

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



Company Name Anheuser-Busch InBev
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
Overall Score (*) 22.5 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
3.9	10	A. Governance and Policies
3.9	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
2.9	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
5.3	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
4.5	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
2.1	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	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Global Human Rights Policy states that 'as a signatory to the United Nations (UN) Global Compact, we are committed to business practices that do not infringe on human rights and do align with various international standards of responsible business conduct, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labor Organization's Declaration on the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.' [Human Rights Policy, December 2016] Score 2 • Met: UNGPs: Under the "Our Commitment" section of the Company's Global Human Rights Policy the Company recognises it's responsibility to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Specifically, in regards to avoid contributing to adverse human rights impacts through activities and seeking to address these impacts which are directly linked to operations, products or business relationships. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017] • Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: ILO Core: The Company's Code of Business Conduct and Global HR policy cover all four ILO areas. [Human Rights Policy, December 2016 & Global Code of Business Conduct, December 2016]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: All four ILO for AG suppliers: The Company states in its Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, 'we expect our Business Partners to respect the human rights of employees within their operations, and to promote human rights of all workers – whether directly engaged by the Business Partner or through third-party companies or agencies, and whether engaged formally or as casual or temporary workers – within their operations. We seek to work with our Business Partners to understand the challenges within our supply chain and work together to support improvements.' The Human rights principles are those which Anheuser-Busch InBev considers to be the most salient within its global value chain, and this includes Child Labour and Young People; Forced Labour and Freedom of Movement; Freedom of Association and the right to collective bargaining; and Discrimination and Harassment. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: All four ILO Core • Met: Respect H&S of workers: In addition, H&S is also covered for own workers and suppliers. [Human Rights Policy, December 2016 & Human Rights Disclosure, March 2018] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers
A.1.3.a.AG	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - land and natural resources (AG)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Respect land ownership and resources: The Company states in its Human Rights Policy that it follows all applicable national laws relating to the rights of land and national resources. Land acquisitions and changes of use are made respecting the rights of individuals and communities impacted. We also conduct due diligence around land rights and title during the development of new business opportunities.' However, in order to award this indicator the company must commit to respecting ownership/use of land and natural resources. [Human Rights Policy, December 2016] • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure • Not met: IFC Performance Standards • Not met: FPIC for all: The Company states in its Responsible Sourcing Policy that 'business partners must seek free, informed, prior consent', however the company does not have its own commitment. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017] • 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	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 • Not met: Children's rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights Score 2 <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	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 identifies stakeholder engagement in its Materiality Assessment. Furthermore, the Company states in its Global Human Rights Policy, that the Company uses "appropriate channels to build ongoing dialogue with employees, community members and relevant external stakeholders who may be impacted by [Company] actions". [Materiality Assessment, December 2017 & Global Human Rights Policy, December 2016: ab-inbev.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design No met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			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
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects AG suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments

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 Global Human Rights Policy was approved by the Global Audit Committee in December 2016. [Human Rights Disclosure, March 2018] • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The Human Rights Disclosure states that the 'Global Compliance Committee and Regional-level Compliance Committees, which both include members of the Executive Board of Management, oversee implementation of the Policy.' [Human Rights Disclosure, March 2018] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs: The Company states in its Human Rights Disclosure that it has established a Global Sustainability Council and Global Reputation Council, both of which include members of the Executive Board. In the first eight months of 2018, reports relating to compliance with human rights policy were twice presented to each of the Audit Committee and Global Ethics and Compliance Committee. [Human Rights Disclosure, March 2018 & Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, August 2018: business-humanrights.org] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion • 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 • 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) 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 Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: The Company's Human Rights Policy states 'the Policy will be communicated in the appropriate language to all our employees and contractors through education and training programs in order to raise awareness of specific behaviours and actions that might lead to or result in human rights violations.' [Human Rights Policy, December 2016] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs: The Company has a Responsible Sourcing Policy that applies to all business partners. The Policy is made available to business partners during the sourcing process and is accessible on the company website. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017] • Met: Including to AG suppliers: The Company states in its Global Responsible sourcing policy, 'We expect our Business Partners to communicate the Policy to their employees and, cascade throughout their supply chain.' [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: The Responsible Sourcing Policy is a prerequisite in every Anheuser-Busch InBev contract for supply. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017] • Not met: Including on AG suppliers: It is not clear if the Company follows up on whether these arrangements are made binding/contractual throughout its suppliers operations.
