

Company Name China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC Group)
Industry Extractives
UNGP Core Score (*) 1.5 out of 26

Score **Out of** **For indicators**

Governance and Policy Commitments

1	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
0.5	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
0	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
0	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy

Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence

Embedding respect

0	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
---	---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)

0	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.2 HRDD - Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)
0	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
0	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed

Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms

0	2	C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers
0	2	C.2 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities
0	2	C.7 Remediying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned

1.5 26

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

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

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

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

Detailed assessment

Governance and Policies

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: General HRs commitment: The Chairman's statement on the CSR Report states 'We stepped up our efforts in sustainable development, adhering to the Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact in the areas of human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption.' The Company also states 'The Board of Directors (the "Board") of CNOOC Limited actively supports the Company's commitment to CSR and gives close attention to CSR Progress. This includeshuman rights issues related to sustainable development.' The Company also states 'CNOOC Limited respects the basic human rights which all employees are entitled to in accordance with the laws in each jurisdiction.' [Environmental, Social & Governance Report 2018, April 2019: cnooclt.com & Employee Responsibility, N/A: cnooclt.com] Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: 'The Company is a member of the UNGC. The Company states that it 'adheres to the Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact in the areas of human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption. [Environmental, Social & Governance Report 2018, April 2019: cnooclt.com] Not met: UDHR Not met: International Bill of Rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company is a signatory of UN Global Compact since 2008. [Environmental, Social & Governance Report 2018, April 2019: cnooclt.com & UNGC, N/A: unglobalcompact.org] Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core Met: Respect H&S of workers: CNOOC Limited states that 'adheres to the core HSE values, which put "Safety First, Environment Foremost, People Oriented and Asset Integrated" approach to continuous HSE management system improvement. We prioritize work safety for all personnel and reinforce this with safe production processes and monitor the results of these safety measures through safety inspections to promote safe and stable production and operation'. [Safety and Health, 25/06/2020: cnooclt.com] Not met: H&S applies to EX BPs
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states 'we will work together with stakeholders and make social responsibility an engine that drives the Company and society forward together.' The Company also states 'To fully communicate with stakeholders to understand their expectations and demands is the foundation of our social responsibility and sustainable development. We have been always communicating with stakeholders on multiple social responsibility issues through an open, transparent and multichannel mechanism.' However, the Company does not disclose a public document stating its commitment to engage with its potentially and actually affected stakeholders [Environmental, Social & Governance Report 2018, April 2019: cnooclt.com] Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company states that 'Deep understanding of our stakeholders' expectations serves as the bedrock for the Company to fulfil CSR and achieve sustainable development. We maintain open, transparent and multichannel communications with stakeholders on a variety of

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>social responsibility issues.' In addition, CNOOC informed what are its stakeholders groups and the type of communication and engagement with which one of them. For example, the Company discloses that engages with public and communities through support for community building activities, participation in public welfare projects and respond to public inquiries. However, no evidence found on actual cases where the Company regularly engages with potentially and actually affected stakeholders. [Environmental, Social & Governance Report 2019, 15/04/2020: cnooltd.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy <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	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: see A.1.2 [Environmental, Social & Governance Report 2018, April 2019: cnooltd.com] • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company states that the Board of Directors actively supports the company's commitment to CSR including human rights. However, there is no information on senior management level on human rights. [Environmental, Social & Governance Report 2018, April 2019: cnooltd.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company states that it has established a risk management committee directly managed by the Company's Chief Executive officer. The committee is responsible for the organization and implementation of the overall risk management and internal control, on-going monitoring of the risk management and internal control system, and making periodic reports to the Board regarding the status of the risk management and internal control system. The Risk Management Committee established the overall targets and policies of the risk management system which are in line with the strategic objectives of the Company, and identified, analysed, and assessed the overall risks. However, it is not clear whether it has process to identify its human right risks. [Environmental, Social & Governance Report 2018, April 2019: cnooltd.com] • Not met: identifying risks in EX business partners <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) • 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks• Not met: Including amongst EX BPs• Not met: Example of Actions decided Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not met: System to check if Actions are effective• Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks• Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks• Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks• Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans• Not met: Including EX business partners Score 2 <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company states 'CNOOC Limited and its subsidiaries have set up full-time and part-time organizations and positions to handle complaints and grievances. Anyone can make reports, allegations and grievances about violations and breaches of regulations to management, compliance monitoring personnel, legal advisers, internal audit department or other relevant departments of the subsidiaries by letter, in person, telephone, or email, etc.' However, it is not clear whether this grievance mechanism covers human rights risks. [Environmental, Social & Governance Report 2018, April 2019: cnoocltd.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved• Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages• Not met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system• Not met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not met: Grievance mechanism for community Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages• Not met: Expects EX BPs to have community grievance systems• Not met: EX BPs communities use global system
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided• Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition• Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts• Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found.

Disclaimer

A score of zero for a particular indicator does not mean that bad practices are present. Rather it means that we have been unable to identify the required information in public documentation.

See the 2020 Key Findings report and the 2019 technical annex for more details of the research process.

The Benchmark is made available on the express understanding that it will be used solely for general information purposes. The material contained in the Benchmark should not be construed as relating to accounting, legal, regulatory, tax, research or investment advice and it is not intended to take into account any specific or general investment objectives. The material contained in the Benchmark does not constitute a recommendation to take any action or to buy or sell or otherwise deal with anything or anyone identified or contemplated in the Benchmark. Before acting on anything contained in this material, you should consider whether it is suitable to your particular circumstances and, if necessary, seek professional advice.

The CHRB is part of the World Benchmarking Alliance ('WBA').The material in the Benchmark has been put together solely according to the CHRB methodology and not any other assessment models in operation within any of the project partners or EIRIS Foundation as provider of the analyst team.

No representation or warranty is given that the material in the Benchmark is accurate, complete or up-to-date. The material in the Benchmark is based on information that we consider correct and any statements, opinions, conclusions or recommendations contained therein are honestly and reasonably held or made at the time of publication. Any opinions expressed are our current opinions as of the date of the publication of the Benchmark only and may change without notice. Any views expressed in the Benchmark only represent the views of WBA, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither WBA nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers or employees accept any responsibility for or make any representation or warranty (either express or implied) as to the truth, accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information contained in this Benchmark or any other information made available in connection with the Benchmark. Neither WBA nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers and employees undertake any obligation to provide the users of the Benchmark with additional information or to update the information contained therein or to correct any inaccuracies which may become apparent (save as to the extent set out in CHRB appeals procedure). To the maximum extent permitted by law any responsibility or liability for the Benchmark or any related material is expressly disclaimed provided that nothing in this disclaimer shall exclude any liability for, or any remedy in respect of, fraud or fraudulent misrepresentation. Any disputes, claims or proceedings this in connection with or arising in relation to this Benchmark will be governed by and construed in accordance with Dutch law and shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Courts of Amsterdam.

As WBA, we want to emphasise that the results will always be a proxy for good human rights management, and not an absolute measure of performance. This is because there are no fundamental units of measurement for human rights. Human rights assessments are therefore necessarily more subjective than objective. The Benchmark also captures only a snap shot in time. We therefore want to encourage companies, investors, civil society and governments to look at the broad performance bands that companies are ranked within rather than their precise score because, as with all measurements, there is a reasonably wide margin of error possible in interpretation. We also want to encourage a greater analytical focus on how scores improve over time rather than upon how a company compares to other companies in the same industry today. The spirit of the exercise is to promote continual improvement via an open assessment process and a common understanding of the importance of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

COPYRIGHT

Our publications and benchmarks are the product of the World Benchmarking Alliance. Our work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit creativecommons.org