

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



Company Name BP
Industry Extractives
Overall Score (*) 48.8 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
5.3	10	A. Governance and Policies
12.2	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
8.3	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
8.1	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
9.8	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
5.1	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: General HRs commitment: The Company code of conduct states 'We seek to conduct our business in a manner that respects the human rights and dignity of people'. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com] • Met: International Bill of Rights: The Company Human Rights Policy states 'We respect internationally-recognized human rights, as set out in the International Bill of Human Rights and the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.' [Human Rights Policy, 2018: bp.com] Score 2 • Met: UNGPs: The Company states that they 'recognise their responsibility to respect human rights and avoid complicity in human rights abuses, as stated in the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.' [Human Rights Policy, 2018: bp.com] • Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: ILO Core: The Company Human Rights Policy states 'We respect internationally-recognized human rights, as set out in the International Bill of Human Rights and the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.' [Human Rights Policy, 2018: bp.com] • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: All four ILO apply to EX BPs: The Company states that the Human Rights Policy applies to every employee and officer in every BP wholly owned entity, and in joint ventures (JVs) to the extent possible and reasonable given BP's level of participation. In situations where BP does not have overall control of a JV, we will do everything we reasonably can to make sure JVs and JV partners follow similar principles.' The Company's document 'BPs expectations of its suppliers' applies to Contractors - however, this does not cover core ILOs. The document states that the 'BPs Code of Conduct underpins our expectations of our suppliers, including contractors...' However, the Code of Conduct does not cover the Core ILO elements. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com & Human Rights Policy, 2018: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: All four ILO Core • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company Code of Conduct covers health and safety requirements. This includes expectations to comply with HSSE requirements. • Met: H&S applies to Ex BPs: The Company Code of Conduct covers health and safety requirements. This includes expectations to comply with HSSE requirements. The Code of Conduct applies to joint ventures and third parties - the Company also states 'we expect and encourage all our contractors and their employees to act in a way that is consistent with our code. The Company also states on their website 'Our standard model contracts include health, safety and security requirements. through bridging documents, we define how our safety management system co-exists with those of our contractors to manage risk on a site. And for our contractors facing the most serious risks, we conduct quality, technical, health, safety and security audits before awarding contracts.' [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com]
A.1.3.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (EX)	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: VPs participant: BP is a signatory to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. [Human Rights Policy, 2018: bp.com] • Not met: Uses only ICoCA members: BP Georgia's Private Security contractor has become a member of the ICoCA. However, The Company has not stated a commitment to only working with ICoCA members. • Not met: Respecting indigenous rights: Even though it has mentioned in its human rights policy that 'we will consult with those who may be affected, including indigenous peoples, where this is possible and appropriate, while meeting applicable legal requirements.', the Company indicated that it is committed to respecting indigenous rights. [Human Rights Policy, 2018: bp.com] • Not met: ILO 169 • Not met: UNDRIP • Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FPIC commitment • Not met: Vol Guidelines on Tenure • Not met: IFC performance standards • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expects BPs to respect all these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company Human Rights policy states 'we will consult with those who may be affected, including indigenous peoples, where this is possible and appropriate, while meeting applicable legal requirements.' The Company human rights policy also states 'Where BP identifies that we have caused or directly contributed to adverse impacts on the human rights of others, BP shall provide for or cooperate in the remediation of the adverse impacts through legitimate processes.' [Human Rights Policy, 2018: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: The Company states that they will continue to take a constructive and progressive role in human rights-related multi-stakeholder initiatives. However, it is not clear whether these initiatives will include the Company's affected and potentially affected stakeholders. [Human Rights Policy, 2018: bp.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to remedy: The Company has indicated in its human rights policy that where it 'identifies that it has caused or directly contributed to adverse

