

Company Name Yum! Brands
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
UNGP Core Score (*) 4.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
1	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
0.5	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		
0.5	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	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
4.0	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: Ethics and Human Rights website: 'Yum! Maintains a work environment that respects and supports human rights for all of our employees around the world.'; Human Rights and Labor Practice Policy: 'Yum! Brands is committed to maintaining a work environment that respects and supports human rights for all of our employees around the world.' [Ethics and Human Rights on website, N/A: citizenship.yum.com & Human Rights and Labor Practices Policy, N/A: citizenship.yum.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs: The Company states in its Human Rights & Key Supply Chain Commitments Policy 'Palm Oil: Under the RSPO criteria, palm oil produced requires certification guidelines that support and align with a number of global human rights and social conventions including: The UN Guiding Principles on Human Rights (2011), principles 11 through 24; ILO Conventions on Forced Labor (1930) and on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007)'. The Company provided feedback to CHRB regarding this indicator ,but no evidence was found of how the Company itself is committed to follow and respect the UN Guiding Principles. [Human Rights & Key Supply Chain Commitments, N/A: citizenship.yum.com] Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	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: ILO Core: The company indicates that "We will not employ underage children or forced labourers and we prohibit physical punishment or abuse. We respect the right of all employees to associate or not to associate with any group, as permitted by applicable laws and regulations.[...] We promote, protect and help ensure the equal enjoyment of human rights by all persons, including minorities, women and those with disabilities" This policy covers non-discrimination, the prohibition of child labour and forced labour and freedom of association. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material, as commitment to Collective Bargaining is not explicit for Company workers. [Human Rights and Labor Practices Policy, 2020: citizenship.yum.com & YUM! Brands, Inc. Supplier Code of Conduct, 02/2020: s2.q4cdn.com] Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers: The supplier code of conduct included in the "human rights and Labour practices policy" 'addresses working hours and conditions, non-discrimination, child labour and forced or indentured labour.' The Company also states in the supplier code of conduct that suppliers must respect the rights of workers to associate, organize and bargain collectively in a lawful and peaceful manner without penalty or interference. However, it is not clear whether the Company is requiring to respecting those rights in all contexts, as it puts freedom of association and collective bargaining in the context of local law. In these cases, companies are expected to require alternative mechanisms or equivalent workers bodies where the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining is restricted under law. [Human Rights and Labor Practices Policy, 2020: citizenship.yum.com & YUM! Brands, Inc. Supplier Code of Conduct, 02/2020: s2.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: See above Met: Respect H&S of workers: The company is 'committed to providing safe and healthy work environments and to being an environmentally responsible corporate citizen. It is our policy to comply with all applicable environmental, safety and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			health laws and regulations.' [Yum! Global Code of Conduct, Feb 2019: s2.g4cdn.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: The supplier code of conduct included in the 'human rights and Labor practices policy' states that 'In compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, codes and industry standards, suppliers are expected to provide their employees with safe and healthy working conditions'. [Human Rights and Labor Practices Policy, 2020: citizenship.yum.com]
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states that consistent, honest and transparent engagement with stakeholders is foundational to its Global Citizenship & Sustainability Strategy. The list of engagement areas include "diversity and inclusion" and "human rights". The ongoing engagement focuses on working with stakeholders on priorities, identified through our materiality assessment, that address our three pillars of food, planet and people. There are many voices and points of view relative to these issues and our goal is to always be as inclusive as possible. This engagement varies from one-time discussions to regular interaction while working on joint projects. [Stakeholders, N/A: citizenship.yum.com & Stakeholder engagement, N/A: citizenship.yum.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: The Company indicates that 'honest and regular engagement with our stakeholders continues to be a key element of our Global Citizenship & Sustainability Strategy [...] Listening to them provides us with important insight into food and industry trends and concerns around topics such as animal welfare, climate change and supply chain risks. Working with organizations that have shared interest when it comes to the areas that are most material to our business helps us address industry challenges, opportunities and public policy issues'. However, no specific commitment found to engage with them in the explicit development or monitoring of human rights approach. [Stakeholder engagement, N/A: citizenship.yum.com & 2018 Global Citizenship & Sustainability Progress Update, 01/05/2019: yum.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: On its website, the Company indicates that 'In line with best citizenship reporting practices, we plan on repeating our materiality assessment every two to three years'. However, this indicator looks for specific engagement in designing or monitoring human rights approach. In addition, it states that 'we have continued to expand our engagement with the WWF. Following a supply chain risk assessment conducted over the past year, we are collaborating to increase the understanding of risk derived from Brazilian supply chain'. However, it is not clear whether this includes human rights approach. [Materiality, N/A: citizenship.yum.com & 2018 Global Citizenship & Sustainability Progress Update, 01/05/2019: yum.com]
