

5.5

26

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2020 Company Scoresheet



Company Name Lindt & Sprüngli

Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain only)

UNGP Core Score (*) 5.5 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators				
Governance a	Governance and Policy Commitments					
2	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights				
1.5	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers				
1	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders				
0	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy				
Embedding 1	respect and Hun	nan Rights Due Diligence				
Embeddir	ng respect					
0	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day				
		human rights functions				
	lights Due Diligen					
0.5	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				
0.5	2	C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned				

(*) 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company states: 'Our long-term commitment to the UN Global Compact and its ten principles reflects our values'. [Sustainability Report 2018, 26/04/2019: lindt-spruengli.com & Sustainability Report 2019, 05/2020: lindt-spruengli.com & Sustainability Report 2019, 05/2020: lindt-spruengli.com Score 2 • Met: UNGPs: The Company states 'we respect the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. In addition, 'Lindt&Sprüngli recognizes its responsibility to respect human rights and international labor standards as defined in the UN Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights'. However, the statement does not refer to a formal commitment to UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. [Sustainability Report 2019, 05/2020: lindt-spruengli.com [Sustainability Report 2019] [Sustainability Report 2019] [Sustainability Report 2019] [Sustainability Report 2019
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company is a signatory to the Global Compact. In the Sustainability report the CEO indicates that 'our sustainability strategy also reflects the ten principles of the UN Global Compact. We have been committed to this initiatives since 2009 and provide an update on the progress we have made in our annual Sustainability Report'. [Business Code of Conduct, 13/06/2018: lindt-spruengli.com & Sustainability Report 2018, 26/04/2019: lindt-spruengli.com] • Met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers: The Company indicates that its suppliers shall not, under any circumstances, use forced, bonded or indentured labor or involuntary prison labor. Employment is voluntary. Suppliers shall not, under any circumstances, use child labor as defined by ILO and United Nations Convention and / or national law, whichever is more stringent. Suppliers shall strictly adhere to all applicable laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination in hiring and employment. 'Suppliers shall respect the rights of employees to form and join trade unions and bargain collectively. If Suppliers operate in a country where these rights are impaired by the law, they shall allow their employees to freely elect their own representatives which can enter into dialogue with the Supplier about working conditions.' [Supplier Code of Conduct 2016, 13/06/2018: lindt-spruengli.com] Score 2 • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material. • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company has a formal health and safety policy including ensuring compliance with all applicable national and international laws, regulations and industry standards, training employees and constantly update their knowledge, tracking relevant indicators, and etc. [Health and Safety Policy, 12/06/2018: lindt-spruengli.com] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: The Company s
			personal protective equipment. Suppliers shall involve workers in the process of identifying and mitigating risks to worker's health and safety. [Supplier Code of Conduct 2016, 13/06/2018: lindt-spruengli.com]
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states that it is committed to providing the various stakeholders with a transparent and detailed overview of the company. It engages with stakeholders including consumers,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			employees, investors, civil society organizations and NGOs, farmers and suppliers,
			and etc. However, it is [Sustainability Report 2018, 26/04/2019: lindt-spruengli.com
			& Sustainability Report 2019, 05/2020: <u>lindt-spruengli.com</u>]
			Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company states that it is
			committed to offering an attractive working environment and maintaining or
			increasing already high levels of employee engagement, satisfaction, and retention.
			In 2019, the Company conducted its employees survey and also discloses its results
			in the Sustainability Report. Additionally, the Company indicates its engagement
			with several stakeholders. However, it is not clear how often the company engages
			with stakeholders. [Sustainability Report 2019, 05/2020: <u>lindt-spruengli.com</u>]
			Score 2
			Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: Although the Company
			discloses its 'Lindt&Sprüngli Farming Program', this is not a formal commitment to
			engage with potentially and actually affected stakeholders. [Sustainability Report
			2019, 05/2020: <u>lindt-spruengli.com</u>]
			Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	remedy		Score 1
			Not met: Commits to remedy: The Company indicates it has a `Child Labor
			Monitoring & Remediation System` and indicates As part of the required
			remediation work, we expanded the community development activities, which
			focused on access to clean drinking water, to include the renovation of primary
			schools. It also states: 'Problems such as child labor on hazelnut farms and poor
		0	working conditions for migrant workers need to be remedied'. However, no
			evidence found of it committing to remedy the adverse impacts on individuals,
