

Company Name Barrick Gold Corporation
Industry Extractives
Overall Score (*) 56.9 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
5.7	10	A. Governance and Policies
16.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
7.5	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
10.0	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
10.9	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
6.8	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 2019 Methodology document. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

Detailed assessment

A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: General HRs commitment: In its Human Rights Policy, the Company states: 'It is Barrick's policy to respect the human rights of all individuals impacted by Barrick operations, including employees and external stakeholders. ' Furthermore, the company state that "Barrick does not tolerate violations of human rights committed by its employees, affiliates, or any third parties acting on its behalf or related to any aspect of a Barrick operation." [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: In its Annual Information Form 2018, the Company indicates: 'Barrick has been a member of the UN Global Compact's ("UNGC") Human Rights and Labour Working Group since 2013, [...]'" [Annual Information Form, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs: In its Human Rights Policy the Company indicates: 'Barrick strives to act in accordance with the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises.' However, this statement is not considered a clear commitment. [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: OECD: See above [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: ILO Core: In its Human Rights Policy the Company states: 'Barrick does not tolerate the use of child labour, prison labour, forcibly indentured labour, bonded

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>labour, slavery or servitude, and adheres to the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.' In addition, it indicates that: 'This Policy is applicable to every employee of Barrick Gold Corporation or its subsidiaries, including senior executive and financial officers, and to members of the Barrick Board of Directors. The reporting requirement of this Policy is also applicable to Barrick's contractors and suppliers. The Policy is not applicable to Acacia Mining and the Porgera Joint Venture, which maintain their own human rights policies, or to Jabil Sayid, and may not be applicable at other locations in which Barrick holds a significant interest but does not exercise operational control.' [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs: In its Supplier Code of Ethics, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers are expected to comply with the International Labor Organization's Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, as well as any contractual terms with respect to work conditions in its contract with Barrick. Suppliers should uphold: The freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; The elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labor; The effective abolition of child labor; The elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation' [...] 'For the purpose of this document, a "Supplier" is defined as a third party individual or entity Vendor that provides goods and/or services, and receives payment, for any aspect of the Company's operations including exploration, development, construction, operations and reclamation. [...] Excluded from this definition of "Suppliers" are all transactions involving land purchases, royalties, or leases, government agencies and/or utilities, financial institutions, other Barrick entities, joint venture partners and other mining companies.' On the other hand, in its website section 'Joint Venture', the Company indicates: 'While our programs and policies do not always extend to those sites and operations we do not operate, we seek to influence management action, for example, through contractual rights and Board membership. That may mean conducting or advocating for audits and assessments, pressing for compensation structures to reflect our priorities, seeking reports on incidents, engaging over aspects of their human rights programs, seeking regular progress reports, asking for details on training and stakeholder engagements, and through other efforts.' [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, Sep 2016: barrick.q4cdn.com & Joint ventures] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: In its Policy with respect to the Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, the Company states: [...] Barrick has created this policy to respect the International Labour Organization (ILO) Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, which are: freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour; the effective abolition of child labour; and the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.' In addition, it indicates: 'This Policy applies to all employees and workers for offices of and entities operated by Barrick Gold Corporation (Barrick), and includes temporary employees, employees of Barrick-operated joint ventures and affiliates, and all third party-employed workers (including contractors) who perform work on Barrick premises or otherwise on behalf of Barrick. It does not apply to entities or joint-ventures that Barrick does not operate.' [Policy with respect to the Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, Oct 2015: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: In its Human Rights Policy, the Company states: 'Barrick recognizes and respects the freedom to join or refrain from joining legally authorized associations or organizations, and respects the safety and health of workers.' [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: H&S applies to EX BPs: In its Supplier Code of Ethics, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers must be committed to respecting the safety and health of workers and creating safe working conditions and a healthy work environment for all of their workers who provide goods or services to Barrick.' On the other hand, in its website section 'Joint Venture', the Company indicates: 'While our programs and policies do not always extend to those sites and operations we do not operate, we seek to influence management action, for example, through contractual rights and Board membership. That may mean conducting or advocating for audits and assessments, pressing for compensation structures to reflect our priorities, seeking reports on incidents, engaging over aspects of their human rights programs, seeking regular progress reports, asking for details on training and stakeholder engagements, and through other efforts.' [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, Sep 2016: barrick.q4cdn.com & Joint ventures]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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: Voluntary Principles (VPs) participant: In its Human Rights Policy, the Company states: 'Barrick will seek to adhere to the requirements of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights in its dealings with private and public security providers, local communities, and potential victims of human rights violations.' In addition, in its Annual Information Form 2018, the Company indicates: 'Barrick has been a member of [...] the Steering Committee of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights between 2012 and 2014 and from 2016 to present, [...].' It also has a Security Policy, where it promises 'to treat all people with respect and dignity, and to be guided in our approaches and actions by the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights.' [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & Annual Information Form, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: Uses only ICoCA members Not met: Respecting indigenous rights: In its Community Relations Policy, the Company states that it promises 'to