

Company Name Chevron Corporation
Industry Extractives
UNGP Core Score (*) 13.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
2	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
1.5	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
2	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		
1	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
0.5	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
1	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
1.5	2	C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned
13.0	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	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: General HRs commitment: The Company states that they 'have a responsibility to respect human rights' in their Human Rights Policy. In addition, 'Chevron's commitment to respecting human rights wherever we operate is embodied in The Chevron Way, our Operational Excellence Management System and our Business Conduct and Ethics Code. Reflecting this commitment, Chevron adopted a corporate Human Rights Policy in 2009.' [About Our Human Rights Policy update 2020, 2020: chevron.com] • Met: UDHR: The Human Rights Policy also states its commitment 'to respect human rights as set out in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labor Organization (ILO) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, as well as adhere to the principles set out in the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights and the International Finance Corporation's Performance Standards'. [About Our Human Rights Policy update 2020, 2020: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: UNGPs: See above [About Our Human Rights Policy update 2020, 2020: chevron.com]
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of 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: ILO Core: The Human Rights Policy also states its commitment 'to respect human rights as set out in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labor Organization (ILO) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. [About Our Human Rights Policy update 2020, 2020: chevron.com] • Met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs: The Company requires its 'suppliers and contractors to adhere to all domestic laws and expect them to adhere to the International Labour Organization's (ILO) core principles. These principles include the freedom of association, the right to collective bargaining, the elimination of forced and compulsory labor, the abolition of child labor, and the elimination of discrimination in the workplace.' [Human Rights website, N/A: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company commits 'to respecting the ILO core labor principles concerning freedom of association and collective bargaining, non-discrimination, elimination of forced labor and underage workers in the workplace.' [About Our Human Rights Policy update 2020, 2020: chevron.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company has an operational excellence management system. The operational system states 'The actions and visibility of leaders make evident their genuine care and concern and the company's commitment to place the highest priority on the safety and health of our workforce, and on the protection of communities, the environment and our assets.' [Operational Excellence Management System, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: H&S applies to EX BPs
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company has an Indigenous Peoples Guidance document which is used for when potential issues related to resettlement of communities or engagement with indigenous peoples are identified.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>The Company Chief Executive Officer, Michael K. Wirth, states in the foreword of the CSR report 'We engage openly and often with stakeholders and stockholders to understand their perspectives on important environmental, social and governance issues, some of which we address in our 2017 Corporate Responsibility Report Highlights. This includes the work we're doing to manage risk; operate safely and reliably; address climate change; protect the environment; respect human rights; and promote diversity and inclusion in our workforce.' [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com & Corporate Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: chevron.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: The Company indicates that ESHIA's consider potential impacts on communities, natural resources, air quality and community health, incorporating human rights due diligence to help the Company consider how to safeguard the rights and interests of potentially affected communities. Chevron obtains inputs from communities for the various ESHIA's which occur through a projects life cycle. If further assessment is needed, Chevron teams can conduct more detailed Human Rights Investigations. It states that early engagement with communities and key stakeholders is integral to planning a large capital project as it helps the project develop appropriate impact mitigation plans during the early stage of project development. [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com & Corporate Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: chevron.com]