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The Company states that all employees are trained on the Global Code of Business Conduct, which includes the human rights policy. [GRI Standards Index, December 2017] • Met: Trains relevant managers including procurement: The Company states in its Human Rights Disclosure, 'in 2017, the changes to our Responsible Sourcing Policy were communicated to our procurement team along with key information on how to embed responsible sourcing into our procurement processes. This was supplemented by in-person training to over 140 procurement colleagues. The training covered key topics including: the importance of human rights and the need to embed this into our procurement decision making processes, an overview of our Responsible Sourcing Policy, and the process to ensure our supplier selections take into account human rights practices.' [Human Rights Disclosure, March 2018] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: The Company states 'AB InBev will assess the compliance of its operating units with its human rights commitments by implementing due-diligence mechanisms, including self-assessment questionnaires and auditing protocols, as appropriate.' In addition, it monitors suppliers' compliance with Global Responsible Sourcing policy (which includes all ILO core areas) using SEDEX. [Global Human Rights Policy, December 2016: ab-inbev.com & Human Rights Policy, December 2016] • Met: Monitoring AG suppliers Score 2 <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	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: HR affects selection of suppliers: In 2017 the Company implemented its "Global Responsible Sourcing Policy" which sets out the requirements for companies working with Anheuser-Busch InBev in relation to its human rights commitments. During 2017, the Company established 'a supplier prequalification process that assesses suppliers' performance against this policy and triggers third-party audits if a supplier is identified as high risk. To support this process, we developed tools leveraging data from the International Trade Union

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Confederation's Global Rights Index, the Trafficking of Persons Index, UNICEF and other sources. Based on these audits, we provide suppliers with a corrective action plan that we monitor over time.' [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017 & 2017 Annual Report, December 2017]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: HR affects on-going supplier relationships: The policy requirements apply to contracts and on-going operations. The Company is a member of SEDEX and uses its audits to manage human rights issues with suppliers. <p>According to the Company's CHRB August 2018 Disclosure, refusal to accept the principle of three Responsible Sourcing Policy and the Supplier Anti-Corruption Policy, or to undergo an ethical audit and address identified issues can result in suppliers month being selected for business. In the case of non-compliance with these requirements the Company states that suppliers may de-authorised. Since 2015, six suppliers have been de-authorised. [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, August 2018: business-humanrights.org & Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, August 2018: business-humanrights.org]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with suppliers to improve performance: The Company states in its CHRB August 2018 Disclosure, that Anheuser-Busch InBev works in partnership with suppliers to support them in effectively implementing responsible sourcing practises. However, the responsible sourcing principles policy does not include any information that relates to the consideration of human rights when selecting their suppliers. [Human Rights Disclosure - August 2018, August 2018: business-humanrights.org]
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected 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: Stakeholder process or systems: The Company states in its Human Rights Disclosure, it recognises that 'identifying and addressing human rights risks is not the sole responsibility of a particular individual or function within our business. We require input and responsibility of multiple functions, including People, Procurement and Legal and Corporate Affairs. To facilitate effective cross-functional working, in 2018 we are establishing a working-level Human Rights Committee chaired by the Global Legal and Compliance Function.' It is not clear whether external stakeholders are included or how this is implemented in the Company's processes and systems. [Human Rights Disclosure, March 2018] • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • Not met: Workers in SC engaged • Not met: Communities in the SC engaged <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: The Company states in its Annual Report 'During 2017, we conducted a risk-based global analysis leading to more than 20 separate legal assessments. Then Zones developed remediation plans to address any identified gaps.' However, it does not provide details on how the identification of risks was carried out and what these risks are. [2017 Annual Report, December 2017] • Not met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers <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): The Company states in its Materiality Assessment that human rights is one of the material aspects considered, however it does not provide details on what aspects of human rights are critical, nor is human rights one of the eight material aspects prioritised in its assessment. The Annual Report states that in 2017 it conducted a risk-based global analysis to assess enforcement of its human rights policy, but it does not disclose

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>which issues are considered and addressed. [Materiality Assessment, December 2017 & 2017 Annual Report, December 2017]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