consider the values, needs and concerns of Indigenous Peoples and vulnerable groups within our sphere of influence.' However, no evidence found of a formal commitment to respect Indigenous Peoples rights. [Community Relations Policy: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: ILO 169 Not met: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: FPIC commitment: In its website section 'Indigenous Peoples', the Company indicates: 'As a company, Barrick has committed to work towards obtaining consent from significantly impacted Indigenous Peoples for new projects and major changes to existing projects, aligned with the ICMM Position Statement.' In addition, in its Human Rights Report: 'As a member of the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), we are committed to conducting business in accordance with the ICMM's Sustainable Development Principles, which include a commitment to upholding fundamental human rights and respecting culture, customs, and values in dealing with our people and others affected by our activities.' [Indigenous Peoples] Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure Rights Not met: IFC performance standards Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs Not met: Respecting the right to water: In its Human Rights report 2018, the Company included 'Water Use & Management - The Right to Water' as a salient human right risk, however, CHRB could not find a statement where the Company commits to respecting the right to water. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: Expects BPs to commit to 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: Regular stakeholder engagement: In its website section 'Stakeholder Engagement' the Company indicates: 'We undertake regular stakeholder- and issues-mapping, to identify our stakeholders and the issues they care about most. We prioritize engagement with stakeholder groups who are directly impacted and interested in our activities (such as local communities and host governments) and those that can have a significant impact on our business success (such as our investors, civil society, and governments).' In addition it discloses a table which 'summarizes the ways that we engaged these site- and enterprise-level stakeholders in 2017, their key interests, and examples of how we have reported on or taken action on these interests.' The table includes Local communities, workers and civil society organizations. [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	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: In its Human Rights Policy, the Company states: 'In instances in which Barrick determines that its employees, affiliates or third parties acting on its behalf have caused adverse human rights impacts, it will consider appropriate mechanisms to mitigate such impacts and remediation. Where violations by employees are proven, Barrick will consider appropriate sanctions and remedies to victims.' We expect our employees, directors, and third party suppliers and contractors to understand and follow our Human Rights Policy and its implementing procedures.' [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<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 EX BPs to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	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: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs): In its Human Rights Policy, the Company states: 'Barrick does not tolerate threats, intimidation or attacks against human rights defenders.' [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expects EX BPs to reflect company HRD commitments: In its Supplier Code of Ethics, the Company indicates: 'Barrick does not tolerate threats, intimidation or attacks against human rights defenders.' On the other hand, in its website section 'Joint Venture', the Company states: 'While our programs and policies do not always extend to those sites and operations we do not operate, we seek to influence management action, for example, through contractual rights and Board membership. That may mean conducting or advocating for audits and assessments, pressing for compensation structures to reflect our priorities, seeking reports on incidents, engaging over aspects of their human rights programs, seeking regular progress reports, asking for details on training and stakeholder engagements, and through other efforts.' [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, Sep 2016: barrick.q4cdn.com & Joint ventures]

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	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: CEO or Board approves policy: Its Human Rights Policy was approved by the Board of Directors. [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: In its Corporate Responsibility Committee Mandate, the Company indicates: 'the Corporate Responsibility Committee (the "Committee") of the Board of Directors (the "Board") assists the Board in overseeing the Company's environmental, safety and health, corporate social responsibility, and human rights programs, policies and performance. [...] The Committee's responsibilities with respect to human rights matters include: (a) reviewing the Company's human rights program, including human rights policies and standards; (b) satisfying itself that management of the Company monitors trends and reviews current and emerging issues in the human rights field and evaluates their impact on the Company; and (c) reviewing the Company's human rights performance to assess the effectiveness of the human rights program.' [Corporate Responsibility Committee Mandate, Dec 2015: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO: The Company include in its website an interview with a member of CSR Advisory Board, Gare Smith, where he speaks about several topics related with human rights and extractives companies. However, this interview does not include references to the Company's HRs specific approach. [In conversation with Gare Smith, Dec 2015: barrick.com]
A.2.2	Board discussions	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: Board/Committee review of salient HRs: According to its Corporate Responsibility Committee Mandate, the CSR Advisory Board Committee 'shall have a minimum of four meetings per year, to coincide with the Company's financial reporting cycle. Additional meetings will be scheduled as considered necessary or appropriate.' 'The Committee's responsibilities also include (a) reporting regularly to the Board and, where appropriate, making recommendations to management of the Company and/or to the Board; [...]'. [Corporate Responsibility Committee Mandate, Dec 2015: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Examples or trends re HR discussion: In the CSR Advisory Board Meeting from November 17th 2017, 'Nancy Lockhart, chair of Barrick's Corporate Responsibility Committee, provided an overview of the Committee's mandate and key topics covered, including water management, tailings management, employee safety, workplace harassment, security and human rights, community relations, and mine closure, among other areas. Ms. Lockhart described her mine site visits in 2017, including to Lumwana in Zambia, Veladero in Argentina, and Jabal Sayid in Saudi Arabia. A wide-ranging discussion ensued on human rights risks in mining supply chains, how Barrick's human rights compliance program helps mitigate these risks (more here), and the pervasive incidence of sexual harassment in the

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>workplace, regardless of industry sector. [...] Jonathan Drimmer briefed the Advisory Board on the main areas that Barrick's Legal team will be focusing on in 2018, including guidance regarding supply chain and human rights; litigation guidelines for Barrick lawyers and outside counsel; and the continuation of a business and human rights discussion series in Canada and the United States to help share learnings and best practice across mining and other industry sectors.' [CSR Advisory Board Meeting, Nov 2017]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both examples and process: See above