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			impacts on the human rights of others, BP shall provide for or cooperate in the remediation of the adverse impacts through legitimate processes'. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies: The commitment does not include not obstructing access to other remedies of collaborating in initiatives that provide access to remedy. • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with EX BPs 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 EX BPs 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 Company Code of Conduct is signed by the CEO and covers a general commitment to human rights. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com] • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The Company has indicated that its safety, ethics and environment assurance committee (SEEAC) at board level monitors the management of non-financial risks. This includes human rights risks. The SEEAC is also responsible for the safety and operational risk function for the Company. [Annual Report, 2017: bp.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	2	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 discloses that the SEEAC (safety, ethics and environment assurance committee) looks at the processes that BPs executive team use to identify and mitigate operational and non-financial risk. The Company clarified in 2017 this included reviewing human rights related risks, and in particular included a review of how BP is managing modern slavery risks. [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com] • Met: Examples or trends re HR discussion: The Company clarified in 2017 this included reviewing human rights related risks, and in particular included a review of how BP is managing modern slavery risks. Following this, the Company conducted Modern Slavery Risk Reviews in parts of their supply chain. [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Incentives for at least one board member: The Company's director remuneration includes elements relating to safety and operational risk. Contractor health and safety is included in these KPIs. [Annual Report, 2017: bp.com] • Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&S: There is no evidence that the H&S of local communities are included in the health and safety incentives. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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): The Company has described responsibility related to the implementation of the Voluntary Principles in its security team in Georgia but no overall description of responsibilities for human rights are described. [Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2017: bp.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	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: Senior manager incentives for human rights: The Company has published information regarding Occupational Health and Safety related incentives for directors. However Health and Safety only is not sufficient enough to be awarded this indicator. [Annual Report, 2017: bp.com] • Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	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: HR part of enterprise risk system: The Company's CHRB Response stated that human rights risks is within the scope of SEEAC. The Company has indicated that 'the board delegates some of its oversight activities to its seven committees. These include the audit committee, which monitors the management of financial risk, and the safety, ethics and environment assurance committee (SEEAC), which focuses on non-financial risk'. However, it has not indicated explicitly whether this included human rights risks - though it is related to its 'operating management system (OMS)' which 'is a group-wide framework' bringing 'together BP requirements on health, safety, security, the environment, social responsibility and operational reliability, as well as related issues, such as maintenance, contractor relations and organizational learning, into a common management system. It sets out the rules and principles that govern key risk management activities such as inspection, testing, competency development and business continuity and crisis response planning. (...) All businesses covered by OMS undertake an annual performance improvement cycle and assess alignment with the applicable requirements of the OMS framework'. [BP] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment: The Company disclosed details with regards to an audit committee or independent risk assessment, however, this covers security only: 'All our businesses are required to carry out a security risk assessment and to incorporate the findings into a security risk action plan. In locations assessed as having higher security risks, businesses are required to carry out an additional Voluntary Principles screening and impact assessment. An independent internal Group Audit function audits the business's conformance with this requirement' [Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2017: bp.com]
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own 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: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: The Company's Business and Human right policy is published on the Company's website in 23 languages. The Company states 'This policy applies to every BP employee and officer in BP wholly-owned entities, and in joint ventures to the extent possible and reasonable given BP's level of participation. ' <p>The Company's human rights policy explicitly states that they respect internationally-recognized human rights, as set out in the International Bill of Human Rights and the ILO Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. The 8 ILO fundamental conventions, also known as core conventions are subsumed by the ILO Fundamental Declarations on Rights at Work.</p> <p>Score 2</p> <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	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: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs: The Company states 'Our standard procurement contracts include requirements for suppliers to respect internationally recognized human rights, with a specific ban on the use of forced, trafficked or child labour.' The Company also discloses 'As one example, we provided training to contractors and sub-contractor teams working on our Tangguh expansion project in Indonesia. We discussed the risks faced in our industry and emphasized the individual role we all play in spotting potential signs and reporting concerns'. However, this is only one example, and it is not clear how all contractors are communicated the human rights policy. Furthermore, as the Company does not clearly commits to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Work, or the four ILO core labour standards, the Company has not been awarded this indicator. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including to EX BPs: The Company also uses an example of working with a joint venture partner in Saudi Arabia to improve labour rights. However, it is not clear whether this is a consistent approach across operations [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: The Company states in their procurement code of conduct that they 'seek to work with third parties who operate under principles that are similar to this Code. This includes making a contractual commitment where it is feasible to comply with the applicable laws and work in line with the Code.' The Company states that they will seek to terminate contracts where they believe they have not met the companies standards. However, this does not cover human rights. • Not met: Including on EX BPs
