

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



Company Name Ahold Delhaize
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain only)
Overall Score (*) 18.5 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
2.1	10	A. Governance and Policies
3.4	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
4.2	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
1.5	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
3.7	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
3.6	10	F. Transparency

(*) Please note that any small differences between the Overall Score and the added total of Measurement Theme scores are due to rounding the numbers at different stages of the score calculation process.

Please note also 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 2018 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

A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

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: The Company states in its Human rights position that 'we are committed to respect the human rights of our associates, our customers, our communities and the people who work throughout our supply chains'. [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs: The Company indicates in the Human Rights Statement that 'this commitment is based on our own collective belief that all people should be treated with dignity and respect, and is derived from international principles, such as the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. However, this does not count as a formal commitment to the UN Guiding Principles. [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com] Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: ILO Core: We embrace clear standards on human rights, such as prevention of forced and child labour and non-discrimination, and we are committed to the principles of freedom of association, and respecting legal rights to collective bargaining [Position on Human Rights: aholddelhaize.com] Met: All four ILO for AG suppliers: 4 ILO core standards are mentioned in the Standard of Engagement [Standard of Engagement: aholddelhaize.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: All four ILO Core • Met: Respect H&S of workers: "We are committed to providing safe and secure working environments for all associates and customers everywhere Ahold Delhaize companies operate." [Position on Human Rights: aholddelhaize.com] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: Suppliers shall adhere to all applicable laws and regulations on occupational health and safety. A clear set of procedures must be established and followed regarding occupational health and safety, including the provision and use of personal protective equipment, clean toilets, access to potable water and, if appropriate, sanitary facilities for food storage shall be provided" [Standard of Engagement: aholddelhaize.com]
A.1.3.a.AG	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - land and natural resources (AG)	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: Respect land ownership and resources • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure • Not met: IFC Performance Standards • Not met: FPIC for all • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.3.b.AG	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - people's rights (AG)	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: Women's rights • Not met: Children's rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles • Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business Principles • Not met: Convention on migrant workers • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: though they do have a community charity like food banks, it is not through community engagement • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	<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
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	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: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs): No Retaliation: We encourage Associates to raise concerns about improper behaviour or possible violations of law or policy. We will not retaliate or allow retaliation against anyone who, in good faith, reports a potential violation of the law, Our Code or any other Company policy. Any form of retaliation is a serious violation of Our Code and may result in disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment." However, no evidence found of a commitment to not tolerate nor contribute to threats , or intimidations to people who oppose to Company's operations or raises questions about the Company's activities. [Code of Ethics Handbook: aholddelhaize.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects AG suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments: Suppliers are expected to establish adequate complaint mechanisms for employees who believe they have been mistreated, and to ensure no retaliation against employees who raise complaints in good faith." However, no evidence found of a commitment for suppliers in relation to not tolerate threats or attacks to people who oppose to

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Company's operations or raises questions about the Company's activities. [Standard of Engagement: aholddelhaize.com]

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: CEO or Board approves policy: The CEO signed the Code of Ethics which explains their commitment to HR [Code of Ethics Handbook: aholddelhaize.com] Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The Company indicates in its human rights position that 'our commitment to human rights is established and supported globally through our Supervisory Board (Sustainability and Innovation Committee) and Executive Committee'. [Human rights- Stakeholder interests, 1 May 2018: aholddelhaize.com & Position on Human Rights: aholddelhaize.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs: Though the company makes references to their annual report in their submission, Safety at Work KPIs do not qualify as HR ones Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Incentives for at least one board member: There is a non financial incentive which is linked to The Dow Jones Sustainability Index (the external target) measures how the Company performs on sustainability against peers in the sector. However, the incentive needs to be related to at least one key industry risk related to human rights. [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com] Not met: At least one key AG HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Performance criteria made public

B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence (25% of Total)