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	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: Incentives for at least one board member: On its website section Responsible Mining Governance, the Company indicates: 'Annual Performance Incentives for Senior Executives are based on short-term functional and operational priorities. Each Senior Executive has an individual scorecard with measures that relate to Barrick's strategic principles and priorities. Weightings and goals vary by role, but most include a portion that relates to Barrick's sustainability performance. In 2017, all non-executive personnel also had a portion of their annual incentive compensation tied to Barrick's short-term Company scorecard. This included a "Reputation and License to Operate" component, composed of safety, environment, anti-corruption, human rights, community relations, and compliance measures, accounting for 15% of the overall scorecard.' In its Human Rights Report, it adds: 'We tie aspects of the program to executive compensation, as reflected in our Information Circular, and our performance on our human rights program is directly linked to the compensation for one director (Board member). We also directly tie performance under our human rights program (as well as our health and safety program) to our global bonus scorecard, which can impact our people from all functions and disciplines across the company; in 2018, the bonus scorecard includes key performance indicators on human rights related to training, vendor onboarding and due diligence and implementation of the VPs.' However, it is not clear if Board members are also included in this incentive scheme. <p>[Responsible Mining Governance & Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&S: See above. However, CHRB could not find further information about the human rights factors included. <p>Score 2</p> <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	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: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'Day-to-day responsibility of the Human Rights Program is vested within the Chief Compliance Officer (CCO). In addition, the CCO maintains a direct reporting line to relevant committees of the Board of Directors on compliance-related issues, including human rights and investigations.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & Responsible Mining Governance] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: In addition, it adds: 'At a management level, leadership is provided through executives responsible for functional oversight at an enterprise-level and through General Managers and Executive Directors, who are jointly responsible for performance at Barrick sites.' [...] 'We consider our human rights program as a form of governance. Specifically, we believe that every functional unit, office, and site plays a role in our respecting human rights. Under our program, the CCO has worked with relevant internal groups and local operating units to help them consider international human rights norms in their conduct and in developing policies, procedures, and management systems. In this way, we try to operationalize human rights in ways most relevant to each area of the business, and maximize the manner in which human rights are integrated into our daily practices.' In its Report, CHRB could find reference to several teams related with different human rights issues: Security team, Community Relations team, Management team, etc. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs: In its Human Rights Report, the Company states: 'Like other companies in our sector, we have entered into joint ventures and other arrangements in which we may hold a significant ownership interest, but which are operated by independent entities and third parties. We try to select partners who largely share our approach, and where possible, incorporate into relevant contracts and agreements our human rights expectations. While our human rights program does not formally extend to those sites and operations, we do attempt to influence management action through contractual rights and Board membership, and are finalizing a set of internal protocols to assist us in that effort. That may be through conducting or advocating for audits and assessments, pressing for compensation structures to reflect human rights goals, seeking reports on incidents, engaging over aspects of their human rights programs, seeking regular progress updates, asking for details on trainings and stakeholder engagements, and through other efforts.' 'In addition to our human rights assessments, we conduct a variety of internal and external audit and assurance activities that bear upon the human rights program. The results are examined over a multiyear period to identify trends and changes. We also consider the findings in conjunction with information generated by other processes, such as through our enterprise risk management process, internal audits, grievances, hotline reports, our third-party annual social assurance process, community and stakeholder engagement programs, engagements with site and functional leads, and our investigations into incidents.' However, it is not clear how responsibility for managing this is allocated within the Company's structure. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
B.1.2	Incentives and performance 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: Senior manager incentives for human rights: In its website section Responsible Mining Governance, the Company indicates: 'Annual Performance Incentives for Senior Executives are based on short-term functional and operational priorities. Each Senior Executive has an individual scorecard with measures that relate to Barrick's strategic principles and priorities. Weightings and goals vary by role, but most include a portion that relates to Barrick's sustainability performance. In 2017, all non-executive personnel also had a portion of their annual incentive compensation tied to Barrick's short-term Company scorecard. This included a "Reputation and License to Operate" component, composed of safety, environment, anti-corruption, human rights, community relations, and compliance measures, accounting for 15% of the overall scorecard.' In its Human Rights Report, it adds: 'We tie aspects of the program to executive compensation, as reflected in our Information Circular, and our performance on our human rights program is directly linked to the compensation for one director. We also directly tie performance under our human rights program (as well as our health and safety program) to our global bonus scorecard, which can impact our people from all functions and disciplines across the company; in 2018, the bonus scorecard includes key performance indicators on human rights related to training, vendor onboarding and due diligence and implementation of the VPs.' [Responsible Mining Governance] Met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S: See above. [Responsible Mining Governance] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Performance criteria made public: See above. However, CHRB could not find further information in the quoted in the website: Information Circular (Annual Information Form). [Responsible Mining Governance & Annual Information Form, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