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 states 'our Grievance Mechanism Guidance and existing operational-level grievance mechanisms enable our business units to identify and respond to community concerns that may call for remedy.' However, no evidence found of a formal, general statement of commitment to remedy. Nothing further found in latest revision. [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com & 2019 Corporate Sustainability Report, 2020: chevron.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 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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. The Company is committed to ILO core areas. • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Business conduct and Ethic code, which includes human rights policy, states that 'the Board Audit Committee, supported by the Corporate Compliance Policy Committee, made up of senior executives in the Company, governs our companywide compliance program. [Business Conduct and Ethics Code, 2018: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility: The Company's 2019 Corporate Sustainability Report includes an interview between Dale Walsh, Vice President of Corporate Affairs, and Jyotsna Mahendra, Senior Advisor of ESG and Sustainability. However, it is not clear how responsibility for day-to-day human rights is allocated across operations. [2019 Corporate Sustainability Report, 2020: chevron.com] • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company has an Environmental, Social and Health Impact Assessment (ESHIA) process. The Company describes how the ESHIA process provides a 'systematic and risk-based approach to identifying, assessing and managing potentially significant impacts, including human rights-related issues'. [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com & Corporate Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: chevron.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: identifying risks in EX business partners: The Company discloses the following: 'One way that Chevron manages potential human rights risk in our supply chain is through our Contractor Health, Environment and Safety Management, or CHESM. Through this process, we work with suppliers to increase accountability and continually improve their performance. Major suppliers are selected for periodic audits and business units may use internal, external or third-party auditing resources, depending on the audit strategy. The audits cover health, environmental and safety standards and compliance. Labor issues or concerns may be emphasized as part of this process, depending on the business location.' However, no evidence of process to identify potential human rights risks and impacts in business partners was found. [Human Rights website, N/A: chevron.com] Score 2 • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification: 'Business units create a prioritized risk profile that integrates all the OEMS focus areas—workforce safety and health, process safety, reliability and integrity, environment, efficiency, security, and stakeholders.' However, no details found on how this process applies to extractive business partners. [Corporate Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: chevron.com] • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: The Company states that they conduct extensive engagements with key stakeholders which cover human rights issues to ensure that the board and management understand and address issues that are important to stakeholders. The Company describes how this process is critical in identifying and mitigating human rights risks. [Human Rights website, N/A: chevron.com] • Not met: In consultation with HR experts: The Company indicates it works with IPIECA, Global Business Initiative on Human Rights and Business for Social Responsibility. It is not clear, however, if it consults with these or other human rights experts in order to identify possible human rights risks. [Human Rights website, N/A: chevron.com] • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): The Company explains their use of HRIA. The Company describes ' Early engagement with communities and key stakeholders is integral to planning a large capital project as it helps the project develop appropriate impact mitigation plans during the early stage of project development. If initial assessments demonstrate the need for a more detailed Human Rights Impact Assessment, Chevron experts will undertake that due diligence (an ongoing risk management process enabling a company to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how it addresses its adverse human rights impacts) to help the company consider how to safeguard the rights and interests of potentially affected communities.' However, the latest version of the website does not seem to mention human rights impact assessments. No further evidence found. [Human Rights website, N/A: chevron.com]
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	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: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company states 'Our [human rights] policy applies to all of our employees and operations, guides our respect for human rights across the business, fosters greater awareness of human rights issues throughout the company and enhances our capabilities to identify and manage human rights risks. Chevron regularly identifies and manages potential impacts through processes and tools, including global and context-specific impact assessments.' [Human Rights website, N/A: chevron.com] • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks <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: The Company's Stakeholder Engagement Process requires that appropriate systems and plans be in place at the operational level to manage community input and issues. It indicates that ' Chevron fosters ongoing two-way engagement with communities, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), government and regulatory authorities, and other appropriate stakeholders to address potential security, safety, health, environmental, supply chain, social, human rights and other concerns.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Appropriate plans are in place, are evaluated on a periodic basis and include stakeholder engagement in the management of potential social impacts and issues management, including grievances.' However, it is not clear whether the Company has action plans to mitigate, or remediate its salient human rights issues. The Company also states that they have a grievance mechanism guidance to encourage best practice for grievance mechanisms, however, it is not clear whether the company has a system to mitigate broader human rights risks. [Human Rights website, N/A: chevron.