B.1.5	Training on 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"> • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The Company states that tier training covers specific aspects of human rights in an operational context. The Company discloses that they trained over 1,000 people on labour rights and modern slavery in 2017. However, this means that not all workers have been trained on human rights obligations. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] • Met: Trains relevant managers including security personnel: The Company states that they have 'developed training and communications to raise awareness of labour rights and modern slavery for people who work on projects, in operational roles and in functions including procurement, human resources and ethics and compliance.' The Company discloses that they trained over 1,000 people on labour rights and modern slavery in 2017. <p>The Company states that they provide training on the Voluntary Principles of Security and Human Rights principles for employees managing security and conduct assessments. In 2013 BP launched its human rights policy and began training employees and leadership teams. BP also delivers additional human rights training specifically on modern slavery. The Company's response to CHRB states that the human rights policy training includes the ILO core labour standards. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com]</p> <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: The Company states that they look at labour rights and modern slavery issues by taking 'risk-based approach to monitoring our contractors and suppliers by considering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - countries that pose a high degree of risk, as identified by risk analytics firm Verisk Maplecroft and other data sources - activities that rely on manual labour, such as construction, catering, cleaning and certain types of manufacturing - factors related to the vulnerability of the workforce, such as poverty levels; ethnic, religious or gender minorities; and migrant workers.' The Company prioritised 17 businesses for modern slavery risk reviews in 2017 using this approach. However, this approach does not cover the core ILOs and seem focused in contractors and suppliers. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] • Not met: Monitoring EX BP's: The Company monitors contractors through their modern slavery risk reviews. It is not clear whether jvs are monitored. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes corrective action process: The Company describes how 'where we find an issue, we try to work with the contractor to resolve it so as to improve the situation of the people affected. If a serious breach is found and no corrective action is taken, we reserve the right to terminate contracts.' [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] • Met: Example of corrective action: The Company describes how when conducting a labour rights audit in Malaysia in 2017, BP identified a number of areas for improvement including with working hours and recruit processes with two potential suppliers. The Company describes how they worked with the suppliers to support the implementation of the corrective actions required to meet BPs expectations. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses % of supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	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: HR affects selection extractives business partners: The Company has provided some details about how it selects suppliers but has not indicated how it engages with extractive business partners such as joint venture partners. The Company procurement code of conduct does not cover human rights. The Company provides an example of working together with a joint venture to improve the monitoring of human rights risks, however, the Company has not provided information how HR affects selection of business partners. • Not met: HR affects on-going business partner relationships <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with business partners to improve performance
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 their annual report 'We engage with local communities through public consultations, as well as more ad hoc meetings.' However, the Company does not disclose how they engage with affected and potentially affected stakeholders. The Company discloses how in 2017 the Company held sessions with more than 1,500 local stakeholders, including indigenous people, in Northern Brazil to discuss the exploration projects potential environmental and social impact. • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • 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	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: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company states 'We are aligning our business processes with the UNGPs, which set out how companies should prevent, address and remedy human rights impacts. Our current focus areas include the recruitment, working and living conditions of contracted workforces at our sites, responsible security, community grievance mechanisms and channels for workforces to raise their concerns. We launched guidance on assessing socio-economic factors, including human rights aspects such as resettlement and modern slavery, as part of our group risk process in 2017. ' The Company conducts Modern Slavery Risk reviews. The Company uses risk analytics from Verisk Maplecroft and other data sources to assess countries that pose a high degree of risk. Using this approach the Company prioritised 17 businesses for modern slavery risk reviews in 2017. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] • Met: identifying risks in EX business partners: The Company discloses how it identifies contractors Modern Slavery Risks . There is also an example of the Company working together with a joint venture in Saudi Arabia to identify and assess labour rights risks. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: The Company uses risk analytics from Verisk Maplecroft and other data sources to assess countries that pose a high degree of risk. Using this approach the Company prioritised 17 businesses for modern slavery risk reviews in 2017. <p>The Company also states that in preparing their sustainability report (which covers human rights) the Company met with around 100 different organisations, to hear what issues matter most to their stakeholders. The Company states that they included issues in the sustainability report if they were highlighted as high importance in terms of business impact and stakeholder concern, the company then discusses how human rights was highlighted as a material issues in 2017, and in particular worker welfare, the rights of people in communities, and security and human rights. The Company then breaks down these issues and our they addressed them. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com & Our Stakeholders and Issues, 06/06/2018: bp.com]</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: The Company states that they consider many aspects 'including prevalence of corruption and bribery in the host country, local employment, security and human rights, community health and safety, the infrastructure of local communities and households, and the livelihoods of local communities, including indigenous peoples' to screen their major projects.' The Company describes an example of the Company working together with a joint venture in Saudi Arabia to identify and assess labour rights risks. During this process the Company held meetings with contractors on workers rights and welfare during site visits. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] • Met: In consultation with HR experts: The Company utilises Verisk Maplecroft analytic data. The Company also uses third party experts, such as Verité, for their labour rights audits. The Company states 'We conduct labour rights audits or assessments when appropriate. Focus areas tend to be working hours, recruitment processes, freedom of movement, employment contracts and channels for workers to raise complaints.' <p>The Company also states that they conduct stakeholder engagement with non-governmental organisations 'we interact with local and international NGOs to discuss issues as diverse as climate change and energy policy, human rights, revenue transparency and operating in sensitive areas.' [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Triggered by new circumstances: The Company describes how they screen major projects to identify and manage any potential human rights impacts. The Company states that ' The findings inform our impact assessments and the mitigation measures we put in place during project design, construction and operations. ' The Company's Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement discloses 'In 2016, we piloted a due diligence process to help screen potential suppliers anywhere in the world on labour rights, including modern slavery risks. We are taking a risk-based approach to monitoring our contractors and suppliers. When appropriate for assessment or monitoring purposes – or if we have reason to believe that violations are occurring in our supply chain – we conduct labour rights assessments or audits that look into issues such as prevention of forced labour and human trafficking and respect for other rights outlined in the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. ' [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] • Met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): The Company includes human rights in impact assessment requirements for certain projects. The Company states that they screen their 'major projects to identify and manage any potential impacts, including human rights....These findings inform our impact assessments and the mitigation measures we put in place during project design, construction and operations.'
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company states on its website 'We are committed to identifying and addressing human rights risks and impacts directly linked with our business activities, including the rights of our workforce and those living in communities affected by our activities.' <p>Our current focus areas include the recruitment, working and living conditions of contracted workforces at our sites, responsible security, community grievance mechanisms and channels for workforces to raise their concerns.'</p> <p>The Company details how they do Modern Slavery Risk reviews for parts of their supply chain that pose a higher risk of modern slavery issues and labour rights than others.</p> <p>The Company also has developed a survey tool to reinforce existing security risk assessment processes with respect to the Voluntary Principles. The tool helps businesses assess the potential impacts of their security arrangements on people and communities. It also helps to simplify capture of information with respect to the Voluntary Principles. [Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2017: bp.com & Governance and Risk, 2017: bp.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company discloses the risk assessments that came from members of the board field visits to BP operations. This includes information with regards to the hiring of contractors and health and safety. The Company also publishes case study's regarding risk-assessments of operations. For example, the Company publishes a case study of 'assessing the risk

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>of modern slavery at our UK retail stations'. The review included 19 contractor companies who provide construction, maintenance and facilities management services. [Assessing the risk of modern slavery at our UK retail stations, 06/06/2018: bp.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	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: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company highlights that their material human rights risks in 2017, as identified by their stakeholders, include worker welfare, rights of people in communities and security and human rights. The Company states that subject matter experts from across BP complete the initial prioritization of these issues. The company then has addressed these three core human rights issues with how they have addressed these issues. This has been validated by Ernst and Young and the Company's sustainability committee. <p>In the 'Human Rights - additional information' document, the company has noted that they have prioritised 17 businesses for a Modern Slavery Risk review. The Company then mapped their supply chain in these cases to identify high risk contractors. In some instances, this initial screening led to further assessment through questionnaires or on-site labour rights assessments, including worker interviews.