

Company Name Teck Resources
Industry Extractive
UNGP Core Score (*) 18.5 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
2	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
1.5	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence		
Embedding respect		
2	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
2	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		
1.5	2	C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers
2	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
18.5	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	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 it is 'committed to respecting and observing all human rights'. [Human Rights Policy, 20/04/2020: teck.com] • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company is a signatory to UN Global Compact since 2007. UN Global Compact provides a framework for businesses committed to aligning their operations and strategies with 10 principles spanning human rights, labour, the environment and anti-corruption. [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com & Human Rights Policy, 20/04/2020: teck.com] • Not met: International Bill of Rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: UNGPs: Furthermore, the company states 'As adopters of the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs), we are committed to respecting the rights of our employees, the communities in which we are active, and others affected by our activities'. [Memberships and Partnerships, N/A: teck.com & Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Met: OECD: As indicated above, the Company states in its Human Rights Policy: 'As a responsible company operating globally, we are committed to respecting and observing all human rights, as articulated in [...] and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises'. [Human Rights Policy, 20/04/2020: teck.com]
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 in its Human Rights Policy that it is committed to respecting and observing all human rights, as articulated in the ILO Core Conventions. [Human Rights Policy, 20/04/2020: teck.com] • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company is a signatory to UN Global Compact. Its commitment includes no discriminatory conduct, no forced labour or child labour occurs in the workplace. It also upholds freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining for its workforce. [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com & Code of Sustainable Conduct, N/A: teck.com] • Met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs: The Company indicates in its Expectation for Suppliers document that 'Teck's expectations for Suppliers and Contractors ("Supplier Expectations") have been established to clearly communicate Teck's expectations for suppliers of goods and contractors performing services ("suppliers" for or on behalf of Teck'. Although this document does not cover all ILO core areas, the policy also indicates that: 'The Supplier Expectations supplement the requirements, guidelines and standards of conduct described in Teck's other internal and external policies. This includes Teck's Code of Ethics, [...], Code of Sustainable Conduct, Health, Safety, Environment and Community Management Standards, Indigenous Peoples Policy, Human Rights Policy [...] amongst others'. As indicated below, the Code of Sustainable conduct covers each ILO core area, including the provision to 'Uphold freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining for our workforce'. [Code of Sustainable Conduct, N/A: teck.com & Teck's Expectations for Suppliers and Contractors, 01/2016: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company states in its Code of Sustainable Conduct that it ensures that no discriminatory conduct, no forced labour or child labour occurs in the workplace. It also upholds freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining for its workforce ('uphold freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining for our workforce, and provide fair living wages and working hours'). [Code of Sustainable Conduct, N/A: teck.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company states in its Health & Safety Policy that it is responsible for providing a safe workplace, effectively managing workplace risk and is committed to providing leadership and resources for managing health and safety. [Health & Safety Policy, 09/2014: teck.com] • Met: H&S applies to EX BPs: The Company states in its Expectations for Suppliers and Contractors that suppliers should establish, maintain and rigorously enforce practices that are protective of worker health and safety. [Teck's Expectations for Suppliers and Contractors, 01/2016: teck.com]
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	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: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company states that its direct engagement of stakeholders is organized into three broad levels: information disclosure, dialogue and participation. Its corporate teams also carry out direct engagement on an ongoing basis. The Company also carries out indirect engagement through the application of externally developed standards and frameworks that reflect stakeholder expectations. Its engagement with stakeholders is guided by HSEC Management Standards and Social Management and Responsibility at Teck (SMART) tools, and engagement outcomes are reported to the Safety and Sustainability Committee of Board of Directors and to HSEC Risk Management Committee. The Company presents a selection of its 'Major Engagement Activities in 2019' with communities, including: 'Engaged with community members, government agencies and Indigenous Peoples on implementation and advancement of the Elk Valley Water Quality Plan'. See below. [2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: In its 'Our approach to human rights' document, it indicates: 'We conduct ongoing due diligence [...] through regular social risk assessments. Identified risks are integrated into management plans and activities as outlined in our SMART toolkit. Significant risks related to human rights are acted upon and responses, communicating how issues are being addressed, are tracked'. It also indicates that 'Guided by our Health, Safety, Environment and Community (HSEC) Management Standards and our SMART Framework, we require all 12 (100%) of our operations, all eight (100%) of our development projects, both (100%) of our joint ventures, and all of our exploration teams to engage and consult with stakeholders and communities to address potential, current and emerging issues, and to maximize opportunities that provide strategic value, for Teck and for those communities'. [Engagement Reporting, N/A: teck.com & 2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	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: Commits to remedy: The Company states that its external standards and commitments include UNGPs. Furthermore, the company states 'Teck demonstrates its corporate commitment to remedy through effective implementation of its site-based feedback mechanisms. We recognize that the nature of mining activities, whether in exploration, construction, operation or closure, create the potential for a wide range of human rights risks and we work to mitigate those risks.' Additionally, in its 2018 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'In 2018, we worked to ensure appropriate management and remedy of negative feedback and significant incidents, through continual improvement of our feedback mechanisms and the reporting and management of incidents. This included a specific focus on improving tracking and reporting of grievances through reporting technologies and practices.' [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com & Memberships and Partnerships, N/A: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Not obstructing access to other remedies: The Company states in its 'Our approach to human rights' document that it 'does not impede access to state-based judicial or non-judicial mechanisms or other mechanisms (such as international mechanisms) for persons who make allegations of adverse human rights impacts'. [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives: It also states: 'We participate in non-judicial grievance mechanisms provided by the state where these are available to resolve grievances'. In its Sustainability Report, it presents an example of collaboration: 'Quebrada Blanca Operations: In late 2017, one of the unions representing operations employees filed a request for intervention and mediation by the Chilean National Contact Point (NCP) under the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, citing alleged human rights concerns with respect to environmental impacts and collective agreement negotiations. Following extended dialogue with the NCP as it evaluated the union's request, in 2019 Teck formally

