

Company Name Kirin Holdings
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain only)
UNGP Core Score (*) 12.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
2	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
2	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
1	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
1	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence		
Embedding respect		
1	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
1.5	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)
1	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
0	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
0.5	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed
Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms		
1	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 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned
12.0	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 in its human rights policy that 'Respect for human rights is a foundation for all our business activities. We recognize that companies such as ours must continuously deepen their understanding of the potential human rights associated with their own business and global value chain and take appropriate action to ensure respect for rights'. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company states that it signed the UN Global Compact and carries out its social responsibility through its corporate activities worldwide. Based on the 10 principles in the areas of human rights, labour, the environment, and anti-corruption, it has determined key themes, and it is advancing initiatives targeting the realization of sustainability for society and companies. [The Global Compact, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: International Bill of Rights: The Company is committed to respecting human rights as set out in the International Bill of Human Rights and the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: UNGPs: The Company also supports and is working to implement the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: ILO Core: The Company states that it is committed to respecting human rights as set out in the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company states that it signed the UN Global Compact and carries out its social responsibility through its corporate activities worldwide. Based on the 10 principles in the areas of human rights, labour, the environment, and anti-corruption, it has determined key themes, and it is advancing initiatives targeting the realization of sustainability for society and companies. [The Global Compact, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers: The Company states in its Supplier CSR Guidelines that its considerations of human rights include: 'prohibition of discrimination, prohibition to inhumane treatment, occupational health and safety, guarantee of minimum wage, responsible practices, respect for freedom to organize and collective bargaining rights, prohibition of forced labour, prohibition of child labour and responsibility towards local communities'. [Policy on CSR Procurement, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company states in its human rights policy that it prohibits any form of discrimination, that it commits to 'respecting freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining', and that it opposes any form of slavery or forced labor, including human trafficking, and child labor. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company states that it gives top priority to securing health and safety and strives to maintain a safe and health workplace environment. [Health and Well-being Policy, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: The Company states in its Supplier CSR Guidelines that its considerations of human rights include occupational health and safety. [Policy on CSR Procurement, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states that 'As we move forward on our journey, we will continue to engage with our stakeholders concerning the human rights issues associated with our business and seek to update our practices to respect human rights'. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: The Company states that it engages 'in dialogue with a variety of stakeholders and Kirin Group executives when their policies.' Furthermore, the Company report that 'listening earnestly to the opinions of our suppliers and other stakeholders, we will make efforts to ensure an understanding of the "Kirin Group Sustainable Procurement Policy" and work together with our stakeholders toward realizing this policy.' No specific evidence found of regular engagement with affected stakeholders in designing and monitoring of its human rights approach. [Policy on CSR Procurement, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to remedy: The Company states in its Human Rights Policy that it will act upon the findings of this due diligence and endeavour to deliver appropriate and effective remedy where it identifies that it has caused or contributed to adverse human rights impacts. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] <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: The Company discloses that conducted a biodiversity risk assessment and about 25% of black tea leaves imported to Japan from Sri Lanka are used in Kirin's operation. In response to this the Company started to provide assistance for willing Sri Lanka tea farmers to obtain Rainforest Alliance certification. However, no evidence found of collaborating in initiatives that provide access to remedy adverse impacts the company that it caused or contributed to. [Environmental Report 2019, 2019: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Not met: Work with AG suppliers to remedy impacts

Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	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 signatory to the UN Global Compact. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company states that the senior executive officer for human resources strategy is responsible for management of the human rights policy. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for AG in supply chain: The Company indicates: 'the Kirin Group places value on mutual communication with its suppliers' and describes the process it has to engage with suppliers: 'periodically distribute a supplier satisfaction questionnaire'. However, even though the Company has CSR procurement management system to communicate closely with its suppliers, no description found on how day-to-day responsibility for managing human rights issues within its supply chain is allocated. [Activities to Promote CSR Procurement, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	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: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company states that it has a due diligence process 'In accordance with the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, endorsed by the United Nations Human Rights Council, Kirin Group has begun carrying out human rights due diligence. This is a continuous process based on our commitment to ensure respect for human rights (Kirin Group Human Rights Policy) and includes steps from identifying human rights issues in the Kirin Group's value chain and planning and implementing corrective action to monitoring, disclosing information, and communicating with external stakeholders. [Implementing Human Rights Due Diligence, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers: The Company states that taking guidance from international human rights and labour standards and in consultation with third party experts, it identified the salient human rights risks that are particularly significant for the alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages industry: working hours, compensation, occupational health and safety, forced labour, child labour, discrimination and harassment, etc. It performed human rights risk assessments for countries it conducts business in and countries where its suppliers operates. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp & Implementing Human Rights Due Diligence, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: The Company Human Rights Due Diligence state that since the launch of the company's Human Rights policy in February 2018, the company has been strengthening their approach to identify, prevent and mitigate human rights impacts related to the company's activities. The Company states that 'as Kirin Group grows our business globally, we want to ensure that we understand the potential for negative impacts on human rights and let this inform whether and how we enter new businesses or markets. We have included human rights due diligence as part of our broader due diligence process to assess the suitability of potential new investments, using a checklist developed in line with the Kirin Group Human Rights Policy'. [Implementing Human Rights Due Diligence, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: The Company states that 'in consultation with an independent external consultant, experts and local stakeholders, we identified six salient risks for our business in Myanmar: occupational health and safety, labour rights, forced labour, child labour, supply chain and surrounding communities'. [Implementing Human Rights Due Diligence, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp & Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Not met: In consultation with HR experts: The Company states that taking guidance from international human rights and labour standards and in consultation with third party experts, it identified its salient human rights risks that are particularly significant for the alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages industry. No further details found, including experts. [Implementing Human Rights Due Diligence, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): The Company describes its Human Rights Impacts Assessment (HRIA) in Myanmar, that happened on August 2018 and that with the HRIA identified six salient risks of its operation in Myanmar and could elaborate a design action plan to strength existent practices and put in places new ones to address the risks in line with international conventions. In February 2020, the Company provided a report on the major progress made in 2019 toward the promotion of respect for human rights in its Myanmar operations, in line with the main human rights issues identified in the HRIA. [Human Rights Impact Assessment in Myanmar, 2018: kirinholdings.co.jp & Human rights impact assessment in Myanmar 2019 Update, 06/02/2020: kirinholdings.co.jp]
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 that for the human rights issues identified, it performed human rights risk assessments by country using the databases of international organizations and NGOs for countries it conducts business in and countries where its suppliers operate, and then determined the priority. [Implementing Human Rights Due Diligence, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company describes that in consultation with an independent external consultant experts and local stakeholders, identified six salient risks of its business in Myanmar, which are occupational health and safety, labour rights, forced labour, child labour, supply chain and surrounding communities. However, this indicator looks for salient risks in all operation, not only one specific place as the Company described. [Human Rights Impact Assessment in Myanmar, 2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company states that it will identify, prevent and mitigate adverse human rights impacts with which it is involved in line with the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. It disclosed that the cycle of human rights due diligence consists of four steps: Understand key human rights issues in formulating the human rights policy and conduct dialog with stakeholders; disseminate the human rights policy and perform a human rights impact assessment; reflect the results of the human rights impact assessment on business processes; and monitor its human rights initiatives and disclose results via reports, etc. However, no evidence found describing how the system to prevent, mitigate or remediate operates. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Not met: Including in AG supply chain: The Company indicates it conducts annual survey, distribute questionnaire to suppliers and conduct on-site inspections if necessary to prevent adverse human rights impacts in our supply chain. However, this seems to refer to compliance monitoring. This indicator looks for evidence of risk-based approach actions taken to mitigate salient issues in supply chain, rather than individual supplier monitoring. [Activities to Promote CSR Procurement, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: Example of Actions decided: The Company has set action plans to mitigate the risk such as to conduct a further assessment of the subcontractors and business partners on their employment practices in collaboration with independent external experts to identify risks of forced labour and areas for improvement. [Human rights impact assessment in Myanmar, 08/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] Score 2 • 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: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective: The Company states that it monitors the human rights initiatives and discloses results via reports, etc. It disclosed the 2019 progress following the human rights impacts assessment conducted in 2018, Myanmar. However, no evidence found on effectiveness of taken actions and how the Company applies that information to improve processes and systems. [Implementing Human Rights Due Diligence, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp & Human rights impact assessment in Myanmar 2019 Update, 06/02/2020: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Comms plan re identifying risks: See indicator B.2.1. The Company carries out a global risk identification and assessment process that includes both its own operations and business partners, and describes at least some features of the process. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] • 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 AG suppliers: 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns: The Company discloses the salient human rights risks it identified as particularly significant for the alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages industry and indicates: 'For these human rights issues identified, we performed human rights risk assessments by country using the databases of international organizations and NGOs for countries we conduct business in and countries where our suppliers operate, and then determined the priority. We will expand our human rights due diligence process in a sequential manner with a plan to cover our business in Myanmar, followed by the supply chain in Laos, and China thereafter'. However, no evidence found of a description on how the Company has responded to specific human rights concerns raised by, or on behalf of, affected stakeholders. [Implementing Human Rights Due Diligence, N/A: kirinholdings.co.jp & Progress Report Regarding Kirin's Operations in Myanmar, 05/06/2020: kirinholdings.co.jp] 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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company states that it has two compliance hotlines: one is an internal hotline manned by Kirin staffers and the other is an external one staffed by a third party. The external hotline is operated by a contracted consultant and offers greater confidentiality to reporters. [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp & Compliance, 06/03/2020: kirinholdings.co.jp] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company reports that in 2018, there were 81 grievances about labour practices or human rights impacts filed, addressed, and resolved through formal grievance mechanisms. Regarding suppliers, 0 cases reported on child labour and forced labour in 2018. [ESG Data, 06/03/2020: kirinholdings.co.jp] Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages Not met: Expect AG supplier to have equivalent grievance systems Not met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	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: Grievance mechanism for community <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages Not met: Expects AG supplier to have community grievance systems Not met: AG supplier communities use global system
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Company describes its change on donation policy for humanitarian purposes to Myanmar after concerns raised by Amnesty International that the donation may have been made to the Myanmar military. However, this remedy described by the Company is not related to human rights on its own operation nor how the Company would remedy some issue identified through a grievance mechanism. [The Progress Updates Concerning The Letter From Amnesty International, 14/12/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: Japanese authorities urged to investigate Kirin over donations made by subsidiary to Myanmar military during ethnic cleansing in Rakhine State • Area: Right to Security • Story: In June 2018, Amnesty International called on the Japanese government to conduct an investigation into payments made by a subsidiary of Kirin Holdings to the Myanmar military during the peak of the ethnic cleansing campaign carried out against the Rohingya population in late 2017. Amnesty alleges that Kirin Holding Company's subsidiary Myanmar Brewery made three donations totaling USD \$30,000 to the Myanmar authorities between 1 September and 3 October 2017. Although the intended purpose of the donations was to help victims of the violence, Amnesty claims the first donation was made at a televised ceremony in the capital Nay Pyi Taw, where staff of Myanmar Brewing gave a donation of USD \$6,000 to the Commander-in Chief of Myanmar's armed forces, Senior General Min Aung Hlaing. According to Amnesty, General Min Aung Hlaing allegedly said that the donations would go in part toward "security personnel and state service personnel" operating in Rakhine State. In a letter from Nobuhiko Hori, the Deputy Director of Group Corporate Communications at Kirin Holdings, to Amnesty International, Mr Hori said that the two subsequent donations consisted of rice and cooking oil and money that was given directly to local volunteers in Sittawe and thus shouldn't be considered comparable to the first donation given by Myanmar Brewing. Kirin owns a 55% stake in Myanmar Brewing, which it purchased in 2015. • Sources: [Amnesty International - 14/06/2018: amnesty.ca][The Guardian - 15/06/2018: theguardian.com][Box (Kirin correspondence with Amnesty) - 13/06/2018: app.box.com][Daily Mail (via AFP) - 14/06/2018: dailymail.co.uk]