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: Under 'Performance Management and Audits' the Company states how it reacts should an issue arise with one of their suppliers. However, no evidence found of the Company committing it to remedy the adverse impacts on individuals, workers and communities that it has caused or contributed to. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material, as statement of commitment to remedy adverse impacts was not found. [Human Rights and Labor Practices Policy, N/A: citizenship.yum.com & Yum! Global Code of Conduct, 02/2020: s2.g4cdn.com] 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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. Companies are awarded this if they are committed either to the ILO Declaration (or each ILO Core area) or the UN Global Compact.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company indicates that oversight for environmental, social and governance (ESG) issues ultimately resides with the Yum! Brands Board of Directors, briefed through its Audit Committee on an annual basis. At the operational level, the Chief Communications and Public Affairs Officer oversees the global reputation of Yum! and is responsible for shaping the Citizenship and Sustainability Strategy with the Vice President, Government Relations and Citizenship & Sustainability and the senior leaders who comprise our ESG Council and through cross-functional and expert working groups at the corporate and brand division levels. ESG issues include 'Human & labour rights' (key issues). [Corporate Governance, N/A: citizenship.yum.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
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying 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: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company met with stakeholders and a third party in 2017 for their first formal materiality assessment to discuss certain ESG topics. According to the website 'Materiality' Human Rights and Labor Practices was one of the most important topics discussed. Through in-depth interviews and surveys with internal and external stakeholders information, including opportunities and risks, has been gathered. 'We reviewed publicly reported materials of stakeholders and peers regarding our industry and business, as well as discussed issues with employees, investors and NGOs'. However, it is not clear if this process entails identify which are the specific human rights issues that might be salient for the Company, as evidence seems to focus in identifying which are the big relevant topics generally, rather than focusing on which human rights issues might be relevant. The Company also discloses in its 10K risks related to human rights. However, this indicator looks for description of process to identify which are the potential human rights risks and impacts. The Company provided additional comments to CHRB regarding this indicator, which have been already considered. [Materiality, N/A: citizenship.yum.com & 2017_GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP & SUSTAINABILITY REPORT, 2017: citizenship.yum.com] • Not met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers: No evidence found of how this process applies to its supply chain and other business relationships. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material. No further evidence found in latest reports. [Materiality, N/A: citizenship.yum.com & 2017_GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP & SUSTAINABILITY REPORT, 2017: citizenship.yum.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification: The Company indicates that 'we plan on repeating our materiality assessment every two to three years'. However, it is not clear if this process entails identify which are the specific human rights risks and impacts as part of due diligence. This indicator looks for how the Company specifically does due diligence on human rights, not only whether human rights can be in the list of 'material' topics. [Materiality, N/A: citizenship.yum.com & 2018_GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP & SUSTAINABILITY REPORT, 2019: yum.com] • 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	<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: Salient risk assessment (and context): The topics that comprise the Company's Global Citizenship & Sustainability Strategy and reporting are based on stakeholder input. The Company has met with stakeholders and a third party in 2017 for their first formal materiality assessment to discuss certain ESG topics. According to the website 'Materiality' Human Rights and Labor Practices was one of the most important topics discussed. Through in-depth interviews and surveys with internal and external stakeholders information, including opportunities and risks, has been gathered. In addition, the Company indicates that human rights its a company risk through the supply chain. However, there is no evidence of the exact process(es) for assessing the Company's human rights risks including how factors such as geographical, social or economic are taken into account. [Materiality, N/A: citizenship.yum.com & 2019 10k-Form, 19/02/2020: d18rn0p25nwr6d.cloudfront.net] • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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: Although the Company states that it has met in 2017 with stakeholders and a third party to discuss, among other issues, Human Rights, no evidence found of an action plan to prevent, mitigate or remediate its salient human rights issues. [Materiality, N/A: citizenship.yum.com & 2017_GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP & SUSTAINABILITY REPORT, 2017: citizenship.yum.com] 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: The Company describes how it monitors and audits its suppliers that they comply with the Supplier Code of Conduct and the effects non-compliance has on the business relationship. However, no evidence for a system(s) for tracking the actions taken in response to human rights risks and impacts assessed and for evaluating whether the actions have been effective or have missed key issues or not produced the desired results in its operations. [Human Rights and Labor Practices Policy, N/A: citizenship.yum.com] 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: 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: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.3 Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.4 Not met: Including AG suppliers: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.2/B.2.3/B.2.4 and at least 1,5 points in B.2.1 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	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 Code of conducts applies to all employees and its subsidiaries. It indicates that 'if you think that something is wrong, are unsure what is proper conduct in a particular situation or believe that another employee may have violated Yum! Policies or applicable law [...] you have the duty to raise questions and report concerns immediately'. The Company's integrity line, 'The Network', is an organization independent from Yum!. The Company provides different phone numbers and persons to report. [Yum! Global Code of Conduct, 02/2020: s2.q4cdn.com & Governance documents on website: investors.yum.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company indicates that it 'has received no written comments regarding its periodic or current reports from the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission that were issued 180 days or more preceding the end of its 2019 fiscal year and that remain unresolved'. However, it is not clear whether it has not received any human right-related complaints from any employee or stakeholder. [2019 10k-Form, 19/02/2020: d18rn0p25nwr6d.cloudfront.net]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The Company has in the Code of Conduct a list with all the numbers of the Network helpline for different countries in which it operates (16 countries). In addition, the Company states on its website that 'A person who has such a concern about the conduct of the Company or any of our people may discuss that concern on a confidential and anonymous basis, by contacting The Network at 1-844-418-4423. The Network is our designated external contact for these issues and is authorized to contact the appropriate members of management and/or the Board of Directors with respect to all concerns it receives. Translation services are available to callers'. However, it is not clear whether complainants are addressed in their native language. [Yum! Global Code of Conduct, 02/2020: s2.q4cdn.com & Governance Documents, N/A: investors.yum.com] • Not met: Expect AG supplier to have equivalent grievance systems • Not met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Grievance mechanism for community: The Company explains in its Code of Conduct the procedures to follow should irregularities of any kind or noncompliance with laws occur. However, this only seems to apply to company employees. The Company also discloses additional complaint procedures available for external individuals. However, the grievance mechanism presented where it seems that external stakeholders can report, only tackles accounting/financial matters. No evidence found for channels or mechanisms that are accessible to all external individuals and communities where people can file complaints about general issues (that allows to file human rights-related complaints). [Yum! Global Code of Conduct, 02/2020: s2.q4cdn.com & Reporting of Concerns Regarding Accounting and Auditing Matters, N/A: s2.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages: See above. In addition, the Company states 'A person who has such a concern about the conduct of the Company or any of our people may discuss that concern on a confidential and anonymous basis, by contacting The Network at 1-844-418-4423. The Network is our designated external contact for these issues and is authorized to contact the appropriate members of management and/or the Board of Directors with respect to all concerns it receives. Translation services are available to callers.' However, evidence presented of translation services does not make clear whether complainants are addressed in their native language and are allowed to report complaints going beyond accounting and auditing matters. [Yum! Global Code of Conduct, 02/2020: s2.q4cdn.com & Governance Documents, N/A: investors.yum.com] • 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: While the Company states that it respects and complies with human rights and expects its suppliers to do the same, that regular audits take place etc. no evidence could be found for a description of the approach the Company took to provide a timely remedy for victims of adverse human rights impacts caused by the Company, or if none occurred, the approach it would take. [Human Rights and Labor Practices Policy, 2020: citizenship.yum.com & Yum! Global Code of Conduct, 02/2020: s2.q4cdn.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 • 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