B.1 Embedding Respect for Human Rights in Company Culture and Management Systems (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Senior responsibility fo HR (inc ILO): Though there is a board level committee responsible for it, there is no specific manager/s for HR issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Day-to-day responsibility Not met: Day-to-day responsibility in supply chain
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights Not met: At least one key AG HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: HR part of enterprise risk system: Though the company, in its submission, claims that there is Human Rights factors in the risk assessment, there is no evidence for it in the annual report for it being integrated in the general risk management systems. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: Though it is on the website, there is no evidence on how the company communicates it Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	Company's own operations		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	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: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs: The company, in its self assessment, explains that their 'standard of engagement' are shared with each supplier before signing the contract • Met: Including to AG suppliers: The Standard of Engagement also mentions that this is applicable for the supply chain. "If a Supplier hires a subcontractor in connection with providing goods or services to Ahold Delhaize, the Supplier shall cause the subcontractor to comply with these Standards of Engagement as if Ahold Delhaize entered into an agreement with the subcontractor directly." <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: The company, in its Standards of Engagements, explicitly says that all suppliers need to meet these standards " These Standards of Engagement (each a "Standard") set minimum standards for Suppliers that are designed to ensure that Ahold Delhaize has visibility into all aspects of its supply chain and meets these objectives. In connection with the foregoing, each of Ahold Delhaize's Suppliers agrees to the following" [Standard of Engagement: aholddelhaize.com] • Met: Including on AG suppliers: The Standard of Engagement also mentions that this is applicable for the supply chain. "If a Supplier hires a subcontractor in connection with providing goods or services to Ahold Delhaize, the Supplier shall cause the subcontractor to comply with these Standards of Engagement as if Ahold Delhaize entered into an agreement with the subcontractor directly." [Standard of Engagement: aholddelhaize.com]
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	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: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: Though the company says on its self assessment form that they train workers, the Form is not public and therefore cannot be used • Not met: Trains relevant managers including procurement <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	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: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: Though the company explains in its self assessment that it monitors its suppliers via BSCI, there is no evidence for monitoring its own operations • Met: Monitoring AG suppliers <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	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: HR affects selection of suppliers: Suppliers must adhere to the company's Standard of Engagement and some need an independent assessment before becoming a supplier [Standard of Engagement: aholddelhaize.com] • Met: HR affects on-going supplier relationships: In its HR policy, it explicitly says that if the supplier is unwilling or unable to remedy problems, they will suspend relationship with that supplier [Position on Human Rights: aholddelhaize.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirement under score 1 met [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com] • Met: Working with suppliers to improve performance: In its annual report, the company provides examples on how it improves its supply chain "Even with multiple measures and controls in place, we realize that challenges remain for our industry, due to lengthy supply chains that often span the world and are not always fully transparent. For this reason, we joined the work of the Consumer Goods Forum on forced labour as well as the Seafood Task Force on human trafficking and forced labour in off-shore fishing. With respect to wages in our supply chain, we are analysing, in close collaboration with UTZ, the effects of introducing a living wage for coffee production workers in Kenya." [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com]
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially	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: Stakeholder process or systems: In its annual report the company describes the process of engaging stakeholders, including associates (employees) and supply

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	affected stakeholders		<p>chain. With employees it carries out and engagement survey and with suppliers face to face meetings, online communication and supplier events. [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: Every year the Company engages with stakeholders including employees and supply chain to determine which are the material issues. Although some of the issues are related to human rights (employees topic include adequacy and equality of wages paid, and with suppliers one relevant topic is human rights in the supply chain), the trigger for the Company is not directly related to human rights, but to know which are the relevant/material issues to build the materiality matrix. [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com] • Not met: Workers in SC engaged: No evidence found of direct engagement with workers in the supply chain triggered by human rights issues. • Not met: Communities in the SC engaged: No evidence found of direct engagement with communities in the supply chain triggered by human rights issues. [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them

