

**Company Name** Coal India  
**Industry** Extractives  
**UNGP Core Score (\*)** 6.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
<b>Governance and Policy Commitments</b>		
1	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
0.5	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
1	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
0	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
<b>Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence</b>		
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
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
<b>Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms</b>		
1.5	2	C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers
1	2	C.2 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities
0	2	C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned
<b>6.0</b>	<b>26</b>	

(\*) 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"> <li>• Met: UNGC principles 1 &amp; 2: The Company noted in the Sustainability Report that it is 'committed to the principles of the United Nations Global Compact on Human Rights.' [CIL's Policy for Corporate Social Responsibility, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: UNGPs</li> <li>• Not met: OECD</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company states in the Sustainability Report that the Company is 'committed to the principles of the United Nations Global Compact on Human Rights.' [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs: It is noted in the Sustainability Report that all suppliers and contractors are required to abide by various labour statutes, citing the Payment of Wage Act, Minimum Wages Act, Equal Remuneration Act, Industrial Dispute Act, Employees State Insurance Act, Child Labour Act and Contact Labour Act. However, no reference found to all the ILO Core areas. [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company has a stated commitment in its Corporate Social Responsibility Policy and in its Sustainability Report to the UN Global Compact Principles. No evidence found, however, in relation to a specific commitment to each ILO core area. [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Respect H&amp;S of workers: It is noted in the 2017-2018 Sustainability Report that CIL's Safety Policy is overseen by an Internal Safety Organisation across all operations. However, there is no evidence of clear commitment to H&amp;S. No commitment could be found in the latest version of the Sustainability Report. [Sustainability Report 2017-2018, 2018: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a> &amp; Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: H&amp;S applies to EX BPs</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company indicates its responsibility to 'develop and retain amicable relationships with all our stakeholders' and that 'it is necessary to identify and believe in extensive engagement with all our stakeholders throughout the year understand their prioritized concerns and needs and address their issues in a consistent and a transparent manner.' The Company's identified stakeholders include: employees, Land losers and local villagers and communities. [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company discloses the mode of engagement and frequency across various stakeholders in its Sustainability Report. Key concerns and timings of engagements are disclosed across some, but not all, stakeholders. Employee engagement timings are noted. "Land losers" are engaged with "when required" and local villagers are reportedly engaged with through ongoing Corporate Social Responsibility activities. [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design</li> <li>• Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to remedy</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies</li> <li>• Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives</li> <li>• Not met: Work with EX BPs to remedy impacts</li> </ul>

## 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2</li> <li>• Not met: Senior responsibility for HR</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility: No evidence of day-to-day responsibility disclosed in either Sustainability Report or Annual Report.</li> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs: No evidence of extractives business partners day-to-day responsibility on human rights issues. A range of labour-related acts that business partners must comply with are provided in the Sustainability Report, but this does not specify human rights. [Sustainability Report 2017-2018, 2018: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a> &amp; Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul>
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying 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"> <li>• Not met: Identifying risks in own operations</li> <li>• Not met: identifying risks in EX business partners</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Ongoing global risk identification</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with HR experts</li> <li>• Not met: Triggered by new circumstances</li> <li>• Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)</li> </ul>
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company conducts a materiality matrix with input from stakeholder concerns. The Company states that this matrix acts as a guidance for the top management while integrating the sustainability management within the business strategy. The key concerns identified, including Health &amp; Safety, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Compensation, and Anti-Corruption, are discussed in detail in the Sustainability Report. However, this indicator looks for a salient risk assessment, going beyond identification of material risks, with evidence of geographic, economic, social or other factors being taken into account. No salient risk assessment could be found considering any of these factors in a document from the past three reporting years. [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a> &amp; Sustainability Report 2017-2018, 2018: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Sustainability Report discloses that stakeholder engagement with Land Losers yielded a key concern regarding Rehabilitation and Resettlement Compensation. The key concerns identified, including Health &amp; Safety, Rehabilitation and Resettlement are discussed in detail in the Sustainability Report. [Sustainability Report 2016-2017, 2017: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met: As above.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Sustainability Report section on Human Rights states that suppliers are required to comply with a series of labour laws - including child labour laws. The index of the report provides data on the number of suppliers screened for impacts on society, however this does not specify human rights issues. There is no explanation given for what the process of screening is, what human rights issues are integrated and how findings are acted on. No further details found in latest reports. [Sustainability Report 2016-2017, 2017: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a> &amp; Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Including amongst EX BPs</li> <li>• Not met: Example of Actions decided</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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"> <li>• Not met: System to check if Actions are effective</li> <li>• Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See B.2.2</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans</li> <li>• Not met: Including EX business partners</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns</li> <li>• Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications</li> </ul>