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 risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system: In its Annual Information Form, the Company describes the risks integrated in its risk management system. Among these risks there are some related with human rights issues: Security and Human Rights; Environmental, health and safety regulations; Community relations and license to operate; and Employee relations. [Annual Information Form, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	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: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: In its Human Rights report, the Company indicates: 'We always try to be clear to our people and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	Company's own operations		<p>contractors about our human rights expectations and requirements. We start by conveying our expectations even before a new person joins the company. The pre-screening for prospective workers not only helps us hire the best candidates, but also makes clear the primacy we place on ethical colleagues. In addition, employment letters and agreements contain statements expressing our human rights expectations, again making clear that our human rights standards are unwavering. Upon joining the company, all of our people, regardless of location or position, receive basic human rights training during their induction.¹ In addition, it reports: [...] as part of our 2016 testing of management controls, 98 percent of our people demonstrated an understanding of the basic aspects of our Human Rights Policy, and 100 percent understood their duties and responsibilities under the Policy and our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics.¹ It also states: 'We try to meet that test by embedding human rights considerations into Barrick's values, governance frameworks and corporate management systems. From Supply Chain and Human Resources to Security and Community Relations, Barrick considers it our responsibility to respect human rights throughout the business. Indeed, the Policy is supported by and incorporates numerous function-specific policies. [...] The Policy is translated into local relevant language, including Spanish and Russian. We also consider it important to be transparent about our policies, and most are publicly available on our website.'¹ [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder: In its Human Rights Report: 'We also try to be transparent in the public reporting of our program and performance. Consistent with the UNGPs, we publicize our human rights commitments to local communities and other stakeholders. This includes through consultations with our Community Relations personnel, who are best positioned to provide such information in a culturally appropriate way to potentially affected stakeholders in communities near our operations. As part of the VPs, we also engage with and consult local communities about security arrangements and our expectations around human rights. With those potentially affected, we strive to discuss candidly our systems and processes for mitigating negative human rights impacts that we may cause or contribute to. We are open in our approach when negative impacts are caused by our suppliers, contractors or other third parties. And we try to report formally when there are severe human rights impacts or risks of such impacts. We have also directly contacted and engaged with key external stakeholders about human rights incidents, progress in remediation efforts, and the relative effectiveness of our systems and processes.'¹ [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience: In addition to explanation above, in its Human Rights Report: 'Much of our global external reporting occurs on our website, which we update to reflect new information or events, through our annual Sustainability Report or through subject-specific reports, such as this Human Rights report. Additional reporting is done at conferences, roundtables and workshops. Reporting also takes place through initiatives or groups in which we participate such as the annual reports to the VPs and to the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM). For the latter, an external letter of assurance related to our systems and processes is submitted each year and referenced in our Sustainability Report. Other avenues of transparency may occur with our increasing number of partnerships with civil society organizations.[...] Other recent examples include: Distributing booklets regarding human rights to local community members and government entities; Conducting community surveys on the prevalence of violence to gain feedback on how to improve security arrangements; Engaging public officials and community authorities on how to promote respect for law and order, reduce conflict, and enhance and strengthen justice service delivery; and Providing education on the impacts of land purchase and sales.'¹ [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	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 all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers: See indicator A.1.2 • Met: Communicating policy to EX contractors and joint ventures: In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: [...] we educate potential suppliers on our human rights expectations to assist them in improving their human rights performance before we enter a relationship with them. Before contracting with a first-tier supplier, we require that the supplier abide by our Supplier Code of Ethics, which incorporates the 10 Principles of the UN Global Compact and key concepts of

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Barrick's Human Rights Policy and Policy with Respect to the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. We also include human rights considerations in our global Vendor Onboarding Standard. This includes basic due diligence on all direct suppliers related to human rights before contracting with them, and it may include enhanced due diligence on suppliers who may have elevated risks of negative human rights impacts or who provide goods or services on-site.' In its website section 'Non managed operations', the Company states: 'While our programs and policies do not always extend to those sites and operations we do not operate, we seek to influence management action, for example, through contractual rights and Board membership. That may mean conducting or advocating for audits and assessments, pressing for compensation structures to reflect our priorities, seeking reports on incidents, engaging over aspects of their human rights programs, seeking regular progress reports, asking for details on training and stakeholder engagements, and through other efforts.' However, there is no clear information describing the steps taken by the Company to communicate its human rights policy commitments to its extractive business partners. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Including to EX BPs (removed) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: See above in relation to contracting suppliers [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Including on EX BPs: See above. [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, Sep 2016: barrick.q4cdn.com & Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'Upon joining the company, all of our people, regardless of location or position, receive basic human rights training during their induction. More than 2,200 new hires received this training in 2017. Certain relevant personnel, including all security personnel, also receive focused in-person human rights training pertaining to their areas.' It adds some figures in Highlight section: '100% Of our people receive basic human rights training during their induction.'; '100% Of security personnel received in-person human rights training'; '7350 People who received human rights training'. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Trains relevant EX managers including security personnel: See above [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2: See indicator A.1.2 • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met: See above [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'Our monitoring activities take different forms. [...] One of the cornerstones of our due-diligence efforts is a stand-alone, independent human rights assessment program for Barrick-operated properties. [...] The assessments are conducted by Avanzar, a respected independent third-party consultancy, and focus on actual, potential and perceived impacts. Each site is assessed on a periodic cycle of two to three years, depending on risk. [...] Our audits and assessments also help assess the status of our programs and their impacts. Local communities, our people, and third parties also perform important monitoring of our activities, and can provide feedback through active engagement, our grievance mechanisms and hotline. And of course, our Board of Directors, including our Corporate Responsibility Committee of the Board, provides important monitoring of our activities.' [...] 'In addition to our human rights assessments, we conduct a variety of internal and external audit and assurance activities that bear upon the human rights program. The results are examined over a multiyear period to identify trends and changes. We also consider the findings in conjunction with information generated by other processes, such as through our enterprise risk management process, internal audits, grievances, hotline reports, our third-party annual social assurance process, community and stakeholder engagement programs, engagements with site and functional leads, and our investigations into incidents. In 2017, all of our sites underwent internal and external audits that bear