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including amongst EX BPs • 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: ' A system is in place to identify stakeholders and to plan and execute engagement with them that promotes mutual understanding about operations, facilities, projects, and products. Chevron fosters ongoing two-way engagement with communities, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), government and regulatory authorities, and other appropriate stakeholders to address potential security, safety, health, environmental, supply chain, social, human rights and other concerns. Appropriate plans are in place, are evaluated on a periodic basis and include stakeholder engagement in the management of potential social impacts and issues management, including grievances.' However, no description found of a system to track actions carried out to mitigate specific human rights salient issues, to check whether they are effective. [Human Rights website, N/A: chevron.com] • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness: The Company states 'Chevron benefits from an internal "community of practice" network of experienced social performance practitioners. For example, Chevron convenes workshops for company practitioners who are involved in managing land issues related to resettlement. In the workshops, Chevron practitioners discuss how the company's expectations on human rights extend to resettlement issues, discuss relevant international standards and share lessons learned from their practical experiences.' However, it is not clear whether this comes from a system to check if the Company's actions relating to human rights are effective, or rather whether this is just a knowledge-sharing format for the Company. [Human Rights website, N/A: chevron.com] <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: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company needs to achieve at least 1,5 points in B.2.1 • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.2 • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.3 • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.4 • Not met: Including EX business partners: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.2/B.2.3/B.2.4 and at least 1,5 points in B.2.1 <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: Chevron Hotline is available for 24 hours, 7 days a week. The Hotline is operated offsite by Global Compliance Services, an independent agent. The Hotline covers human rights related issues and is accessible to all workers. [Business Conduct and Ethics Code, 2018: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: Grievance mechanisms have the following attributes: 'the process should be publicized such that all community members can understand and have access to it, including groups who may face barriers to access, such as women and historically disadvantaged groups. Barriers can include language, illiteracy, bureaucratic form filling, cost, geographic distance and fear of reprisal'. In addition, the Company's hotline is available in more than 12 languages. [Grievance Management Guidance Summary Document, 08/2018: chevron.com & Ethics hotline, 02/2019: secure.ethicspoint.com] • Met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers: The Company states the following: 'Employees, suppliers and contractors may communicate workplace concerns to Chevron's Corporate Compliance Hotline (available 24 hours a day, seven days a week).' [United Kingdom Modern Slavery Act Statement for 2018, 2018: chevron.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 Grievance Management Guidance indicates that grievance mechanisms are available to communities: 'The process should be publicized such that all community members can understand and have access to it, including groups who may face barriers to access, such as women and historically disadvantaged groups. Barriers can include language, illiteracy, bureaucratic form filling, cost, geographic distance and fear of reprisal.' [Grievance Management Guidance Summary Document, 08/2018: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: Furthermore the Grievance Mechanism Guidance helps business units to update or design a grievance mechanism that is 'legitimate, accessible, predictable, equitable, transparent, and rights-compatible'. The Company provides information regarding the Myanmar Grievance Mechanism, which was established as part of its stakeholder engagement programs. The Myanmar Grievance Mechanism Procedure Document highlights how a 'handout/brochure will be provided in Myanmar language with information about the grievance mechanism and contact details.' [Chevron Myanmar Grievance Mechanism Procedure, 31/08/2015: chevron.com & Human Rights website, N/A: chevron.com] • Met: EX BPs communities use global system: The Company states the following: 'Employees, suppliers and contractors may communicate workplace concerns to Chevron's Corporate Compliance Hotline (available 24 hours a day, seven days a week). As indicated above, mechanism is open to anyone including communities. [Grievance Management Guidance Summary Document, 08/2018: chevron.com & United Kingdom Modern Slavery Act Statement for 2018, 2018: chevron.com]
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Company provides evidence of how it provided remedy following an incident which allegedly led to the deaths of employees during Company operations. A Company representative disclosed the following: 'Together with our Human Resources Manager, I met with Anita Broome, Kathy Riley and Andrew Jenkins' family a few days after the Incident. Approximately a week later I met with Jack Archer and with Andrew Phillips' family. During these visits, which were understandably harrowing for everyone, I expressed our regret and sympathy to the families who were trying to comprehend their enormous loss. We provided contact information for a grief/mental health service we had arranged and encouraged the families to contact Chevron if they needed any assistance. [...] I made it clear in no uncertain terms that Chevron intended to reach a legal settlement with them, regardless of liability, and the company would pay them full compensation. Together with B&A, Chevron agreed to pay for the legal representation of the families and others so that they could seek independent legal advice as to their civil rights to seek compensation, including bringing claims for such compensation. As part of that process interim payments were promptly provided to a number of the families and other claimants. All but two claims (which relate to PTSD claims) have been settled. [...] I saw to it that grief/mental health counsellors were brought to the Refinery and I encouraged all on site to engage with them.' [Gregory Mark Hanggi Witness Statement, 10/04/2019: 74.208.67.93] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Changes introduced to stop repetition: The Company took steps to make changes in vacuum truck operations to prevent another serious incident. These changes included '20.1 All bowzers at site had to be earthed using a marked and verified earthing point. 