

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



Company Name BRF
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
Overall Score (*) 8.9 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
1.2	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.9	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
1.7	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
0.8	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.8	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
2.6	10	F. Transparency

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

Please note also that the "Not met" labels in the Explanation boxes below do not necessarily mean that the company does not meet the requirements as they are described in the bullet point short text. Rather, it means that the analysts could not find information *in public sources* that met the requirements *as described in full* in the CHRB 2018 Methodology document. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

Detailed assessment

A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: General HRs commitment: The company states that 'BRF respects, protects and fulfils the enjoyment of human rights, internationally agreed and provided for in both national and international legislation applicable to the Company and People'. [Code of Ethics and Conduct, May 28, 2015] Score 2 • Not met: UNGPs: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator • Not met: OECD: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator
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: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company indicates that 'BRF has been a signatory of this set of commitments [referring to the UNGC] since 2011, and as of 2013, the company became part of the Global Compact 100 Stock Index, which recognizes companies committed to incorporating the principles into their business model'. [Annual and sustainability report 2016, March 20th, 2017: ri.brf-global.com] • Not met: All four ILO for AG suppliers: The Code of conduct for suppliers contains statements on child labour, non-discrimination, forced labour, and freedom of association. No evidence found on respecting the right to collective bargaining, the Company indicates that suppliers shall 'assure the right of employees to be members of class associations and workers unions and to organize themselves into

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>entities of their own choice, without retaliation, under the terms established in the applicable standards'; [Code of conduct for suppliers, 05/2012: brf-global.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: All four ILO Core: No evidence found of a explicit commitment to each ILO core labour standards • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company states that 'Since 2006, our Health, Safety, and Environment Program (HSE) has developed and implemented actions that enable safe behaviour and respect for life in our operations'. [Annual and sustainability report 2016, March 20th, 2017: ri.brf-global.com] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: The Code for suppliers contains requirements and guidelines on health and safety [Code of conduct for suppliers, 05/2012: brf-global.com]
A.1.3.a.AG	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - land and natural resources (AG)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Respect land ownership and resources • Not met: Respecting the right to water: The Company is committed to reducing its impact on water and expects its supplier to use water rationally. However, this was found in an annual report. No evidence found of a formal commitment t respect the right to water. • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure • Not met: IFC Performance Standards • Not met: FPIC for all • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.3.b.AG	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - people's rights (AG)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Women's rights • Not met: Children's rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles • Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business Principles • Not met: Convention on migrant workers • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy: The Company indicates that 'The overall expansion of our operations results in an increase in the complexity and importance of the Company's relationship with local communities. More than just mitigating the negative impacts of the operation, we strive to generate a positive and participatory agenda involving the community, aiming to build solutions that promote local development'. However, no specific statement of commitment to remedy found in public policies. [Annual and sustainability report 2016, March 20th, 2017: ri.brf-global.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with AG suppliers to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) <p>Score 2</p> <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	0.5	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 code of ethics contains a general commitment to human rights and a specific commitment on child labour. The code has been approved by the Board of Directors Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Incentives for at least one board member 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
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations 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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs: The company states in the code of conduct for suppliers that "The destination of this material is the Supplier, who shall execute the Instrument of Notification and Agreement, returning it to BRF, following the instructions of its relationship area". [Code of conduct for suppliers, 05/2012: brf-global.com] Not met: Including to AG suppliers: The code of conduct for suppliers to be signed by every supplier states that 'As a Supplier of BRF and/or its subsidiaries [...] I will disclose this Code to my representatives, collaborators, suppliers and contractors that render services to BRF'. [Code of conduct for suppliers, 05/2012: brf-global.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: The code of conduct for suppliers states that 'BRF expects that its Suppliers be pledged with the search