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			entered into NCP mediation on the issues raised. The dispute was resolved in September 2019, resulting in requirements for both parties to resume dialogue under the collective agreement and for Teck to undertake specific actions that will be regularly monitored until 2020' [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com & 2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Work with EX BPs to remedy impacts

Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	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: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. The Company is signatory to the UN Global Compact. • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: In its Approach to Human Rights document, the Company indicates: 'The following senior leaders are accountable for management of human rights at Teck: • The Senior Vice President, Sustainability and External Affairs reports directly to our CEO and is responsible for sustainability, health and safety, environment, community, Indigenous affairs and human rights • The Vice President, Community and Government Relations leads activities related to social management and responsibility, community engagement and community investment, Indigenous affairs and human rights • Teck's legal department is responsible for the oversight of the Human Rights Policy. Teck has an internal Human Rights Working Group (HRWG) to align and focus efforts across the organization in support of embedding Teck's Human Rights Policy.' [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: In addition, the Company states: 'Members of HRWG work together to enhance Teck's human rights management and reporting, to increase awareness and internal alignment on human rights, and to strengthen the network of human rights practitioners at Teck.' [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs: In its Sustainability Report 2018, the Company summarizes the day-to-day responsibilities for Supply Chain Management, including human rights issues: 'Through responsible supply chain management, our objective is to ensure that we minimize our potential impacts on people and on the environment, and that we manage business and reputation risks while capitalizing on opportunities. [...] Supply chain management is a multidisciplinary function at Teck involving several departments: [...] Community and Government Relations group administers the Human Rights Policy, which is overseen by our Legal department; these groups work together to embed human rights considerations into our supply chain management practices. [...] Corporate Risk and Legal groups support our Supply Management, Logistics and Transportation, and Operations and Exploration groups. The Corporate Risk group identifies and manages supply chain risks through the corporate risk assessment processes while the Legal group manages commercial contract development and compliance with Teck's policies related to our supply chain'. It also states that its scope 'covers all of the operations managed by Teck and also, where appropriate, key issues at exploration and development projects and at joint venture operations.' In addition, the Company indicates in its 'Our approach to human rights' document: 'Human Rights Management in Joint Ventures (JVs): Teck has several joint venture partners, including, for example, Newmont Corporation[...] Newmont Corporation and Teck have a shared committee that is responsible for ensuring JV partners are represented in the Health, Safety, Environment and Community (HSEC) sphere'. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com]