## 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"> <li>• Met: Channel accessible to all workers: In its SR 208/2019, the Company reports that it 'uses the integrated Centralized Public Grievance Redressal and Monitoring System (CPGRAMS), a web based solution run by the Department of Administrative Reforms &amp; Public Grievances, Government of India, to resolve Public Grievances. All grievances from employees, customers &amp; other stakeholders are resolved by using the CPGRAMS Grievances received online [...].' [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: No evidence found within last three years in relation to number of complaints filed, addressed or resolved in relation to human/labour rights. [Sustainability Report 2016-2017, 2017: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a> &amp; Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The stakeholder engagement framework is the only mechanism specified by which affected parties can participate in discussions with the company. While specific groups are included, there is no mention of channels being open to those affected by extractives business partners human rights impacts. However, no evidence found in reference to local languages. [Sustainability Report 2017-2018, 2018: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers: In its SR 2018/2019, the Company reports: 'All grievances from employees, customers &amp; other stakeholders are resolved by using the CPGRAMS Grievances received online [...].' [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul>
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Grievance mechanism for community: The stakeholder engagement framework includes meetings with community and NGOs. In its SR 208/2019, the Company reports that it 'uses the integrated Centralized Public Grievance Redressal and Monitoring System (CPGRAMS), a web based solution run by the Department of Administrative Reforms &amp; Public Grievances, Government of India, to resolve Public Grievances. All grievances from employees, customers &amp; other stakeholders are resolved by using the CPGRAMS Grievances received online [...].' [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages: The stakeholder engagement framework specifies that 'a system of communication for obtaining feedback and assessing opinions/ideas/suggestions' is provided. Interpretation into local languages is not specifically mentioned. [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Expects EX BPs to have community grievance systems</li> <li>• Not met: EX BPs communities use global system: The Sustainability Report description of the Online Grievance Management system or Stakeholder Engagement Framework does not specify that these channels are open to</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			extractives business partners stakeholders. [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a> ]
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Sustainability Report provides details on how stakeholder engagement identified land resettlement as a salient human rights risk, and how this risk was mitigated by the Company through subsequent programs. However, no example could be found of how the Company provides remedy to victims following a negative human rights impact. [Sustainability Report 2018-2019, 2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks: The description of the Stakeholder Engagement process describes how material issues identified from stakeholder groups are linked with relevant GRI aspects, plotted with regards to relevance, and then inform mitigation plans. However, no description found of steps it would take to provide remedy for victims following human rights negative impacts. No further evidence found in latest reports. [Sustainability Report 2016-2017, 2017: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a> &amp; Sustainability Report 2017-2018, 2018: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition</li> <li>• Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts</li> <li>• Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism</li> </ul>