</p> <p>The Company Modern Slavery Statement describes how the Company is taking a risk-based approach to monitoring contractors and suppliers - and 'when appropriate for assessment or monitoring purposes - or if we have reason to believe that violations are occurring in our supply chain - we conduct labour rights assessments or audits that look into issues such as prevention of forced labour and human trafficking and respect for other rights outlined in the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.'</p> <p>The Modern Slavery Statement also describes how the review of the risk of modern slavery in the Company's businesses and supply chains has 'in some instances led to further actions. Including reviewing of contractor workforce recruitment plans, on-site labour rights assessments and verifying contractors commitments to labour rights.' [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com & Our Stakeholders and Issues, 06/06/2018: bp.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Example of Actions decided: The Company publishes a wide range of case studies in their 'Human Rights - Additional Information' document. For example, the Company discloses how initial screening of modern slavery risk reviews led to further assessment through questionnaires or on site labour assessments. <p>As published on the Company website, as a result of their actions to assess the risk of modern slavery at BPs UK retail stations, the Company states that they continue to work with one of the contractor companies, who had been identified as having gaps in information on workforce nationality data, 'to better understand their methods of working with sub-contractors and their plans to strengthen them.'</p> <p>The Modern Slavery Statement also describes how the review of the risk of modern slavery in the Company's businesses and supply chains has 'in some instances led to further actions. Including reviewing of contractor workforce recruitment plans, on-site labour rights assessments and verifying contractors commitments to labour rights.' [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com & Assessing the risk of modern slavery at our UK retail stations, 06/06/2018: bp.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Including amongst EX BRs: The Company details risk assessments done with regards to contractors, such as the UK retail station review. The Company also details a case study regarding work with a joint venture partner in Saudi Arabia where BP has helped 'support them in assessing the risk of modern slavery - both before and after contracts are awarded'. Actions taken following a risk assessment, to mitigate risk, also flow onto contractors and JVs such as reviewing contractor recruitment standards and processes. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com & Assessing the risk of modern slavery at our UK retail stations, 06/06/2018: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective: The Tangguh Independent Advisory Panel (TIAP), set up in 2002 provides guidance to BP on the non-commercial aspects of its operations in Tangguh, Indonesia. As part of this work, it

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts		<p>held engagement sessions with local and international NGOs in the UK and US to share the results of TIAP's 2015 assessment and some of the highlights and challenges of BP's social development programmes. Stakeholders discussed issues such as security and human rights and the progress of indigenous Papuan development through local enterprises. TIAP provided BP with several suggestions for possible improvements to the joint training exercise and BP plans to work with the police to develop further scenarios in line with the recommendations within the report. Nevertheless, details of overall system(s) for tracking the actions taken in response to human rights risks assessment and for evaluating effectiveness of actions have not been disclosed by the Company. [Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2017: bp.com & Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Comms plan re identifying risks: The Company has communicated that it has a system to identify human rights risks and impacts including own operations and extractive business partners (see B.2.1). [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] • Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: The Company has communicated that it has a system to assess which are its human rights issues, including a disclosure of these (see B.2.2). [Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2017: bp.com] • Met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: The Company has communicated that it has a system to take action to prevent, mitigate or remediate its salient human rights issues and has provided an example (see B.2.3). [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including EX BRs <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's code of conduct refers to 'Open Talk', which it describes as 'BP's global helpline, is a confidential way to get answers to your questions and to raise concerns. It is administered by an independent company, is available every day of the week at any time, day or night, and can accommodate calls in more than 75 languages. You can contact Open Talk anonymously from most locations'. <p>The Company Human Rights - Additional Information document states that Open talk can be utilised by anyone (incl. all workers) to raise concerns anonymously for human rights related grievances.</p> <p>The Company has also indicated that: 'Government assigned protection of the BTC and South Caucasus pipelines in Georgia comes from the Strategic Pipeline Protection Department (SPPD). Private Security of our sites is provided by 'Veziri'. BP security team has installed 'feedback boxes' at all sites to ensure that the workforce can report issues affecting performance regarding human rights. 'Veziri' also implemented a grievance system using an online submission tool for anonymous grievances. Further to this, BP Georgia has created a procedure for 'Cooperation and Investigation in Response to Allegations of Human Rights Abuses'. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company does disclose in 2017 that the company did not receive any third party complaints about any incidents related to excessive use of force. However, other quantitative information regarding human-rights related grievances is not disclosed. [Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2017: bp.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The Company publishes their code of conduct in 23 languages. Complaints against the code of conduct can be made through the Open Talk grievance mechanism. The Company publishes a list of local numbers, and a 'collect call' number which will accept calls without any charges to the caller. The Code of conduct states that Open talk 'is administered by an independent company, is available every day of the week at any time, day or night, and can accommodate calls in more than 75 languages.' [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com]
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: The Community can access Open Talk, BPs independently operated grievance mechanism. In addition to having Open Talk, the Company requires each of their operating sites to document how they manage community complaints. The Company has clarified to CHRB 'Yes: any employee, contractor or other third party can contact BP's confidential helpline, OpenTalk. This includes complaints from communities in relation to impacts associated with activities of BP's extractive business partners, where BP is not the operator.' [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com & Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: The grievance mechanism Open Talk can accommodate calls in 'more than 75 languages.' The grievance mechanism is independently operated, and can be accessed anonymously. Furthermore, there is the option of a 'collect call' number which will accept calls without any charges to the complainant. Furthermore, the Company OMS requires that BP entities establish and implement a process to receive communications from key communities and stakeholders, respond to their concerns, identify and manage impacts and record and act on their external commitments. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com & Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] • Met: EX BP communities use global system: The Company states that they 'encourage employees, contractors, communities and other third parties to speak up if they see something they think could be unsafe or unethical...anyone can ask questions and raise concerns anonymously in Open Talk.' The Company OMS requires that BP entities establish and implement a process to receive communications from key communities and stakeholders, respond to their concerns, identify and manage impacts and record and act on their external commitments. Community members can make grievances related to operated joint venture BP operations. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com]
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	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: Engages users to create or assess system: The Company monitors the number of calls that come through the Open Talk mechanism. If the Company believes the number of calls have gone down, remedial action is taken. <p>The Company has a case study that describes their South Caucasus Pipeline Expansion project - regular reviews of employee terms and conditions, welfare and grievances by experienced employee relations professionals within the contractor organizations. The Company states that it is 'sharing what we learned from this assessment with our businesses around the world.' [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com & Sustainability Report, 2015: bp.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Description of how they do this: Related to its mechanism for workers, the Company has provided the following example in their 2015 Sustainability Report: 'We look for opportunities to reinforce our culture of speaking up. For example, we identified that the number of concerns raised by our employees in Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey was lower than expected. Following a survey, we discovered that employees were not aware of the channels available to raise concerns or were reluctant to use them. To address this, we delivered more than 100 training sessions to employees, contractors and suppliers. The sessions reinforced the importance of ethical behaviour, explained how to raise concerns and outlined our policy of zero tolerance towards retaliation. Since the programme began in 2013, the number of concerns raised in the region increased from 37 to 58 in 2015'. [Assessing the risk of modern slavery at our UK retail stations, 06/06/2018: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with users on system performance: The Company states that one of their 'human rights focus areas' is consultation and grievance mechanisms. However, the Company does not go into further detail as to how they engage with users on system performance. [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Met: EX BPs in creation or assessment: The Company discloses how it worked together with a non-operated joint venture partner. The Company worked together with the partner to support them in assessing the risk of modern slavery - and as a result the Company held meetings with contractors on worker rights and welfare during site visits and checked the recruitment, working practices and worker grievance mechanisms of shortlisted companies. [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com]
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	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: Response timescales: Open Talk is administered by an independent company. The website opentalkweb.com, is available to everyone in 12 different languages representing the countries in which we operate, and provides many more phone numbers and facility to take a complaint in over 75 languages. The Group Ethics and Compliance Officer is responsible for the Code of Conduct. [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com] • Not met: How complainants will be informed: The Company states "We listen and respond to concerns; establish and implement a process to receive communications; update complainants on progress and the outcome of their complaint" and "we communicate with the individuals who raised the concern throughout the process and also respond formally at the end". However, they do not clarify how the complainants will be informed. [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Escalation to senior/independent level: Information regarding complaints is stated in the Company's operating management system. The company discloses "As an example, at our South Caucasus Pipeline Expansion (SCPX) project in Azerbaijan, all grievances are logged and investigated. The details are then discussed and recommendations are proposed at the grievance investigation panel, which includes company legal, social, land and environmental team members and managers. Senior management are involved for more serious and complex issues." [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com]