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 indicates in its Sustainability Report: 'As guided by the UNGP, we determine and report on our most significant or salient human rights issues. [...] We proactively identify areas of highest human rights risk so we can prevent adverse impacts from occurring and conduct human rights assessment at our operations. We review human rights practices and performance on an annual basis, and conduct assessments of human rights management at our sites every two years. The last assessments were conducted in 2018 and will take place again in 2020. The 2018 results were used to inform Teck's overall salient human rights issues and also to identify potential risk areas to integrate into ongoing social risk assessments and management activities at individual sites'. [2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Met: identifying risks in EX business partners: In addition, the Company reports: 'Each year, Teck's Human Rights Working Group identifies human rights risks and impacts through a saliency assessment. During the saliency assessment, we identify and prioritize the most significant human rights risks to individuals throughout our value chain so we can better focus our policies and programs that have the biggest impact on people impacted by our business activities. [...] Our operations complete a biannual self assessment with the Human Rights Working Group chair that involves the General Manager of each operation and their nominees for Human Resources, Environment and Communities, and Supply management/ materials management/procurement'. The Company also discloses its approach to managing sustainability in the value chain, including the work of the 'supply chain management group' and 'materials stewardship team'. 'Inbound supply chain risks are initially identified as part of the analysis and identification of critical suppliers by our Supply Management group. Outbound supply chain risks are identified by the Logistics and Transportation group as well as by the Materials Stewardship working group, which advises and develops active risk management processes to reduce the impacts of our products and to ensure products satisfy or exceed regulatory, environmental and societal needs'. [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com & Our approach to value chain, 03/2020: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: As indicated above: 'The last assessments were conducted in 2018 and will take place again in 2020. The 2018 results were used to inform Teck's overall salient human rights issues and also to identify potential risk areas to integrate into ongoing social risk assessments and management activities at individual sites'. 'During the saliency assessment, we identify and prioritize the most significant human rights risks to individuals throughout our value chain'. [2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: As part of its process to manage impacts, 'Sites prioritize any impacts, real or perceived, that are identified as being of highest significance to COIs [Communities of Interest]. Regular, effective COI mapping, engagement and operational feedback mechanisms also support impact management efforts, as well as helping the company identify any vulnerabilities and potential human rights risks related to our activities.' [Our Approach to Relationships with Communities, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances: The Company indicates the following: 'Prior to entering a country to conduct exploration activities, we assess a range of social risks associated with operating in each jurisdiction, including those relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National security, including terrorism, social unrest, border conflict, religious conflict and ethnic conflict • Personal security, including kidnapping, extortion, hijacking and robbery • Personal health, including access to safe water, pollution levels, sanitation and disease; Based on the results of these assessments, we decide whether it is appropriate for us to pursue exploration activities in a given location.' However, no evidence could be found that the Company performs human rights due diligence related to labour standards prior to entering a new country. [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): The Company indicates how it assesses social risks: They 'begin with evaluating the geographic range of impact of a site's or project's activities and developing a tailored social risk profile. [...] Examples of social risks include environmental concerns contributing to erosion of community trust, and disputes around land rights affecting local livelihoods or cultural practices'. In its Sustainability Report, it indicates: 'We review human rights practices and performance on an annual basis, and conduct assessments of human rights management at our sites every two years. The last assessments were conducted in 2018 and will take place again in 2020. The 2018 results were used to inform Teck's overall salient human rights issues and also to identify potential risk areas to integrate into ongoing social risk assessments and management activities at individual sites.' [2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com & Our Approach to Relationships with Communities, 12/3/2020: teck.com]
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	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: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company indicates the following: 'Each year, Teck's Human Rights Working Group identifies human rights risks and impacts through a saliency assessment. During the saliency assessment, we identify and prioritize the most significant human rights risks to individuals throughout our value chain so we can better focus our policies and programs that have the biggest impact on people impacted by our business activities. In 2019, we conducted our saliency assessment in line with the UNGPs. This process included: • Desktop research including a review of relevant internal policies and procedures, peer review benchmarking, and a media scan. This review considered social, geographical and economic factors that influence our impacts on human rights • Internal stakeholder interviews from a diverse cross-section of Teck business areas, and reviews of our biannual operations human rights self assessments • A workshop to prioritize the most significant human rights risks to individuals with multidisciplinary attendees'. [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company reports its salient human rights issues, including: Right to safe and healthy working conditions; Right to freedom of association, assembly and collective bargaining; Right to not be subjected to slavery, servitude or forced labour (specific to supply chains); Right to non discrimination in employment / occupation; Right to adequate standard of living; Right to clean water and sanitation, among others. [2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com & Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met: See above.
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:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company states in its Sustainability Report 2018: 'If issues or new risks are identified, they are brought to the attention of senior leadership through our HSEC Risk Management Committee and Teck's Safety and Sustainability Committee of the Board. All our operations have preventive control measures in place to minimize the likelihood of incidents and to mitigate potential effects on employees, communities or the environment in case an incident does occur. We apply a hierarchy of controls to strengthen our ability to prevent and mitigate risk. Control measures include facility design considerations, spill containment measures, monitoring systems and alarms, standard operating procedures, training, regular inspections, and the identification of potential issues through internal risk assessments and audits'. In addition, in its Sustainability Report 2019, the Company summarizes its salient human rights issues in a table and the reference to the section in the report where related activities and actions are reported. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & 2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Not met: Including amongst EX BPs: The Company indicates: '