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>some relation to human rights considerations.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Monitoring EX BP's: It also indicates: 'Under our Human Rights Policy, suppliers are expected to report human rights issues of which they become aware, and we may ask suppliers to periodically provide certifications that they are not aware of any unreported human rights allegations in their work. We conducted due diligence on 99% of new mining operations suppliers in 2017 — more than 10,600 vendors. Where appropriate, we investigate allegations involving existing suppliers and engage with them in providing remediation for negative human rights impacts.' In addition, it states on its website that: 'While our programs and policies do not always extend to those sites and operations we do not operate, we seek to influence management action, for example, through contractual rights and Board membership. That may mean conducting or advocating for audits and assessments, pressing for compensation structures to reflect our priorities, seeking reports on incidents, engaging over aspects of their human rights programs, seeking regular progress reports, asking for details on training and stakeholder engagements, and through other efforts.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & Joint ventures] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process: In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'People have been disciplined and dismissed, and suppliers have been terminated, where individuals have committed human rights violations, have failed to report human rights violations, or have hindered investigations into potential human rights violations.' However, CHRB could not find further information describing the Company's corrective action process nor the numbers of incidence. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of EX supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	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: HR affects selection EXs business partners: The Company states the following 'Before contracting with a first-tier supplier, we require that the supplier abide by our Supplier Code of Ethics, which incorporates the 10 Principles of the UN Global Compact and key concepts of Barrick's Human Rights Policy and Policy with Respect to the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. We also include human rights considerations in our global Vendor Onboarding Standard. This includes basic due diligence on all direct suppliers related to human rights before contracting with them, and it may include enhanced due diligence on suppliers who may have elevated risks of negative human rights impacts or who provide goods or services on-site. For suppliers, a failure to fully engage in our vendor onboarding process may cause them not to be retained or to have heightened controls instituted.' The Company's definition of supplier from the supplier code includes covers any 'third party individual or entity Vendor that provides goods and/or services, and receives payment, for any aspect of the Company's operations including exploration, development, construction, operations and reclamation'. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, Sep 2016: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: HR affects on-going EX business partner relationships: The Company indicates 'Where appropriate, we investigate allegations involving existing suppliers and engage with them in providing remediation for negative human rights impacts. [...] For third-party suppliers, discipline for committing human rights violations, failing to report violations, and hindering investigations may include termination of existing relationships, requests for focused training, and other measures. [...] we have actively sought to strengthen our processes regarding contractors. Among the steps taken in the past few years are: [...] Working with and, where appropriate, dismissing contractors who fail to comply with our policies or the law.' As indicated above, the Company's definition of suppliers goes beyond literally 'supplier'. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, Sep 2016: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with EX business partners to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially	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: Stakeholder process or systems: In its website section 'Stakeholder engagement', the Company states: 'We undertake regular stakeholder- and issues-mapping, to identify our stakeholders and the issues they care about most. We

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	affected stakeholders		<p>prioritize engagement with stakeholder groups who are directly impacted and interested in our activities (such as local communities and host governments) and those that can have a significant impact on our business success (such as our investors, civil society, and governments). At our mine sites, this means working closely with our people, local communities, and government stakeholders who are located in the mine's direct area of influence. At the enterprise-level, we engage with investors, our home government, and civil society organizations that are interested in our operations. Perception surveys, partnerships, participation in multi-stakeholder forums, and meetings are some of the ways that we engage and understand stakeholder interests and concerns about our sustainability performance.¹ The website discloses actions carried out in 2017 by stakeholder group including, among others, employees, local communities and host governments. [Stakeholder Engagement]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: In its website, the Company presents a table summarizing 'the ways that we engaged these site- and enterprise-level stakeholders in 2017, their key interests (triggers), and examples of how we have reported on or taken action on these interests.', including some frequency information by type of stakeholder. For example, for local communities, reasons for engage include jobs at the mine, supplier opportunities, regular communication with the mine and transparency on environmental impacts. For some of the actions taken there are descriptions on frequency, like 51 community visits to mine (in 2017) in Pueblo Viejo, monthly community councils in Argentina, one stakeholder perception surveys in communities at all sites in 2017 [Stakeholder Engagement] • Not met: Engagement includes EX business partners workers • Met: Engagement includes EX business partners communities: Local communities are included as a stakeholder group in the table disclosed by the Company in its website section 'Stakeholder engagement'. [Stakeholder Engagement] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them: In its website section 'Stakeholder engagement', the Company states: 'In 2017, issues of concern expressed by our stakeholders included: Local employment and local procurement at our operations; Barrick's human rights program and security practices; Our environmental performance and remediation of any incidents; Governance of joint-ventures and affiliates; Our approach to climate change.' However, CHRB could not find further information on how the Company took these views into account. [Stakeholder Engagement]