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 • Not met: Example of Actions decided • Not met: Including in AG supply chain <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	<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 • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including AG suppliers <p>Score 2</p> <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	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company states 'our Helpline is available 24/7 and is toll-free. It is available to all employees, where you can confidentially and, if you choose, anonymously report any concern in relation to potential breaches of our Code of Business Conduct. It is a secure means of reporting, provided by an independent company (EthicsPoint). It is available anywhere in the world and you can file your report in your language.' This covers human rights grievances. [Global Code of Business Conduct, December 2016] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: As above, you can file in any language. [Global Code of Business Conduct, December 2016] • Met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers: The Company states in its Responsible Sourcing Policy that grievances mechanisms are available for suppliers to report any gaps or breaches of the policy. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017]
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: In the Company's Global Human Rights Document, under the heading "Community Engagement and Operational-Level Grievance Mechanisms" the Company states that "grievances may be filed via [the Company's] internet-based message interface (talkopenly.ab-inbev.com) that immediately notifies the Vice President, Compliance, Litigation and Antitrust and the Vice President, Global Corporate Audit". [Global Human Rights Policy, December 2016: ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: In addition to the internet-based message interface, the Company states that a "toll-free whistle-blowing line,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			equipped with translation services, is available 24/7" for grievance reporting. [Global Human Rights Policy, December 2016: ab-inbev.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expects AG supplier to have community grievance systems: The Company's Responsible Sourcing Policy states that "Business Partners must have systems in place to enable anonymous grievance reporting by workers and external individuals." [Global Human Rights Policy, December 2016: ab-inbev.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: The Company states that 'the reports and investigations are treated and conducted confidentially; EthicsPoint captures the reports and directs them to the Global Compliance and Internal Audit teams who oversee the treatment of reports and conduct investigations; If necessary, follow-up communications can be facilitated anonymously by EthicsPoint via the website.' However, there is no further information available regarding the timeframes. [Global Code of Business Conduct, December 2016] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The Code of Conduct states that 'AB InBev prohibits and will not tolerate any retaliation or threatened retaliatory action against any employee who reports of a possible violation of law, regulation or AB InBev policy.' In addition, it is possible to report anonymously. However, it is not clear whether there is a commitment to 'no retaliation' against other stakeholders and how this commitment is ensured. [Global Code of Business Conduct, December 2016] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not 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 • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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.a	Living wage (in own agricultural operations)	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 target timeframe • Not met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Paying living wage • Not met: Definition of living wage reviewed with unions

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 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) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses significant parts of SP and why
D.1.4.a	Child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Does not use child labour • Not met: Age verification of applicants and workers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remediation if children identified
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: The Company states in its Responsible Sourcing Policy that 'Business Partners must prohibit the employment and exploitation of children and must not engage in or support the use of child labor as defined by the ILO.' Business partners are required to adhere with the policy in supply contracts. [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.a	Forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Pays workers in full and on time • Not met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.1.5.b	Forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (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: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: The Company's Responsible Sourcing Policy states that "Business Partners must prohibit, and must not benefit from any forms of forced or compulsory labour" and that "the use of bonded labour is strictly forbidden." Further, the sourcing policy states "Workers must not be required to lodge recruitment fees (deposits) and are free to withdraw from the employment relationship with reasonable notice. Workers must be allowed to leave the work premises off-shift. Business Partners must also prohibit the trafficking of persons, including arranging or facilitating the travel of another person with a view to that person being exploited". [Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017: ab-inbev.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.5.c	Forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in own agricultural operations)	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: Does not retain documents or restrict movement: The Company's Global Human Rights Policy states that the Company "prohibits all forms of forced or compulsory labour and thus all employment relationship must be voluntary in nature. The use of prison labour or indentured or bonded labour is strictly forbidden, and workers must not be required to relinquish identity papers, passports, or work permits as a condition of employment. Workers must not be required to lodge recruitment fees (deposits), workers are free to withdraw from the employment relationship with reasonable notice and are allowed to leave the work premises off-shift." [Global Human Rights Policy, December 2016: ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.1.5.d	Forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	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: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: The Company's Responsible Sourcing Policy states that "workers must not be required to relinquish identity papers, passports or work permits as a condition