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Teck has several joint venture partners, including, for example, Newmont Corporation[...] Teck and Newmont Corporation are committed to ensuring that the project undertakes meaningful engagement with communities to better understand current human rights conditions and the risks and opportunities associated with human rights in the region. Newmont Corporation and Teck have a shared committee that is responsible for ensuring JV partners are represented in the Health, Safety, Environment and Community (HSEC) sphere.' However, no evidence found in public sources of how extractive business (beyond this joint venture) partners (including contractors) are included in the Company's Action Plan to mitigate risks identified and assessed as part of the due diligence process. No further evidence could be found in the 2019 report. [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com & 2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Example of Actions decided: 'In the period 2011 to 2017, our Quebrada Blanca Operations (QB) recorded 28 high-potential incidents associated with driving on Pintados Road near the operation. Through their ongoing implementation of the High-Potential Risk Control strategy, QB has implemented a range of control improvements to reduce incidents on this road. In 2018, no high-potential incidents were recorded'. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: System to check if Actions are effective: The Company indicates on its 'Our approach to Business & Sustainability' website section and document: 'Teck's Health, Safety, Environment and Community (HSEC) Management Standards outline a high-level framework for the identification and effective management of HSEC issues and risks to support continual improvement in related programs and performance'. Its HSEC Management standards cover topics including: '1. Safety, Health and Occupational Hygiene; 2. Communities and Indigenous Peoples . Human Rights 4.Water, Ecosystem and Biodiversity 5. Materials Stewardship and Energy Efficiency; among other. However, no further information found describing how the Company checks the effectiveness of its Action Plan to face salient human rights issues. [Our approach to business & sustainability, 03/2020: teck.com & Our approach to Business and Sustainability, N/A: teck.com] • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <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	0.5	<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: 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. • Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See indicator 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 EX business partners: 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 <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns: The Company discloses information about its SMART Framework: 'our approach to improving our social performance across Teck's sites while also recognizing the unique context and circumstances of each region. [...] Teck defines an incident as an "undesirable event arising from company activities that is both unplanned and uncontrolled, regardless of the severity of consequences". Company-wide criteria have been established for sites to identify, report and evaluate the severity of consequences, with respect to community incidents. Sites are expected to follow up on all incidents identified to understand the impacts and implement corrective actions wherever possible, with more significant incidents potentially subject to root cause investigation'. However, no details found describing how the Company responded to a specific human rights concern raised by affected stakeholders or its representatives. [Our Approach to Relationships with Communities, 12/3/2020: teck.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications: As indicated above, the Company discloses information about its SMART Framework: 'our approach to improving our social performance across Teck's sites while also recognizing the unique context and circumstances of each region. [...] Company-wide criteria have been established for sites to identify, report and evaluate the severity of consequences, with respect to community incidents. Sites are expected to follow up on all incidents identified to understand the impacts and implement corrective actions wherever possible, with more significant incidents potentially subject to root cause investigation.' However, no evidence found describing how the Company ensures that affected stakeholders are able to access to the information related to the Company's response when a specific human rights concern is raised. [Our Approach to Relationships with Communities, 12/3/2020: teck.com]