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	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: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The Code of Conduct covers human rights. The Code of Conduct states that BP 'does not tolerate retaliation. We consider acts of retaliation to be misconduct. Retaliation can take many forms, for example: threats, intimidation, exclusion, humiliation, and raising issues maliciously or in bad faith. ' <p>Bob Dudley's note on the Code of Conduct states 'Please have the courage to speak up if you see anything that appears to breach this Code. Your concerns will be considered seriously - and BP will not tolerate retaliation against anyone.' [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: The Company states that it is the responsibility of managers to be a positive role model and support team members by 'doing your part to make sure that no one experiences retaliation for speaking up or co-operating in an investigation.' [Code of Conduct, 04/06/2018: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects EX BRs to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	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: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights <p>Score 2</p> <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	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: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Company states 'If we do cause, or contribute to, adverse impacts on the human rights of communities near our operations, we are committed to providing for, or co-operating in, making it right.' The Company then describes case study examples of how they have negotiated grievances with communities. For example, in Trinidad & Tobago, the Company conducted seismic surveys to develop

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>the Juniper gas field which affected people working in the local fishing industry as it meant they could not work in the area for safety reasons. Following consultations with fishing associations and communities, we made payments for temporary loss of livelihood to those affected. ' [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.1	Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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: Living wage target timeframe • Not met: Describes how living wage determined <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Pays living wages • Not met: Reviews livings wages definition with unions
D.3.2	Transparency and accountability (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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: Member of EITI: The Company is a founding member of the EITI. [Revenue Transparency, 07/06/2018: bp.com] • Met: Reports of taxes beyond legal minimums: The Company publishes a 'payments to governments' report that reports taxes beyond legal minimums. [Report on payments to government, 31/12/2017: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Reports taxes and revenue by country: The 'payment to governments' yearly report breaks down taxes, royalties, fees, bonuses and infrastructure improvements paid by country breakdown. [Report on payments to government, 31/12/2017: bp.com] • Met: Steps taken re non EITI countries: In 2017, the Company supported EITI implementation in a number of countries were they operate - including in Iraq and Trinidad & Tobago. [Revenue Transparency, 07/06/2018: bp.com]
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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 not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
D.3.4	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company reports the recordable injuries (2017: 384 and recordable injury frequency (2017: 0.22) [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: The Company reports day away from work cases (2017: 97) and day away from work case frequency (2017: 0.055). [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com] • Met: Fatalities disclosures: The Company reports fatalities for employees (2017:1) and contractors (2017:0). [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Set targets for H&S performance: The Company tracks their safety performance using industry metrics to continuously improve safety across the Company's operations. The Company compares their recordable injury frequency, and days away from work frequency, with the American Petroleum Institute US benchmark and the International Association of Oil & Gas Producers benchmark. The Company highlights how 'Within industry group IPIECA, we have developed a global performance standard to help us monitor and improve prevention programmes, investigate incidents and implement corrective actions from lessons learned. 'The Company states that they have a goal of "no accidents" and "no harm to people". The Company also notes that remuneration for executives is linked to performance against safety performance indicators (Recordable Injury Frequency and Tier 1 incidents). [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Met targets or explains why not: The Company describes the fatality in 2017 'when a firefighter died in the course of his duties at our biofuels business in Brazil.' The Company also discusses their safety performance in comparison with the American Petroleum Institute US Benchmark and the International Association of Oil & Gas Producers Benchmark. The Company reports on the safety of their vehicle accidents "Results are promising, and, in 2017, our 1,700 fuel drivers in Europe reached 12 consecutive months without a single severe vehicle accident. There were 547 reported vehicle accidents in 2017. This is the third consecutive year in which we have recorded no driving-related workforce fatalities and the 10th consecutive year in the Upstream segment." However, the Company does not specifically report against their no accidents and no harm to people target. [Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com]