of employment. Workers must not be required to lodge recruitment fees (deposits) and are free to withdraw from the employment relationship with reasonable notice. Workers must be allowed to leave the work premises offshift". [Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017: ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on free movement • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.6.a	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own agricultural operation)	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 not to interfere with union rights / Steps to avoid intimidation or retaliation: The Code of Conduct includes a commitment not to interfere with the right of workers to form or join Trade unions and to bargain collectively. The Global Human Rights Policy discloses " "AB InBev supports the right of all its workers to form and join lawful trade unions and other organizations of their choice, and to bargain collectively in support of their mutual interests. In addition, AB InBev does not discriminate in any way against workers that choose to form or join trade unions, or against those workers that choose not to form or join trade unions. In those countries and/or situations in which the legal system prohibits or severely restricts the right of freedom of association, AB InBev will support, within the framework of applicable laws and regulations, the establishment of alternative means to facilitate the effective representation of workers interests and communication between workers and management," [Global Code of Business Conduct, December 2016 & Human Rights Policy, December 2016] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining agreements • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.1.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	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: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts: The Company states in its Responsible Sourcing Policy that "Business Partners must support the right of all workers to choose whether to form or join lawful trade unions and other organizations of their choice, and to bargain collectively in support of their mutual interests. Business Partners must not discriminate in any way against workers that choose to form or join trade unions, or against those workers that choose not to form or join trade unions. In those countries and/or situations in which the legal system prohibits or severely restricts the right of freedom of association, Business Partners must support, within the framework of applicable laws and regulations, the establishment of alternative means to facilitate the effective representation of workers' interests and communication between workers and management." [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends in progress made

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own agricultural operations)	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: Injury Rate disclosures: The total recordable injuries in 2017 were 269 for brewery and manufacturing employees and 811 for office and corporate employees. [2017 Annual Report, December 2017] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: Lost time injuries in 2017 were 60 for brewery and manufacturing employees; 209 for office and corporate employees; and 74 for contractors. [2017 Annual Report, December 2017] • Met: Fatalities disclosures: The number of fatalities in 2017 were 0 for brewery and manufacturing employees; 3 for office and corporate employees; and 2 for contractors. [2017 Annual Report, December 2017] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Set targets for H&S performance: The Company states that it aims to "continually improve safety performance, which includes setting stretching targets. In 2017 [the Company] succeeded in reducing lost time injuries for both.. people and.. contract workers in breweries and vertical operations by 38% from 2016, which exceeded our targets by 21%. In distribution we divide the area into two distinct categories, Logistics and Sales. Logistics includes Tier II warehousing operations and Distribution drivers that deliver product. Tier II Logistics experienced an 11% improvement in safety performance compared to 2016 and the sales department finished the year with a 43% improvement compared to 2016. With a target of 17% year-on-year improvement the combined departments achieved an overall improvement of 29% over the prior year. Further analysis reveals a 30% improvement for employees and 22% improvement with contractor workers". [Human Rights Disclosure - Final3, March 2018: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Met targets or explains why not: According to the Human Rights Disclosure Document that Company has met and surpassed all set targets. [Human Rights Disclosure - Final3, March 2018: business-humanrights.org]
D.1.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	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: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: The Company sets out clear minimum requirements for suppliers in its Global Responsible Sourcing Policy. [Human Rights Disclosure, March 2018] • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: The total recordable injuries in 2017 were 269 for brewery and manufacturing employees and 811 for office and corporate employees. [2017 Annual Report, December 2017] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: Lost time injuries in 2017 were 60 for brewery and manufacturing employees; 209 for office and corporate employees; and 74 for contractors. [2017 Annual Report, December 2017] • Met: Fatalities disclosure: The number of fatalities in 2017 were 0 for brewery and manufacturing employees; 3 for office and corporate employees; and 2 for contractors. [2017 Annual Report, December 2017] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How working with suppliers on H&S: The Company states in its Human Rights Disclosure, 'Health and Safety is the most significant risk, with 47% of SMETA Audits identifying it an issue. We recognise this is a common challenge in global supply chains. In 2017, we implemented a supplier health and safety training program in key markets in our Africa Region - South Africa, Tanzania, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia - reaching 246 suppliers. In 2018, we are expanding the program to include farmers in our agricultural supply chain to support them with the information and guidance they need to protect themselves and their employees. We recognise there are limitations to the supplier