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	<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 employees can report their concerns to their supervisor or the Company's Senior Vice President & General Counsel, and, if they wish, any report can be made anonymously through the Whistleblower hotline. [Code of Ethics, 23/04/2009: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company reports that in 2018, that through the hotline it received '48 reports of alleged violations of our Code of Ethics in 2019. The areas for which we received the greatest number of reports were in relation to employee relations (34%), policy issues (15%) and safety (11%). Of these 48 cases, 28 were closed following investigation or were closed on the basis that no investigation was necessary. The remaining 20 cases are still under investigation.' However, it is not clear how many human rights related complaints were received and addressed or resolved. [2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The Company expects 'our employees and contractors, as well as community members, to bring human rights concerns to our attention through our site-level feedback mechanisms and our Doing What's Right hotline.' The hotline website is available in all languages of countries in which Teck operates'. [EthicsPoint, N/A: secure.ethicspoint.com & Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Not met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system • Met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers: The Company states 'are committed to engaging with our communities of interest on our human rights impacts and to reporting on our performance. We expect our employees and contractors, as well as community members, to bring human rights concerns to our attention through our site-level feedback mechanisms and our Doing What's Right hotline. This program accepts complaints in the languages of all countries where Teck is active.' [Our Approach to Human Rights, 12/3/2020: teck.com]
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	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: Grievance mechanism for community: In its Approach to Relationship with Communities, the Company states: 'Teck provides direct feedback mechanisms at every operation and project and in every exploration region to specifically ensure that those who want to provide feedback—whether it's a comment, question, concern, complaint or compliment—are able to do so easily and, if they wish, anonymously. Feedback mechanisms may include dedicated phone lines and in-person or online platforms.' In addition, in its 2018 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'All of our operations and major projects and most of our exploration projects have implemented feedback mechanisms, which help us to understand our impacts on communities and take steps to address negative impacts and replicate positive impacts. Feedback received is recorded and categorized into four levels: Level 1: Feedback/donation request; Level 2: Question or concern; Level 3: Issue, concern or grievance; Level 4: Repeated and ongoing concern, or an issue, concern or grievance that is major in nature and may include a breach of law or company policy'. [Our Approach to Relationships with Communities, 12/3/2020: teck.com & 2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: See above. Although, there is no specific information about local languages in public sources, channels are set for each operation and exploration region. [Our Approach to Relationships with Communities, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • Met: EX BPs communities use global system: In its Approach to Communities the company states that 'Teck provides direct feedback mechanisms at every operation and project and in every exploration region to specifically ensure that those who want to provide feedback—whether it's a comment, question, concern, complaint or compliment—are able to do so easily and, if they wish, anonymously. Feedback mechanisms may include dedicated phone lines and in-person or online platforms.' [Our Approach to Relationships with Communities, 12/3/2020: teck.com]
C.7	Remediating adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	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"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Company indicates in its Sustainability Report: '[...] feedback was received on topics that are relevant to human rights (including rights associated with local health, access to water, local livelihoods, safe and just working environment). In all cases, acknowledgement of the complaint was provided, as well as effort to remedy within a time-bound process'. However, no details found describing how remedy was provided. In addition, the Company reports on different incidents and how it proceeded, including the following: 'In late 2017, one of the unions representing operations employees filed a request for intervention and mediation by the Chilean National Contact Point (NCP) under the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, citing alleged human rights concerns with respect to environmental impacts and collective agreement negotiations. Following extended dialogue with the NCP as it evaluated the union's request, in 2019 Teck formally entered into NCP mediation on the issues raised. The dispute was resolved in September 2019, resulting in requirements for both parties to resume dialogue under the collective agreement and for Teck to undertake specific actions that will be regularly monitored through 2020'. However, no evidence found regarding the specific actions that the Company is undertaking to provide remedy. [2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com] • 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 • Met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism: The Company also reports: 'In 2019, we undertook an in-depth review of our existing community feedback guidance and tools as part of our commitment to strengthen our rights-based approach to social management. The review included a comprehensive gap analysis of our guidance against the UNGP, other international standards and industry best practice. The review also included the creation of site-level tools to review the effectiveness of feedback mechanisms and to screen any complaint with a human rights lens. These tools will help us identify strengths and gaps in the current design and implementation of site mechanisms, and enable us to focus on improvements in the most critical areas'. [2019 Sustainability Report, 12/3/2020: teck.com]

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

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

Disclaimer

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COPYRIGHT

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