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			for an ethical and responsible administration, based upon the requirements of this Code, and requests the formalization of the Instrument of Notification and Agreement' [Code of conduct for suppliers, 05/2012: brf-global.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including on AG suppliers
B.1.5	Training on 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: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments • Not met: Trains relevant managers including procurement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments • Not 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR affects selection of suppliers • Met: HR affects on-going supplier relationships: The Supplier code of conduct states that 'The compliance of the requirements contained in the document in question shall be monitored and evaluated periodically by BRF and the non compliance thereof will result in the application of disciplinary measures and/or fines established in the labour, civil or penal legislation, as the situation may require, up to including the termination of the business relationship between the parties'. [Code of conduct for suppliers, 05/2012: brf-global.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with suppliers to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Stakeholder process or systems • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • Not met: Workers in SC engaged • Not met: Communities in the SC engaged Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations • Not met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Example of Actions decided • Not met: Including in AG supply chain Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	taking appropriate action		
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including AG suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The company states that "Complaints may be reported to the immediate superior or through the BRF Transparency Hotline, made available by BRF on the corporate intranet and website. Complaints can be reported through phone, website or email. Complaints may also be reported on an anonymous basis" [Code of Ethics and Conduct, May 28, 2015] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect AG supplier to have equivalent grievance systems • Not met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Grievance mechanism for community: The annual report states that 'In addition to the BRF transparency hotline, other channels that we offer to different audiences – such as investors, the press, consumers, clients and business partners – are the Corporate Communication Area and the Customer Service Center'. However, it is not clear whether the hotline is open to these audiences, and particularly to individuals and communities who may be adversely impacted by the Company, particularly in high risk locations. [Annual and sustainability report 2016, March 20th, 2017: ri.brf-global.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects AG supplier to have community grievance systems • Not met: AG supplier communities use global system
C.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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	available and explained		
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The Code of ethics states that 'BRF strongly condemns any form of retaliation against complainants who have reported a complaint in good faith and with responsibility, even if the complaint proves not to be genuine'. [Code of Ethics and Conduct, May 28, 2015] Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: 'Complaints may also be reported on an anonymous basis, as far as permitted by the local legislation of the country'. [Code of Ethics and Conduct, May 28, 2015] 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: The company does not describe how they determine what a living wage should be but they state in their annual report that "the lowest salary practiced in 2016 was 12% higher than the national minimum wage.[In Brazil]" and that their "Wages meet market standards, and are aligned with performance and the professional's time with the company." [Annual and sustainability report 2016, March 20th, 2017: ri.brf-global.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Describes how living wage determined Not met: Paying living wage Not met: Definition of living wage reviewed with unions
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: Supplier Code of Conduct does not contain a commitment to living wage, although it states that 'workers shall be paid appropriately, following the minimum criteria established by law or by the workers' unions, with the payments made on time, plus other legal benefits, without wage deductions due to disciplinary issues' [Code of conduct for suppliers, 05/2012: brf-global.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers 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)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • 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 • Not met: Does not use child labour: The company states that they are signatories 'of pacts and voluntary initiatives covering corporate responsibility aspects - such as fighting degrading or slave/child labour'. However, no evidence found on guidelines on verifying age. • Not met: Age verification of applicants and workers Score 2 • Not met: Remediation if children identified
D.1.4.b	Child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour Score 2 • 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 • Not met: Pays workers in full and on time • Not met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions Score 2 • 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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.c	Forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement Score 2 • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: The supplier code of conduct to be signed by the suppliers states suppliers should "Not to restrain the freedom of the worker by retaining documents" [Code of conduct for suppliers, 05/2012: brf-global.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on free movement [Code of conduct for suppliers, 05/2012: brf-global.com] Score 2 • 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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights / Steps to avoid intimidation or retaliation: The company do not explicitly commit to not interfere with the right of workers but the "follow the labour law of each of the countries and, when there is an entity representing the workers, collective bargaining agreements are 100% observed." [Annual and sustainability report 2016, March 20th, 2017: ri.brf-global.com] • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining agreements Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB: However, the Company states that suppliers should assure "the right of the employees of class associations and workers unions and to organize themselves into entities of their own choice, without retaliation, under the terms established in the applicable standards". [Code of conduct for suppliers, 05/2012: brf-global.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own agricultural operations)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company reports the lost-time injuries and the lost-time injury rates for the last three years [Annual and sustainability report 2016, March 20th, 2017: ri.brf-global.com] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: The Company reports the total number of lost days for the last three years [Annual and sustainability report 2016, March 20th, 2017: ri.brf-global.com] • Met: Fatalities disclosures: The Company reports the number of fatalities for the last three years [Annual and sustainability report 2016, March 20th, 2017: ri.brf-global.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Set targets for H&S performance • Not met: Met targets or explains why not
D.1.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (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: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements • Not met: Injury Rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosure Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.8.a	Land rights: Land acquisition (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: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders • Not met: Approach to doing so if no recent land deals Score 2 <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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Rules on land & owners in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on land issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends in the progress made
D.1.9.a	Water and sanitation (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: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Water targets considering local factors • Not met: Reports progress and shows trends in progress made
D.1.9.b	Water and sanitation (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Rules on water stewardship in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on water stewardship issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.10.a	Women's rights (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: 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • Not met: Meet all requirements under score 1
D.1.10.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights Score 2 • 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 7.15 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 1.79 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	0.63 out of 4	Out of a total of 51 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, BRF made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 8 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.63 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 • Met: Company reports on GRI: "Since 2009, we have adopted the GRI methodology, a global benchmark for social and environmental reports" [Annual and sustainability report 2016, March 20th, 2017: ri.brf-global.com] • Not met: Company reports on SASB • Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	BRF met 0 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples • 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 • 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 • 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) • Not 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 CHR B Ltd, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither CHR B 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.