

Company Name Starbucks
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
UNGP Core Score (*) 4.5 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
1	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
2	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
0	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
0	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence		
Embedding respect		
0	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
0	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.2 HRDD - Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)
0	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
0	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed
Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms		
1.5	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
4.5	26	

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

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

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

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

Detailed assessment

Governance and Policies

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: General HRs commitment: In its Global Human Rights Statement, the Company states: 'Starbucks Global Human Rights Policy emphasizes Starbucks commitment to basic human rights as a core component of the way Starbucks does business and how Starbucks engages its employees' [Global Human Rights Statement: globalassets.starbucks.com] • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: 'Starbucks signed the UN Global Compact in June 2004. We consider these principles to be a natural extension of our Mission Statement, which defines our commitment to social and environmental responsibility'. [UN Global Compact: starbucks.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGPs • Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	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 commits to respect all ILO Core in its Global Human Rights Statement. With respect freedom of association and collective bargaining, the Company states. 'Starbucks respects employees' rights to engage in free association and to participate in a collective bargaining process should they so choose.' [Global Human Rights Statement: globalassets.starbucks.com] • Met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers: The Supplier Social Responsibility Standards document covers all ILO core as well as health and safety. With respect to freedom of association and collective bargaining, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers must recognize and respect the right of workers to freedom of association and to bargain collectively. Workers must not be subject to intimidation or harassment in the exercise of their right to join or to refrain from joining any organization.' The Company further states that 'we require our suppliers to communicate and uphold these Standards with their employees, suppliers, contractors and subcontractors and, when appropriate, to post them in the local language in a prominent place accessible to all workers.' [Supplier Social Responsibility Standards: Manufactured Goods and Services, 2006: globalassets.starbucks.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company commits to respect all ILO Core in its Global Human Rights Statement. With respect freedom of association and collective bargaining, the Company states. 'Starbucks respects employees' rights to engage in free association and to participate in a collective bargaining process should they so choose.' [Global Human Rights Statement: globalassets.starbucks.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: See above [Global Human Rights Statement: globalassets.starbucks.com] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: See above [Supplier Social Responsibility Standards: Manufactured Goods and Services, 2006: globalassets.starbucks.com]
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company indicates on its Website: 'It is our vision that we will help inspire our partners, customers, suppliers and neighbours to create positive change. To be innovators, leaders and contributors to an inclusive society and a healthy environment so that Starbucks and everyone we touch can endure and thrive'. However there is no commitment to engage with potentially or actually affected stakeholders. [Social Impact, N/A: starbucks.com] <p>• Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations • Not met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including in AG supply chain • Not met: Example of Actions decided Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including AG suppliers

