N/A: barrick.q4cdn.com] |
| E(4).3 | The Company has taken appropriate action | 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: Denies allegations, but has engaged affected stakeholders: Barrick Gold denies they are linked to the event. The company claims that it inherited litigation from the historical operations of the Marcopper mine related to the harms caused by the 1996 tailings dam collapse. Barrick Gold says that "Over the past three years, Barrick has made a good faith effort to settle these matters in a principled way. As this is currently before the courts, we are unable to comment further on any settlement discussions related to this case, except to say that we are disappointed that an out-of-court settlement has not been reached." In 2014, Barrick Gold offered a \$20-million settlement but the Marinduque provincial board turned it down after it felt that the amount was not enough to compensate for the environmental damage cause by the mining disaster on the island. [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRRC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: Denies allegations, but reviewed systems to prevent such impacts: The company's statement doesn't make any reference to reviewing management systems or tailings disposal methods in the wake of the disaster. It claims that "the consequences of this unfortunate incident were remediated long before Barrick acquired Placer Dome." [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRRC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Denies allegations, but implements review recommendations: There is no evidence provided that a review was conducted into the effect of the disposal of the tailings. Instead, in the reports regarding the 2014 settlement proposed by Barrick Gold, its 'Stipulate Statement of Facts' require that "(vii) the May 13, 1988 Order of the Office of the President includes express findings by the National Government that the continued operation of the Marcopper Mine and disposal of mine tailings into Calancan Bay was in the public interest...(ix) the weight of scientific evidence demonstrates that the mine tailings present in the Province's waterways do not currently pose and have not posed an unacceptable risk to human health" [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRRC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org & Marcopper mine article (Marinduque rising), 06/03/2014: marinduquegov.blogspot.com] • Not met: Denies allegations, and ensures systems prevent such impacts: The company in its statements has not provided any evidence or description of how it ensures implementation of the current management systems on Marinduque. [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRRC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org & Marcopper mine article (Asia Pacific Post), 29/11/2016: asianpacificpost.com] |

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