### 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"> <li>• <b>Headline:</b> Coal India's subsidiary BCCL activities in Jharkhand accused of harming local residents</li> <li>• <b>Area:</b> Health &amp; safety, environmental damage</li> <li>• <b>Story:</b> In March 2019, The Guardian published an article about the consequences of coal in the village of Liloripathra, in India's eastern Jharkhand state. Local mines are operated by Bharat Coking Coal Limited (BCCL), a subsidiary of state-owned Coal India. BCCL has been running the mines in Jharia since the government nationalized the coking coal industry in 1971.</li> </ul> <p>Three miles from Liloripathra, in Laltanganj village, a crater of fire reportedly emits gases laden with carbon monoxide and sulfur oxide. No one knows for certain what caused the fire to start, but scientists suspect that coal spontaneously combusted at an abandoned mine that hadn't been decommissioned properly. Villagers in Laltanganj complain of persistent coughs, headaches, and chest pain. Respiratory diseases like tuberculosis, bronchitis, and asthma are all common according to Dr. SK Bhagania, a physician at a private clinic in Jharia town. He estimates that over 25% of the ailments he treats may have been triggered by the fumes. In June 2017, teenager Rahim Khan and his father Bablu Khan were sucked into the ground when an underground fire raging beneath them caused a sinkhole to open up outside their front door. Sundari Devi faced a similar fate while walking home through the village of Indra Nagar; her body was never recovered.</p> <p>In 2008, BCCL began implementing a resettlement program to relocate people living in fire-affected areas. In their master plan, the JRDA said that at least 79,159 families would need to be rehoused by 2021. But in 2016, the former minister of coal, Piyush Goyal, admitted to that so far only 4,049 families, approximately 5% of those eligible, had been relocated. Regarding scavenging, Raj Maheshwaram, in charge of law and order in the district, admitted in the article that BCCL needed to do more to prevent villagers from going into the mines illegally. "I don't think there is a sufficient number of security personnel at the mines and in this case, the security officials have failed in their duty," he says.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sources:</b> [The Guardian - 11/03/2019: <a href="http://theguardian.com">theguardian.com</a>][[]][[]]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• <b>Met:</b> Public response available: Anil Kumar Jha, the chairman of Coal India, believes safety measures at the mines are in line with international standards. "There are accidents and people have died also. But such types of incidents are reducing with each passing year. Our safety parameters can be compared with any other country," he says. [Guardian report on mine accidents: <a href="http://theguardian.com">theguardian.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Not met:</b> Response goes into detail: Coal India has only made vague and general statements on the case.</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).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"> <li>• Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: Coal India Limited (CIL) is committed to promote sustainable development by protecting the environment through integrated project planning &amp; design, prevention/mitigation of pollution, conservation of natural resources, restoration of ecology &amp; biodiversity, recycling/ proper disposal of wastes, addressing climate change and inclusive growth. It also aims to bringing awareness amongst its stakeholders for continual improvement in environmental performances following best practices. [Environmental Policy Statement, 2018: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: Coal India Limited's environmental policy applies to all subsidiaries. [Environmental Policy Statement, 2018: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: Coal India tracks health and safety incident and discloses the data related to workplace incidents on its "Safety at a Glance" document. [Safety at a Glance, 2020: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul>
E(1).3	The Company has taken 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"> <li>• Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders: The company does not appear to have engaged with the affected stakeholders.</li> <li>• Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders: The company has not encouraged linked business to engage.</li> <li>• Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: The company has not provided any remedies to the affected stakeholders.</li> <li>• Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: The company has not reviewed its management system in response to the allegation.</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims</li> <li>• Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders: The company does not appear to have improved its systems or engaged with the affected stakeholders.</li> </ul>
E(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Headline:</b> 23 workers killed in mine collapse in India</li> <li>• <b>Area:</b> Health and safety</li> <li>• <b>Story:</b> On December 29, 2016 at least 18 mine workers were killed after a collapse at the Lalmatia open-cast coal mine. As many as 23 people were buried under rubble in the collapse at the mine, located about 390km from the Jharkhand state capital Ranchi. The mine is operated by Eastern Coalfields Ltd (ECL), a subsidiary of Coal India Ltd.</li> </ul> <p>Families of the victims accused Coal India of overlooking safety rules after it ignored two warnings prior to the collapse. The Indian government has called for a nationwide safety survey for the country's coal mines after the accident. [Coal India has a poor safety record, with 135 accidents reported in 2016, killing 37 people and injuring 141, the company said in a report.]</p> <p>On September 12, 2018, the press reported that Coal India planned to close 53 of its 174 underground coal mines by the end of 2018 due to safety concerns at the mines operated by the Company and its subsidiaries. According to The Hindu, a total of 65 workers died in in the first six months of 2016, with 18 people killed at the Lalmatia coal mine, owned by Coal India subsidiary Eastern Coalfields. A further 122 people were reported to have suffered serious accidents during this period. Stated by the press, the safety concerns have cast doubts over the ability of the Indian Government to deliver safe mining operations license. It was also reported that the unprofitable, very small and not financially viable coal mines may close as well</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources: [Channel News Asia - 03/01/2017 -: <a href="http://channelnewsasia.com">channelnewsasia.com</a>][The Hindu Business Line - 12/09/2018: <a href="http://thehindubusinessline.com">thehindubusinessline.com</a>][The Economic Times - 31/12/2016: <a href="http://economictimes.indiatimes.com">economictimes.indiatimes.com</a>][The Hindu - 02/01/2019: <a href="http://thehindu.com">thehindu.com</a>]</li> </ul>
E(2).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"> <li>• Met: Public response available: Through the press, the Company only said that fog had slowed rescue operations as authorities tried to clear the collapsed mine waste. [News article about mine collapse: <a href="http://hindustantimes.com">hindustantimes.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Response goes into detail</li> </ul>



Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(2).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"> <li>• Not met: Company policies address the general issues raised: It is noted in the 2017-2018 Sustainability Report that CIL's Safety Policy is overseen by an Internal Safety Organisation across all operations. However, there is no evidence of clear commitment to H&amp;S. No commitment could be found in the latest version of the Sustainability Report. [Sustainability Report 2016-2017, 2017: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: In its document 'Mine Safety at a Glance' the company discloses the number of fatalities, rate of fatalities and injury rates for each year since 1975. [Mine Safety at a Glance, 13/03/2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: According to press reports, Coal India planned to close 53 of its 174 underground coal mines by the end of 2018 due to safety concerns at the mines operated by the Company and its subsidiaries. Stated by the press, the safety concerns have cast doubts over the ability of the Indian Government to deliver safe mining operations license. It was also reported that the unprofitable, very small and not financially viable coal mines may close as well. [Media report on mine closing: <a href="http://thehindubusinessline.com">thehindubusinessline.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims</li> <li>• Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders</li> </ul>
E(3).0	Serious allegation No 3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Headline: Local protests following the death of 4 workers paralyze production at a Coal India mine in Odisha</li> <li>• Area: Health &amp; safety</li> <li>• Story: On July 13, 2019, 4 people died and 9 were injured after debris slide from a dumpsite at an opencast mine in the Talcher coalfields. Local trade union representatives argue that this accident was preventable. As of August 5, 2019, four out of six of NTPC's coal power plants were closed, affecting supply to 17 states of India. Employees ceased work at Coal India's subsidiary, where a cave-in led to the death of four workers. Locals from four villages in Talcher, where Mahanadi Coalfields Limited's (MCL) Bharatpur mine operates, are seeking compensation of INR 3 crore (EUR 387,000) and permanent jobs for the kin of the deceased. They are also demanding a comprehensive safety audit of all mines operated by MCL as well as specific and mandatory safety guidelines. The miners' protest, including sit-ins at mining sites and strikes, was led by political activists of the Bharatiya Janata Party, which heads the federal government in New Delhi.</li> <li>• Sources: [Reuters, : <a href="http://reuters.com">reuters.com</a>][The Times of India - 05/08/2019: <a href="http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com">timesofindia.indiatimes.com</a>][Mining Weekly - 31/07/2019: <a href="http://miningweekly.com">miningweekly.com</a>][IndustriALL Global Union - 31/07/2019: <a href="http://industriall-union.org">industriall-union.org</a>]</li> </ul>
E(3).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"> <li>• Met: Public response available: Although Coal India has taken action in response to the incident by suspending mining operations and the senior mine manager, and also announcing compensation, it has not offered a public response. [Guardian report on mine accidents: <a href="http://theguardian.com">theguardian.com</a> &amp; NDTV report on the Odisha accident: <a href="http://ndtv.com">ndtv.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Response goes into detail: Although Coal India has taken action in response to the incident by suspending mining operations and the senior mine manager, and also announcing compensation, it has not offered a public response that does into detail.</li> </ul>
E(3).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"> <li>• Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: Coal India states that "it has always given the highest priority towards 'safety'." As part of its safety policy, Coal India takes the following actions to eliminate or materially reduce mining hazards: Implement Statutory Rules and Regulations and strenuous efforts made for achieving superior standards of safety; deploy safety personnel wholly for accident prevention work; provide material and monetary resources needed for the smooth</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>and efficient execution of Safety Plans; bring about improvement in working conditions by suitable changes in technology; set up a frame work for execution of the Safety Policy and Plans through the General Managers of Areas, Agents, Managers and other Safety Personnel of the mines; multi-level monitoring of the implementation of the Safety Plans through Internal Safety Organization at the Company level and Area Safety Officers at Area level; prepare annual Safety Plan and long term Safety Plan at beginning of every calendar year, mine-wise and for the company, to effect improved safety in operations as per prevailing geo-mining conditions to prepare the mines for onset of monsoon, to fulfil implementation of decisions taken by Committee on Safety in Mines and Safety Conferences and to take measures for overcoming accident proneness as may be reflected through study of accident analysis, keeping priority in sensitive areas of roof-fall, haulage, explosives ,dumper movement, other machinery etc.; all senior executives at all levels of management, will continue to inculcate a safety consciousness and develop involvement in practicing safety towards accident prevention in their functioning; institute continuous education, training and retraining of all employees</p> <p>with the emphasis laid on development of safety oriented skills; continue efforts to improve working and living conditions and help of all the employees both in and outside the mines. [Mine Safety at a Glance, 13/03/2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: Coal India's safety policy applies to each subsidiary. [Mine Safety at a Glance, 13/03/2019: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: Coal India tracks health and safety incident and discloses the data related to workplace incidents on its "Safety at a Glance" document. [Safety at a Glance, 2020: <a href="http://coalindia.in">coalindia.in</a>]</li> </ul>
E(3).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"> <li>• Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders: Coal India stated to the press that it had suspended the senior mine manager and announced compensation for the affected workers. However, there is no evidence of actual engagement.</li> <li>• Met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: The company has provided resettlement to people living in fire-affected areas. However, in 2016, the former minister of coal, Piyush Goyal, admitted that so far only 4,049 families, approximately 5% of those eligible, had been relocated. In addition, the company stated that it would offer compensation to those affected by the fires. However, there is evidence that this has not been accepted by the workers, some of whom have continued to demand higher compensation and a high-level investigation into the accident. [Guardian report on mine accidents: <a href="http://theguardian.com">theguardian.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: Coal India stated to the press that it had suspended the senior mine manager and announced compensation for the affected workers. [NDTV report on the Odisha accident: <a href="http://ndtv.com">ndtv.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims: Although the company has said it would offer compensation, there is evidence that this has not been accepted by the workers, some of whom have continued to demand higher compensation and a high-level investigation into the accident.</li> <li>• Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders: There is no evidence that Coal India has improved its systems in response to the allegation.</li> </ul>

## 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](https://creativecommons.org)