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: See explanation below [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: identifying risks in EX business partners: See explanation below. However, it is not clear whether the risk identification process cover all its extractive business partners (including Joint Ventures). [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Ongoing global risk identification: In its Human Rights Report, the Company describes its global system in place to identify its salient human rights: 'Our human rights program, and our engagement with internal and external experts and stakeholders, provides many of the important inputs and processes to help us identify these potential impacts. In identifying our salient risks, we undertook three sets of activities: Analysing the past results of our internal processes. These include results from third-party human rights assessments, internal and external audits and assessments, hotline reports and investigations, grievances and our enterprise risk management process, which includes root cause analysis; Analysing sectoral risks and the risks in the countries and communities where we operate. Our participation in multi-stakeholder initiatives like the Voluntary Principles, in cross-sector working groups like BSR's Human Rights Working Group, and in industry associations like the Mining Association of Canada and the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) are important sources of information. [...]; Formal and informal consultation with senior management, external experts and civil society organizations, our CSR Advisory Board and ongoing engagement with internal and external stakeholders, at our mine sites, in our host countries and communities, at the corporate level, and through workshops and meetings as well as one-on one conversations. In addition, in 2017 and 2018 we have done extensive internal and external stakeholder surveys which have informed our salient risks.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: In consultation with stakeholders: See above [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: In consultation with HR experts: See above [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: Triggered by new circumstances: See above. In addition, the Company indicates: 'We continuously evaluate this list in light of issues we see in our operations, changes in the industry, and feedback from stakeholders.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'All of our higher risk sites have undergone human rights assessments as part of our global Human Rights Assessment Program. These assessments are conducted by Avanzar, a respected third-party consultancy. The tool used to guide those assessments evaluates, in detail, whether Barrick has processes in place to prevent forced and slave labor for itself and third parties, and whether evidence of forced or slave labor is present.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
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:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Salient risk assessment (and context): Its Human Rights Report is dedicated: detail the philosophy of its human rights program and detail its salient human rights risks and how we are managing them. For each one of its 6 salient human rights risks the Company explains why it is a risk, its approach to managing this risk and its performance and progress made until the moment. The section 'Why it is a risk' summarize the assessment made and context. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company has identified and assess 6 salient human rights risks, which are developed in its Human Rights Report: Security, Water Management, Safety and Health, Non-discrimination, Working Conditions, Resettlement. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Both requirements under score 1 met: See above [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	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 Plans to mitigate risks: Its Human Rights Report is dedicated: detail the philosophy of its human rights program and detail its salient human rights risks and how we are managing them. For each one of its 6 salient human rights risks the Company explains why it is a risk, its approach to managing this risk and its performance and progress made till the moment. Its Action Plan is summarized in the section 'Approach to Managing this risk'. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: Including amongst EX BPs Met: Example of Actions decided: With respect its salient risk 'Security': 'Barrick has developed a Security Policy and Security Management System designed to respect human rights while protecting persons and property associated with our mines. We categorize our operations according to the security risk and, based on

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>the security threat and the location of the operation, we determine which procedures and what type of protective equipment and infrastructure are required. Recognizing the risks that security-related matters pose to human rights and other areas of sustainability, security is subject to partial oversight from Barrick's legal governance and compliance function. All security personnel receive human rights training on an annual basis. [...]We will continue to consider approaches to vetting and training private security providers, including through collective action; the International Code of Conduct for Private Security Contractors Association (ICOCA) and activities within the VPs are both potential avenues. We also will consider ways, through the VPs, home governments and other approaches, to help enhance the human rights training for public security, and avoid having public security officers with credible human rights violation accusations assigned to provide security around our sites. We will continue to work with leading civil society organizations, companies, and governments to identify best practices and practical solutions to the continued risks that security forces pose. In 2017, Barrick's Security team also conducted external benchmarking and research into step-change opportunities for the Company's security performance, particularly in terms of security structures and operating models. In 2018, compliance personnel are engaging with the security team in different locales to identify further areas of improvement.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met: See above
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective: Although the Company reports on measuring how effectively grievance mechanism is as part of human rights assessments, and indicates that in response to findings of assessments it has strengthened its processes regarding contractors no evidence found of a general system to track how effective its action plans are being in handling human rights risks that it faces (beyond the particular problems that may arise with a specific supplier contractor). This indicator does not look for how it handles non-compliances but how effective the company is in mitigating the salient issues it generally faces. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & Human Rights, Jul 2019] • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness: Although it indicates that 'in response to findings from human rights assessments, we have actively sought to strengthen our processes regarding contractors..'. However, this indicator looks for evidence of lessons learnt from checking effectiveness of specific measures to tackle specific human rights issues faced by the Company. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & Human Rights, Jul 2019] <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: See indicator B2.1 [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See indicator B2.2 [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: See indicator B.2.3 [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans: Although the Company provided evidence of reviewing effectiveness of grievance mechanisms including room for improvement the approach in non-operated sites and debate on the remedy framework implemented at one operation, no evidence found of measuring the effectiveness of action plans to mitigate specific human rights salient issues, including lessons learned. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Including EX business partners <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns: In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'The Porgera Remedy Framework was launched in October 2012 to provide remedy to the victims following 18 months of extensive consultation with local, national, and international experts in human rights. Operating in an extremely difficult context, the Framework – the first of its kind – ran for more than two years and provided remedies to 119 women. While an independent review found the Framework had several implementation challenges, it also found the Framework's design was "meticulous" in its attention to claimants' rights and described the remedies provided as "generous ... rights-compatible, and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>from the perspective of compensation under human rights law, complete." ' However, this refers to a case that took place between 2012 and 2014. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: In its Ethics Point / Compliance Hotline website, the Company indicates: 'Barrick has provided the Compliance Hotline for you to report unethical behavior and policy violations securely and confidentially by telephone or via the Internet. You may remain anonymous if you wish. The Compliance Hotline is operated by EthicsPoint, a third-party provider.' In addition in the Compliance Hotline FAQ, the Company adds: 'The Compliance Hotline [...] is available to all employees as well as Barrick's contractors and suppliers to report concerns relating to the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and related policies.' [Barrick's Compliance Hotline & Compliance Hotline FAQ: secure.ethicspoint.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: In its Human Rights Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'In 2017, our sites received 259 grievances and resolved 244 grievances, including cases carried over from the previous year. At the end of 2017, 34 grievances remained outstanding. The types and number of grievances vary significantly between sites. At the majority of our sites, grievances are primarily related to contractor behavior, property damage, and demands for local employment, local procurement, and contracting opportunities.' However, no information found regarding the number of grievances about human rights filed, addresses and resolved. [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: Compliance Hotline website is only available in English and Spanish. In its FAQ, the Company indicates: 'If you do not speak English, or prefer to have an interpreter assist you in speaking with the EthicsPoint representative, please immediately inform the EthicsPoint representative which language you speak. The representative will then begin conferencing in an interpreter if one is available. As this happens, you will hear music, please remain on the line. You will then hear a recorded message in your language to confirm that an interpreter will come on line shortly. An interpreter will then join your conversation to assist you and the representative in completing the call.' However, no evidence found of access to the channel, in all appropriate languages, as it seems that in first place you might have to speak with someone that does not speak the complainant language. [Barrick's Compliance Hotline & Compliance Hotline FAQ: secure.ethicspoint.com] • Met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system: In its Suppliers Code of Ethics, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers are expected to have an internal process whereby complaints can be raised and investigations can be undertaken for violations of this Supplier Code of Ethics. When complaints relating to the Supplier Code of Ethics are raised, Suppliers must promptly investigate.' Its Suppliers Code also includes information of Grievance channels for Company's Joint Ventures. [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, Sep 2016: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers: In the Compliance Hotline FAQ, the Company adds: 'The Compliance Hotline [...] is available to all employees as well as Barrick's contractors and suppliers to report concerns relating to the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and related policies.' [Compliance Hotline FAQ: secure.ethicspoint.com]
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	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: Grievance mechanism for community: In its website section Community Relations, the Company indicates: 'Barrick has mandatory requirements related to the implementation and management of grievances. All sites must have a grievance mechanism approved by the Executive Director and General Manager for receiving, documenting, tracking, reporting, and responding to complaints and grievances. The grievance mechanisms must be accessible to a wide range of stakeholders, including women and vulnerable people, and be culturally appropriate. In 2017, our sites received 259 grievances and resolved 244 grievances, including cases carried over from the previous year. As of December 31, 2017, we were working to resolve 34 outstanding grievances at Barrick-operated mine sites.' [Community: barrick.q4cdn.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: See above [Community: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: Expects EX BPs to have community grievance systems: In its Supplier Code of Ethics, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers under contract with Barrick are encouraged to engage the community to help foster social and economic development and to contribute to the sustainability of the communities in which they operate.' However, there is no requirement about establish a grievance mechanism available for communities. [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, Sep 2016: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: EX BPs communities use global system
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	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: Engages users to create or assess system: In its Human Rights Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'Our people and third parties are routinely encouraged to use Barrick's Compliance Hotline to report any potential human rights violations they might see or hear about. Details on the hotline are available on Barrick's website and intranet, and we are continually striving to identify additional means of reporting concerns. For instance, a few years ago we added a web based method of reporting, and in 2018, we are working toward creating a compliance app that will allow such reporting.' However, there is no further information about how it engages with potential or actual users on the design, implementation or performance of the grievance mechanism. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: Description of how they do this: The Company describes the case of how, in the course of implementing the 'Porgera remedy framework' it sought advice 'of a range of actors, including Professor Ruggie, the Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights, leading human rights attorneys, and prominent human rights consultants and advisors. These experts helped shape Barrick's approach'. However, no evidence found of engagement with potential or actual users of the mechanisms (in either its design, implementation or performance). [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Engages with users on system performance Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance Not met: EX BPs consult users in creation or assessment