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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 identify indigenous rights holders • Not met: How engages with communities in assessment <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM) • Not met: Gives recent example FPIC or dropping deal
D.3.6	Land rights (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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: The Company disclosed to the CHRB, as published on the BHHRC website, "Our operating management system (OMS) includes requirements for our projects that wherever possible a community or communities not be moved from their principal place of dwelling. OMS also provides guidance on physical and economic resettlement if this is necessary, including how to identify legitimate land tenure rights." However, this information does not detail how the company engages with the affected or potentially affected communities in the process. [BP Response to CHRB Initial Assessment 2018, 22/08/2018: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: Describes approach to doing so if no recent 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 deals
D.3.7	Security (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC): The Company publishes an annual report to the Voluntary Principles. The Company provides training on the principles for employees accountable for managing security and conduct assessments to identify areas where the Company can improve. [Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2017: bp.com & Sustainability Report, 2017: bp.com] • Met: Example of respecting HRs in security: The Company states that 'BP continues to build relationships in our non-operated joint ventures which enable us to discuss and share our approach to security and human rights across our operations. In particular in 2017 we have worked closely with Kosmos Energy to learn from each other's approaches across a number of projects we are working on together. Throughout the year BP undertook a series of briefings to key internal stakeholders, delivered VPSHR training and supported VPSHR Risk Assessments (VPSHR-RA) and in-country implementation processes in a number of countries, including Trinidad, Mauritania, Senegal and Egypt. ' [Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2017: bp.com] • Met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach: As above with regards to joint ventures. The Company also states 'As with any type of contractor, BP businesses screen and select private security contractors based on a combination of factors.' These factors include alignment to human rights policy. [Annual Report on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2017: bp.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Assesses and involves communities: The Company describes how local operations implement actions to help meet security and human rights commitments, such as providing channels for local communities to raise concerns. The Company provides an example of the Integrated Community Based Security (ICBS) concept which is implemented in Tangguh is built on working in an ongoing fashion with the local community; ICBS establishes shared responsibilities for maintaining security. [BP Response to CHRB Initial Assessment 2018, 22/08/2018: business-humanrights.org] Met: Working with local community: The Company describes the Integrated Community Based Security Concept (ICBS) which is implemented in Tangguh. 'The Integrated Community-Based Security (ICBS) concept which is implemented in Tangguh is built on working in an ongoing fashion with the local community; ICBS establishes shared responsibilities for maintaining security. Local communities, government bodies and security forces are all given a role in resolving conflict issues. The Field guidelines which govern the provision of security at Tangguh require use of a community policing system, in which dialogue with communities and mechanisms for conflict prevention and resolution play a key part.' [BP Response to CHRB Initial Assessment 2018, 22/08/2018: business-humanrights.org]
D.3.8	Water and sanitation (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks: The Company describes how they design, operate and decommission their wells in a way that reduces the risk of water contamination. The Company discloses "Another aspect we consider, as part of our environmental and social impact assessment for new projects, is the potential effect our activities might have on the surrounding community's right to water and sanitation. If we identify a potential impact, we put in place preventive and corrective actions. For example, we may reduce water withdrawal by using recycled water. We did not identify any such impacts in any of our projects in 2017." [Human Rights - Additional Information, 2017: bp.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Water targets considering local factors Not met: Reports progress in meeting targets and shows 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 39.07 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 9.77 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	2.74 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, BP made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 26 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 2.74 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Company reports on GRI: The company has submitted reports to GRI
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0.4 out of 4	<p>BP met 1 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0.4 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator.</p> <p>Specificity and use of concrete examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) <p>Discussing challenges openly</p> <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 <p>Demonstrating a forward focus</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
			<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.3.1 : Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs) • Not met: Score 2 for D.3.4 : Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)

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.