20.2 That earthing leads for bowzers had to have continuous visual indicators attached to them to show whether the bowser

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>remained earthed. 20.3 That conductive hoses had to be used which met British Standard 5958. This was to ensure that static electricity would be adequately transferred to the earthing point. 20.4 Mandatory continuity checks were completed on hoses to ensure proper bonding would dissipate any static charge. A requirement was introduced that hoses be re-checked at least annually and a record kept for each hose recording the test. 20.5 Loading rates whilst vacuuming had to be reduced to as low as reasonably practicable in order to reduce the risk of static electricity build up. 20.6 That bowser operatives had to wear a personal 4-way gas monitor device. These devices continuously monitor the working environment for four different hazards, one of which is flammable gases'. [Gregory Mark Hanggi Witness Statement, 10/04/2019: 74.208.67.93]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: Chevron will pay GBP 5 million after storage tank explosion • Area: health and safety • Story: On June 6, 2019, the press reported that Valero Energy was fined GBP 5 million after a storage tank explosion killed four workers and seriously injured another at a Pembrokeshire oil refinery in 2011. <p>According to the press, Valero Energy pleaded guilty to breaching the Health and Safety at Work Act. Valero Energy was fined GBP 5 million and ordered to pay costs of GBP 1 million. However, Chevron Corporation will pay the fine and court costs after coming to an agreement with Valero, because at the time of the incident the refinery was operated by Chevron.</p> <p>As reported by the press, the fine came after an investigation found there has been longstanding failures within the refinery safety management systems and as a result the risks posed by flammable atmospheres within the amine recovery unit were not understood or controlled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources: [Tank Storage Magazine - 07/06/2019: tankstoragemag.com][BBC, 01/05/2019: bbc.co.uk][BBC, 03/06/2011: bbc.co.uk]
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response available: According to the BBC, in the aftermath of the explosion, Chevron said: "Emergency services were called and responded immediately and remain on the scene. The fire has been extinguished. "We are taking appropriate action to respond to the situation. We are still in the process of accounting for all personnel." <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response goes into detail
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: The Company has an operational excellence management system. The operational system states 'The actions and visibility of leaders make evident their genuine care and concern and the company's commitment to place the highest priority on the safety and health of our workforce, and on the protection of communities, the environment and our assets.' [Operational Excellence Management System, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: Though the company Operational Excellence systematically manages workforce system mentions 'safety and health of our workforce', it does not refer to contractors, suppliers or other BP. [Operational Excellence Management System, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company reports annually various health and safety indicators, including the number of work-related fatalities. [2019 CSR Performance data, 2020: chevron.com]
E(1).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Engages with affected stakeholders: In the witness statement of Gregory Mark Hanggi, the former site manager - which the company submitted to CHRB- it is describes how he met the families of the victims to express the company's condolences and provide some assistance. [Gregory Mark Hanggi Witness Statement, 10/04/2019: 74.208.67.93]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: In the witness statement, Mr Hanggi states that ' I saw to it that Chevron provided some immediate financial provision. I then, after a few months, wrote to the families and Mr Phillips in October 2011, to try to put their minds at ease so far as financial considerations were concerned. I made it clear in no uncertain terms that Chevron intended to reach a legal settlement with them, regardless of liability, and the company would pay them full compensation' [Gregory Mark Hanggi Witness Statement, 10/04/2019: 74.208.67.93] • Met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: In its witness statement, Mr Hanggi explains in detail the steps the company took to improve the safety at the site. In addition, they also initiated along with Pembrokeshire College a module on safety education which was sponsored by Chevron. [Gregory Mark Hanggi Witness Statement, 10/04/2019: 74.208.67.93] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims: See above [Gregory Mark Hanggi Witness Statement, 10/04/2019: 74.208.67.93] • Met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders: See above [Gregory Mark Hanggi Witness Statement, 10/04/2019: 74.208.67.93]

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