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: Starbucks states that a potential violation of the Global Human Rights Policy can be reported by following the Company's Anti-Harassment / Anti-Retaliation Compliant Procedure or the Standards of Business Conduct. The Ethics and Compliance helpline and WebLine are also available for all partners (workers). [Business Ethics and Compliance -Standards of Business Conduct, 2011] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: Its Ethics and Compliance website is available in 10 languages (Chinese and Thai included). In addition, Starbucks states that 'a live interpreter can be made available upon request' [Ethics and Compliance Helpline: businessconduct.eaweblines.com & Speak up: livingourvalues.starbucks.com] • Not met: Expect AG supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: In its Supplier Social Responsibility Standards the Company indicates: 'suppliers must foster and maintain conditions in which workers can freely communicate grievances and expect prompt and reasonable action'. However, there is no further requirements about these conditions, or if they imply a proper grievance system. [Supplier Social Responsibility Standards: Manufactured Goods and Services, 2006: globalassets.starbucks.com] • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Grievance mechanism for community Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: Animale, Work Global Brazil and others linked to slave labor in Brazil Nestle Nespresso, Starbucks, and Syngenta's Nucoffee reported to have sourced coffee from Brazilian farms using forced labor and child labor • Area: Forced Labour Working Hours • Story: 3 May 2019, In April 2019 the Brazilian Government updated its 'Dirty List' of employers - those deemed guilty by an internal government body to have engaged in acts of modern slavery - to include 48 additional employers. The article notes "Another new member of the 'dirty list' is the producer of Fazenda Cedro II, in Triângulo Mineiro, Helvécio Sebastião Batista, who sells Café Fazenda Cedro," which had been certified with Nespresso and Starbucks quality seals and used to provide coffee for both brands. The article observes that labor inspectors found six workers on the farm, after inspection in July 2018, with exhaustive hours that went, in some cases, from 6am to 11 pm, in addition to hygiene conditions considered degrading in the lodgings. The article adds that at Cedro II and other properties managed by Batista, labor inspectors have found 19 more workers in slavery-like conditions, in addition to the six that caused his property's inclusion on the Dirty List. Those properties lacked proper toilets and had no kitchen facilities. The workers also reported working exhaustive hours, in some cases until 11pm, often without their mandatory weekly day off. In a statement to Reporter Brasil, Starbucks said it would investigate the episode, which "could lead to the suspension of the commercial relationship with a farm until the case has been clarified". The company has since announced that it suspended the farm from its supplier list because of the charges. In Brazil slavery is defined as forced labor, but also includes debt bondage, degrading work conditions, long hours that pose a health risk or work that violates human dignity. • Sources: [Reporter Brasil - 03/05/2019: reporterbrasil.org.br][Monga Bay - 03/05/2019: news.mongabay.com][Reporter Brasil - 04/04/2019: reporterbrasil.org.br]
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response available: In its response to Reporter Brasil Starbucks said it will look into the incident and that it has suspended the farm from its supplier list because of the charges. It said the farm's practices previously complied with the C.A.F.E. certification seal, which follows "ethical and sustainable standards" developed in partnership with Conservation International and overseen by SCS Global Services. [Reporter Brasil article about workers: reporterbrasil.org.br] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response goes into detail: The company's response doesn't provide sufficient detail on the allegations.
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"> • Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: The company's Global Human Rights statement prohibits forced labour "Starbucks will not make use of any form of forced or compulsory labor at any time for any purpose. Wages will be paid regularly and according to all Starbucks requirements and applicable laws. It is prohibited for any employees to instruct or permit any other partner or individual doing work on Starbucks behalf to work any amount of time for which the partner is deliberately not compensated". In its Supplier Responsibility Standards the company states "Starbucks will not tolerate the use of any forced or involuntary labor, either directly or indirectly, by our suppliers, contractors or subcontractors. This includes the use of slave labor, bonded labor, indentured labor or involuntary convict labor." [Global Human Rights Statement: globalassets.starbucks.com & Supplier Social Responsibility Standards: Manufactured Goods and Services, 2006: globalassets.starbucks.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The company's Global Human Rights Policy "applies to all Starbucks employees. Starbucks expects any parties who do business on Starbucks behalf to conduct business in ways that uphold the principles of this Policy." In its Supplier Responsibility Standards the company states "We require our suppliers to communicate and uphold these Standards with their employees, suppliers, contractors and subcontractors and, when appropriate, to post them in the local language in a prominent place accessible to all workers. Suppliers shall communicate these Standards verbally to any illiterate workers." [Global Human Rights Statement: globalassets.starbucks.com & Supplier Social Responsibility Standards: Manufactured Goods and Services, 2006: globalassets.starbucks.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: In its Supplier Responsibility Standards the company states Starbucks will not tolerate the use of any forced or involuntary labor, either directly or indirectly, by our suppliers, contractors or subcontractors. This includes the use of slave labor, bonded labor, indentured labor or involuntary convict labor. Workers cannot be required to surrender their identity papers or other original personal documents or pay deposits as a condition of employment. Workers must be free to leave the workplace at the end of their shift and to resign without repercussion. All overtime should be voluntary and should not be in excess of legal limits." [Global Human Rights Statement: globalassets.starbucks.com & Supplier Social Responsibility Standards: Manufactured Goods and Services, 2006: globalassets.starbucks.com]
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"> • Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders: In its response to Reporter Brasil Starbucks said it will look into the incident and that it has suspended the farm from its supplier list because of the charges...However there is no evidence that the company has engaged with the affected stakeholders. • Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders: In its response to Reporter Brasil Starbucks said it will look into the incident and that it has suspended the farm from its supplier list because of the charges...However there is no evidence that Starbucks has encouraged the Owner and Administrator of the farm to engage with the affected stakeholders. • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: There is no evidence that remedy has been provided to the affected stakeholders. • Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: In its response to Reporter Brasil Starbucks said it will look into the incident and that it has suspended the farm from its supplier list because of the charges...However there is no evidence that the company has reviewed its management systems in light of the allegations. • Not met: Denies allegations, but reviewed systems to prevent such impacts <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims: There is no evidence that remedy has been provided to the victims. • Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders: In its response to Reporter Brasil Starbucks said it will look into the incident and that it has suspended the farm from its supplier list because of the charges...However there is no evidence that the company has reviewed its management systems in light of the allegations. However there is no evidence that it has improved its systems or engaged with the affected stakeholders.

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