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response available: The company responds publicly to the allegations through a statement to the Guardian newspaper and to the Agence France-Presse. [Daily Mail article (Myanmar), 14/06/2018: dailymail.co.uk & Guardian article (Myanmar), N/A: theguardian.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Response goes into detail: In a statement to the Guardian newspaper Kirin Holding Company said: "The company takes human rights and the allegations seriously, and is planning to improve the donation process. While this investigation is ongoing, all corporate donations in Myanmar have been halted". Additionally in comments reported by the Agence France-Presse, spokesman Nobuhiko Hori said members of the military were present during the first of the three donation rounds but said they believed the money was for relief. The second and third donations -- which included cooking supplies -- were handed directly to victims, he said. "We're taking seriously (the allegation) that we didn't sufficiently trace the money," he said, adding Kirin was halting any future funding pending the investigation. [Daily Mail article (Myanmar), 14/06/2018: dailymail.co.uk & Guardian article (Myanmar), N/A: theguardian.com]
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: The company in its Human Rights policy says "We understand that our business activities may have direct or indirect human rights impacts at every stage in the value chain, from R&D and procurement of raw materials to consumption/use of our products and services. We are committed to respecting human rights as set out in the International Bill of Human Rights and the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work." [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The company in its Human Rights policy says "This policy applies to all the executives and employees - including part-time, dispatch and contract workers - of the Kirin Group, which constitutes Kirin Holdings Company, Limited and its consolidated subsidiaries...We expect that all of our business partners adhere to this policy. The Kirin Group will work to make our suppliers aware of this Policy, and we expect their compliance." [Human Rights Policy, 09/02/2018: kirinholdings.co.jp] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The company does not have a policy committing it to respect International Humanitarian Law.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders: There is no publicly available evidence that the company has engaged with the Rohingya people and victims of the Myanmar army's military operations in Rakhine state. In a letter to Amnesty International, addressing the issue of the financial donation made to the Myanmar army, the President and CEO of Kirin Holdings, Yoshinori Isozaki says "We were told that the donations would be sent to victims of the conflict in Rakhine, and we did not sufficiently pursue details of which vehicle would ultimately be responsible for doing so. We understood from follow-up enquiries that the Rakhine State government distributed the funds." However this isn't engagement with the affected stakeholders. [Kirin CEO letters to Amnesty International, 22/05/2018] • Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders: In a letter to Amnesty International, addressing the issue of the financial donation made to the Myanmar army, the President and CEO of Kirin Holdings, Yoshinori Isozaki says "Kirin is preparing to conduct a Human Rights Impact Assessment of Myanmar Brewery's suppliers and business partners in Myanmar. We have control over operations managed or engaged in by Myanmar Brewery, but there are limits to the extent we can directly influence the activities of business partners outside of the joint venture. As such, under our Group Human Rights Policy we will continue to seek the understanding and support of MEHL for our human rights policy". This is not sufficient encouragement of Myanmar Brewing to engage with affected stakeholders. [Kirin CEO letters to Amnesty International, 22/05/2018] • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: There is no publicly available evidence that remedy has been provided to the Rohingya people and victims of the Myanmar army's military operations in Rakhine state. • Met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: In a letter to Amnesty International, addressing the issue of the financial donation made to the Myanmar army, the President and CEO of Kirin Holdings, Yoshinori Isozaki says, "We have initiated a re-assessment of the entire donation process, from request and collection to publicity and distribution to beneficiaries....This lack of traceability is one of the key issues we plan to address in our revised process, which will also include a closer assessment of the different organizations that may be available to provide effective aid....we intend to improve our donation assessment by putting in place a more rigorous and defined process to assess the nature and appropriateness of the organization managing the donations, the purpose of the donations, and how donated funds will be used and publicized. The company has reviewed its process for providing donations. [Kirin CEO letters to Amnesty International, 22/05/2018] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims: There is no publicly available evidence that remedy has been provided to the Rohingya people and victims of the Myanmar army's military operations in Rakhine state. • Met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders: The company has conducted a human rights impact assessment in Myanmar. Additionally in a letter to Amnesty International, addressing the issue of the financial donation made to the Myanmar army, the President and CEO of Kirin Holdings, Yoshinori Isozaki says, "We are putting in place a timeframe to address these points of concern in a new donation process. The revised process will include a provision that our donations must be traceable, and if funds cannot be tracked then we will select alternative audited channels that fulfil our tracing criteria. [Kirin CEO letters to Amnesty International, 22/05/2018]

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