B.2 Human Rights Due Diligence (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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: No evidence found of the process to identify its human rights risks and impacts in specific locations or activities in its own operations. [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com] • Not met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers: Although the Company audits its suppliers, it is not clear the process it follows to identify human rights risks and impacts in the supply chain. [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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): Though the company mentions in its self assessment that it is going to conduct a Due Diligence in 2018, there is no ref to a public document and it is not specific enough on end date etc. • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks: see above <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	<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: Action Plans to mitigate risks: There is no system yet though the company plans to do that after its due diligence in 2018 • Not met: Example of Actions decided: as above • Not met: Including in AG supply chain: as above <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met: as above
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: Though the company follows up on the risks in its supply chain, there is not clear evidence for systems for its own HR risks • 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	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: Comms plan re identifying risks • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	rights impacts are addressed		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	2	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 has a ethics helpline which the HR policy refers to. The company's ethics helpline is accessible to all workers. [Position on Human Rights: aholddelhaize.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: In its Whistle blower document, the company describes their number of complaints, the number resolved and the time it took. [ahold delhaize whistleblower line report: aholddelhaize.com] • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The service is free and in different locations and languages. [Position on Human Rights: aholddelhaize.com] • Met: Expect AG supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: In its whistle blower document it says that "suppliers are expected to establish adequate complaints mechanisms for employees who believe they have been mistreated". [ahold delhaize whistleblower line report: aholddelhaize.com]
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: The hotline service is available to the public as explained in the company's human rights position: "Our established, local "ethics helplines" are free, confidential and secure services that enable our associates and the public to raise concerns about improper behaviour or possible violations of law or policy. [Position on Human Rights: aholddelhaize.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: The hotline service is available in different locations and is free to use (accessible) [Code of Ethics Handbook: aholddelhaize.com] • Met: AG supplier communities use global system: The company's ethics line are open to everyone as explained in the company's human rights position: "Our established, local "ethics helplines" are free, confidential and secure services that enable our associates and the public to raise concerns about improper behaviour or possible violations of law or policy. [Position on Human Rights: aholddelhaize.com]
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with users on system performance • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: AG suppliers consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: "We encourage Associates to raise concerns about improper behaviour or possible violations of law or policy. We will not retaliate or allow retaliation against anyone who, in good faith, reports a potential violation of the law, Our Code or any other Company policy. Any form of retaliation is a serious violation of Our Code and may result in disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment." [Code of Ethics Handbook: aholddelhaize.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: "When you make a report, you are encouraged to identify yourself. You may, however, choose to remain anonymous. If you choose to identify yourself, we will keep your identity confidential in a manner consistent with conducting a thorough and fair investigation." [Code of Ethics Handbook: aholddelhaize.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice: Though there is a policy against retaliation, the company didn't explicitly say that never retaliated in practice. • Not met: Expects AG suppliers to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms: In its CoE, it does mention that it will fully cooperate with lawful requests for information or premises visits by government agencies and regulation authorities. It commits to provide 'truthful and accurate responses'. Also states that "Associates should never alter, withhold or destroy records related to litigation or an investigation involving the Company" which means impede. However, no evidence found of a commitment to not impeding access to state-based judicial or non-judicial mechanisms or any other for persons who make allegations on human rights. [Code of Ethics Handbook: aholddelhaize.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided: There were no cases which were substantiated in 2017 • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers: Though there is a pilot project on the impact of living wage in Kenya, this is not enough to qualify as improving living wages practices. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs (purchasing practices) • Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights (purchasing practices) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.1.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifies suppliers back to manufacturing sites (factories or fields): The Company states the following with regards to mapping their supply chain: "It requires a continuous effort to map and understand the global food supply chain so we can assess how natural resources are used, for instance, or how good working conditions are monitored and ensured." However, this information does not mean that it explicitly maps its own supplier and there is not enough information on how it does that. [Annual report, 2017: aholddelhaize.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses significant parts of SP and why

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.4.b	Child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: Suppliers must establish robust age-verification mechanisms as part of the recruitment process, which may not be in any way degrading or disrespectful to the worker. This principle aims to protect children from any form of exploitation. [Standard of Engagement: aholddelhaize.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.b	Forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: There is no explicit mention of debt or fees in the standard of engagement. • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.d	Forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on free movement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts: Though it does require FoA and CB, there is no ref to non interference or prohibition of harassment of trade unionists • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: In the standard of engagement, suppliers are required to adhere to H&S standards: "A clear set of procedures must be established and followed regarding occupational health and safety, including the provision and use of personal protective equipment, clean toilets, access to potable water and, if appropriate, sanitary facilities for food storage shall be provided. Employees shall receive adequate training to ensure that they can perform their duties in a safe manner. Workplace practice and conditions and conditions in residential facilities provided by the Supplier which violate basic human rights are forbidden." [Standard of Engagement: aholddelhaize.com] • Not met: Injury Rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosure Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.8.b	Land rights: Land acquisition (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Rules on land & owners in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on land issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends in the progress made
D.1.9.b	Water and sanitation (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Rules on water stewardship in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on water stewardship issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.10.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made

E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity thresholds were found, and so the score of 14.80 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 3.70 out of 20 points for theme E.

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	1.14 out of 4	Out of a total of 42 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Ahold Delhaize made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 12 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 1.14 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Company reports on GRI • Met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0.5 out of 4	Ahold Delhaize met 1 of the 8 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0.5 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions • Met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers • Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts • Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management

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 2018 Key Findings report 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 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 CHRB Ltd, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither CHRB Ltd 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 CHRB Ltd 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 Ltd's 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 English law and submitted to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of England and Wales.

As CHRB Ltd, 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.