			workers and communities that it has caused or contributed to. [Sustainability
			Report 2018, 26/04/2019: <u>lindt-spruengli.com</u> & Sustainability Report 2019,
			05/2020: lindt-spruengli.com] Score 2
			Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives.
			Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives Not met: Work with AC complians to remedy impacts.
			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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. The Company is signatory to the UN Global Compact. • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company states: 'Our Corporate Sustainability Committee of the Board consists of three members of the Board of Directors. It supports the Board of Directors in setting the strategic course for company activities, while promoting comprehensive sustainable management.' However, there are no evidence indicating human rights approach and whether there's responsibility at senior management level. [Sustainability Report 2019, 05/2020: lindt-spruengli.com] Score 2 • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for AG in supply chain
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not met: Identifying risks in own operations Met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers: The Company states that the Lindt Cocoa Foundation also co-funds a second research project of the International Cocoa Initiative (ICI). The objective of this project is to develop further the ICI's Protective Cocoa Community Framework with a view to discovering which risk factors are strongly associated with child labour and developing a scoring system for these factors. This will enable stakeholders to adopt a targeted approach to reducing the risk factors which can lead to child labour. Also, the Company discloses that 'address the locally relevant challenges such as poverty, child labor, and deforestation and at the same time secure the supply of high-quality cocoa beans. We achieve this through higher productivity on the farms, diversified incomes, preservation of biodiversity and natural ecosystems, reduced risk of child labor, and improved infrastructure in communities'. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017: lindt-spruengli.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material. Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
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 Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks Not met: Including in AG supply chain Not met: Example of Actions decided 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not met: System to check if Actions are effective 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company needs to achieve at least 1,5 points in B.2.1 Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.2 Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans 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 Score 2 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)/mec hanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company indicates: 'In other Lindt&Sprüngli subsidiaries, local whistleblowing mechanisms have been put into place for employees to issue their concerns and report non-compliances. For example, a whistleblowing hotline has been established at Lindt & Sprüngli South Africa, and Lindt&Sprüngli Australia, Lindt & Sprüngli Italy and Lindt & Sprüngli Canada have also developed a whistleblowing policy/speak up program'. However, it is not clear whether all company workers have access to whistleblowing mechanisms. [Sustainability Report 2019, 05/2020: lindt-spruengli.com] Score 2 Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mec hanism(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 Not met: Grievance mechanism for community: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material. Score 2 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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Company reports: In 2019, 12 cases of child labor were observed by field staff during their child labor monitoring visits in the communities, where of only three cases were related to Lindt&Sprüngli Farming Program farmers. Of those three cases, two were found working on cocoa farms and one child was found doing work not related to cocoa farming. All of the 12 cases of child labor detected in 2019 were successfully and completely solved through conversations with parents, warnings or advices being given, and sensitization training to promote change'. Additionally, it discloses: 'having 29 schools currently under construction is expected to increase the reception capacity of existing schools to provide educational opportunities for more than 3,034 children in the communities each year. An estimated 999 students in total, respectively around 111 students per year, have so far attended school in the three-unit classroom block built in 2011/11'. However, it is not clear what specifric remedy was given to victims, as evidence seems to refer to conversations and with partents and supplier training. [Sustainability Report 2019, 05/2020: lindt-spruengli.com] Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 Met: Changes introduced to stop repetition: See above. The Company discloses: 'A number of initiatives within the framework of the Lindt&Sprüngli Farming Program are directed towards creating an environment conducive to growth, education and the protection of children. This will support us in our ambition to eliminate child labor in our communities. We have decided to move beyond our risk-oriented concept within the current "Action Plan Against Child Labor" to a more proactive and opportunity-based concept with a new "Action Plan for Child Protection". With this new orientation, we will strengthen our activities by combining both our supply chain and community-level approach

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

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

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