

Company Name Tyson Foods
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
UNGP Core Score (*) 6.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
1	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 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)		
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
6.0	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	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: According to the Sustainability Report, Tyson Foods states that "Our policies and practices follow the human rights principles set forth in the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labor Organization's Fundamental Principles and Labor Standards. Team member rights are further strengthened through the Ethics Help Line, annual Compliance Training and the Social Compliance auditing program." [2018 Sustainability Report, 2018 & 2019 Sustainability Report, 2020: tysonsustainability.com] • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: Tyson Foods is a member of UN Global Compact. [UN Global Compact, 08/08/2019: unglobalcompact.org] • Met: UDHR: See above. • Met: International Bill of Rights: According to the Sustainability Report, Tyson Foods states that "Our policies and practices follow the human rights principles set forth in the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labor Organization's Fundamental Principles and Labor Standards." [2018 Sustainability Report, 2018 & 2019 Sustainability Report, 2020: tysonsustainability.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	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: ILO Core: According to its Sustainability Report, the Company states that 'Our policies and practices follow the human rights principles set forth in the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labor Organization's Fundamental Principles and Labor Standards. Team member rights are further strengthened through the Ethics Help Line, annual Compliance Training and the Social Compliance auditing program'. [2018 Sustainability Report, 2018 & 2019 Sustainability Report, 2020: tysonsustainability.com] • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: Tyson Foods has recently joined UNGC. [UN Global Compact, 08/08/2019: unglobalcompact.org] • Met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers: The Company indicates it expects its suppliers to make the commitments such as: 'Ensure no forced labor or child labor is being use [...] Respect the right of employees to freely associate, organize, and bargain collectively [...] Prohibit discrimination, harassment and workplace violence' under the section Labor and Human Rights. [Supplier Code 2019, 11/06/2019: tysonfoods.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: In the Code of Conduct, the following commitments are explicated: Child Labor, Forced labor, Freedom of Association. In the Team Member, statements as "Team members can choose whether or not they want to unite for collective bargaining purposes." highlights the commitment to collective bargain. Besides, "Non discrimination" is also mentioned. In addition, in the Company's website section 'Human Rights' it states: 'We do not tolerate child or forced labor in any of our operations or facilities. [...] Freedom of association - We respect your right to join or not to join a trade union, or to have recognized employee representation in accordance with local law.' However, CHRB could not find alternative measures to support freedom of association and collective bargaining rights where they are restricted by law. [Team Member Promise, 2017: tysonfoods.com & Human Rights, 09/2019: tysoncodeofconduct.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Respect H&S of workers: According to the Team Member Promise, the Company states that "Tyson strives to provide a safe workplace for all team members. Our company is committed to reducing workplace injuries and illnesses year-over-year. All team members are expected to support a safe working environment by working safely and according to the safety training provided." [Team Member Promise, 2017: tysonfoods.com] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: According to the Supplier Code, the Company states: 'We are committed to fostering our strong safety culture, to conducting business in a way that protects our team members and to integrating health and safety into every process. We expect our suppliers to operate in a manner that makes continuous efforts to achieve a workplace that is free from work-related injuries and illness'. [Supplier Code 2019, 11/06/2019: tysonfoods.com]
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: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company states that 'To better serve our communities, we want to understand the diverse needs and makeup of our team members and communities. Since 2017, we've conducted independent community social baseline assessments of our operations in over 20 Tyson Foods plant communities. The assessments examined the impacts and risks in the communities where we do business, and how we might be a better neighbour and employer of choice'. In addition, the Company states that 'We're committed to keep local grain local within our supply chain. We actively build resources for and relationships with grain farmers who provide locally grown corn for our birds, through our Local Grain Services (LGS) program. LGS increases the number of farmers who sell direct, while decreasing supply chain inefficiencies and waste – a win-win for our grain suppliers and our business'. [2018 Sustainability Report, 2018] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: According to the Sustainability Report, the Company possesses a Social Baseline Study (SBS). 'The study's goal is to examine the impacts and risks in the communities where we do business, and how we might be a better neighbour and employer of choice.' In this sense, there is evidence that the Company monitors its stakeholders. Also, the Company provides an example of a social baseline assessment in Eagle Mountain, Utah, where Tyson Fresh Meats plans to build a new plant. However, it is not clear whether affected stakeholders are involved in the actual design or monitoring of the Company's human rights' approach. [2018 Sustainability Report, 2018 & 2019 Sustainability Report, 2020: tysonsustainability.com]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	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 remedy <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 • 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: Tyson Foods commits to ILO Conventions, according to it is stated in the Sustainability Report. [2019 Sustainability Report, 2020: tysonsustainability.com] • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: According to the Sustainability Report 'John R. Tyson, our Chief Sustainability Officer, who reports to our CEO and regularly interacts with the company's Board of Directors, is responsible for leading and implementing our sustainability strategy. John is supported by a team of sustainability professionals who facilitate our goal-setting efforts, including actions to manage or mitigate risks, as well as the pursuit of continual improvement opportunities related to animals, communities, the environment, food and the workplace. [2019 Sustainability Report, 2020: tysonsustainability.com] <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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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): In the California Transparency Code, the Company states that "Tyson may engage in verification measures where it deems appropriate to evaluate and address risks of human trafficking and slavery in connection with our supply chain, including possible site visits and independent third party audits (announced or unannounced) to ensure compliance with contractual obligations and the Supplier Code of Conduct. " However, no evidence found of a proactive assessment carried out to assess company wide which are its human rights salient issues. Current evidence seems to refer to compliance monitoring. [California Transparency Code, 22/08/2017: s22.q4cdn.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks • 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 • Not met: Including AG suppliers 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: The Company provides a toll-free number and web-based reporting mechanism (Ethics Help Line) for team members who are obligated to report suspected violations of Code of Conduct or the law. [2019 Sustainability Report, 2020: tysonsustainability.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company reports the complaint areas and also discloses that 'During FY2019, our Ethics Department received 5,527 contacts related to Employment Practices. Of the investigated contacts, 75% were deemed unsubstantiated. The remaining 25% of calls were substantiated and resolved. While the option to report anonymously is available, 60% of team members making reports in FY2019 chose to provide contact information. In comparison data provided by a reputable benchmarking report shows, on average, 58% of those who contact a company hotline provide contact information'. However it is not clear the total among of complaints that were related to human rights, and how many of those were either addressed or resolved. [2019 Sustainability Report, 2020: tysonsustainability.com] Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: According to the Sustainability Report, the Ethics Help Line is managed by a team of corporate ethics and compliance professionals and is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and services are available in multiple languages by phone or the Internet. [Supplier Code 2019, 11/06/2019: tysonfoods.com] Met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers: The supplier code contains channels to contact Tyson to report ethical concerns, including a help line, a web line, and Tyson Foods' ethics and compliance department. [Supplier Code 2019, 11/06/2019: tysonfoods.com]
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 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		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