pre-qualification process and audits alone. To better understand how systemic human rights risks relate to our supply chains, in 2017 we partnered with the World Wide Fund for Nature to carry out a supply risk analysis covering key social, environmental and economic risks, including human rights risks, for our priority agricultural crops globally. This highlighted potential risk of child and forced labour in Latin American supply chains, and we are undertaking deeper analysis to better understand the risk and any action value required. We also recognise that our suppliers value support to implement responsible sourcing principles in their businesses. In 2017, we collaborated with AIM-PROGRESS, Partner Africa, The Coca-Cola Company and Diageo to create a Business Toolkit that includes training on productivity and efficiency, quality, safety, time management, workforce cooperation and communication, workforce management, environmental management, business integrity and land rights. In 2018, the toolkit will be available as online learning and in-person workshop materials to enable scale. [Human Rights Disclosure, March 2018]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.8.a	Land rights: Land acquisition (in own agricultural operations)	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: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders • Not met: Approach to doing so if no recent land deals <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How valuation and compensation works • Not met: Steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals • Not met: Describes approach if no recent land deals
D.1.8.b	Land rights: Land acquisition (in the supply chain)	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: Rules on land & owners in codes or contracts: The Company states 'Business Partners must follow all applicable national laws relating to the rights of land and national resources ensuring land acquisitions and changes of use are made respecting the rights of individuals and communities impacted. Business Partners must conduct due diligence around land rights and titles during the development of new business opportunities. Business Partners must seek free, informed, prior consent and have a grievance mechanism in place to resolve any disputes over land titles.' [Global Responsible Sourcing Policy, October 2017] • Not met: How working with suppliers on land issues <p>Score 2</p> <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.a	Water and sanitation (in own agricultural operations)	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: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks: The Company website describes that 'AB InBev annually updates water risk assessments at our breweries and other manufacturing facilities throughout the world using the WRI Aqueduct tool and its own global management system called Voyager Plan Optimization (VPO) and our Supply Excellence Program. We regularly engage our experts throughout the company through technical meetings, quarterly conference calls and an annual water-risk workshop at our global environment and safety conference. We also engage with local water stakeholders to verify the risk and seek ways to partner on solutions. The Company also implements watershed protection project in Brazil.' [Company website: Better World, June 2018: annualreport.ab-inbev.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Water targets considering local factors: The Company's 2025 Water Stewardship Targets states that commits to '100% of our communities in high stress areas will have measurably improved water availability and quality'. The Company also discloses 'Our ultimate goal is to ensure water access and quality for both our communities and our breweries.' [Company website: Better World, June 2018: annualreport.ab-inbev.com] • Not met: Reports progress and shows trends in progress made: The Company has made progress in relation to water and sanitation focusing on managing water related risks, protecting local watersheds, investing in community water-access programs and engaging colleagues in these efforts. Furthermore, the Company has invested in technologies that enable the return of water to the local watershed from which the water was withdrawn. However, the Company has not reported on their targets or shown trends. [2017 Annual Report, December 2017]
D.1.9.b	Water and sanitation (in the supply chain)	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: Rules on water stewardship in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on water stewardship issues <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.10.a	Women's rights (in own agricultural operations)	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: Process to stop harassment and violence against women • Not met: Working conditions take account of gender • Not met: Equality of opportunity at all levels of employment <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Meet all requirements under score 1
D.1.10.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	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 in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			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 18.01 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 4.50 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	1.73 out of 4	Out of a total of 51 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Anheuser-Busch InBev made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 22 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 1.73 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	0 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Company reports on GRI: The Company indicates that it reports against selected indicators from the GRI Standards, however, the Company does not demonstrate its reporting against this standard in a standardised format.
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0.4 out of 4	Anheuser-Busch InBev met 1 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0.4 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 • Not 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 • Not met: Score 1 for D.1.1.a : Living wage (in own agricultural operations) • Met: Score 2 for D.1.7.a : Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own agricultural operations)

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 CHR B 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 CHR B 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 CHR B 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.