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: The Company describes the reporting process initiated after a violation incident is reported. However, no evidence found about timescales for addressing the complaints (just timescales to notify reports internally to different levels of the company) [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: How complainants will be informed <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Escalation to senior/independent level: The Company indicates that 'following the report of a potential human rights violation, the General Counsel will promptly alert the President and other relevant personnel as the General Counsel deems appropriate under the circumstances. Depending on the nature of the report, the Company may be required to, or elect to, report the matter to government authorities'. [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.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: In its Code of Business Conduct, the Company states: 'We will not tolerate retaliation by anyone, regardless of their level or position, against an employee, contractor or other third party vendor for raising concerns or questions regarding ethics, or for reporting suspected Code violations in good faith'. [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: Its Compliance Hotline allows to make anonymous reports: 'The Compliance Hotline allows you to file a confidential report via either the telephone or the Internet. You may remain anonymous if you wish.' In addition, the Company states that 'Anyone found to be engaging in retaliation may be subject to disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment.' [Compliance Hotline FAQ: secure.ethicspoint.com & Code of Business Conduct and Ethics: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Has not retaliated in practice Not met: Expects EX BPs to prohibit retaliation

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	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: Won't impede state based mechanisms: In its Human Rights Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'When we identify negative human rights impacts that we cause, contribute to, or are directly linked to, we strive to take a culturally appropriate and thoughtful approach to remediation and communication, and we seek to avoid obstructing access to other remedies, including state-sponsored judicial and non-judicial mechanisms, in a manner consistent with the UNGPs'. However, this statement does not consider a clear commitment to not impeding access to state-based judicial or non-judicial mechanisms. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: Complainants not asked to waive rights: In its Human Rights Report, the Company states that it does not 'require individuals and communities who participate in non-judicial grievance mechanisms to waive their access to judicial recourse.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms: In addition, it declares: 'We are sensitive to the importance of collaborative stakeholder and victim input in the development of appropriate remedy. We also recognize the potential need for independence in circumstances where remediation may be appropriate. That includes voluntary participation in independent state-based non-judicial complaints, and where such complaints are raised, we form an internal working group of relevant personnel to assess how to best engage, with a presumption that we will in fact engage.' The Company also discloses information about some experiences of issues resolved using non-judicial grievance mechanism (see below) [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable): As an example of its work with non-judicial grievance mechanism, the Company indicates: 'we have engaged extensively with Canada's CSR Counsellor on a range of issues, and in 2011 and 2012, we participated in an OECD National Contact Point facilitated dialogue arising from Porgera, reaching agreement with the notifiers on water monitoring and other issues.' However, it is not clear what the issue resolved was and if there was anything recent than 2012. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	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"> Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided: In its Human Rights Report 2018, the Company describes the approach it took for the case Porgera: 'The Porgera Remedy Framework was launched in October 2012 to provide remedy to the victims following 18 months of extensive consultation with local, national, and international experts in human rights. Operating in an extremely difficult context, the Framework – the first of its kind – ran for more than two years and provided remedies to 119 women.' However, the example correspond to 2012-2014. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks: In addition, it states: 'In assessing when remediation may be appropriate and the nature of the remediation to be provided, we are particularly sensitive to the importance of victim participation, stakeholder input, as well as the potential need for independence from the operational unit that may be involved in the negative impact. While remedies for negative human rights impacts will naturally differ depending on the circumstances, in-kind remediation is often preferred to cash, and sites have adopted guidelines that consider such factors, including: the degree and nature of the harm suffered, whether mine personnel were involved and on duty, whether third-party perpetrators used mine resources or committed an act related to their contracted duties, the nature of the evidence in support of the claim, the individual's age and personal circumstances, and local laws. Examples of remedies provided include apologies, cash compensation, remediation of the underlying problem, focused training and strengthening of processes. Where negative human rights impacts are caused or contributed to by entities in our value chain or entities we do not control, we try to use leverage to have them provided with appropriate remedy and design processes to prevent recurrence.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition Met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts: In its Human Rights Report 2018, the Company summarized the approach it would take: 'It takes persistent hard work and dedicated efforts to limit negative human rights impacts for any company, especially a multi-national enterprise like ours.; [...] we need to seek creative answers, be willing to try new approaches, seek advice from those

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>who have addressed similar situations, share our experiences with others, and engage in collective action to pursue larger and more lasting changes. [...] We must listen to a range of voices. [...] Embracing a global human rights approach meant reviewing how each functional unit around the globe may impact human rights, both positively and negatively. It meant adjusting procedures in light of human rights concerns, educating relevant personnel about how they may affect human rights, and vesting personnel with relevant accountabilities and responsibilities' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism: It adds: 'Our annual human rights assessments include a review of how effectively the grievance mechanisms escalate potential human rights concerns. Our grievance mechanisms are also internally audited for implementation and effectiveness during regular audits of our Community Relations Management System (CRMS), and externally assessed against the UNGPs effectiveness criteria. Barrick has also commissioned independent reviews of site grievance mechanisms to test if they are meeting the needs of the company, its mines and its host communities.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]

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 or achieved: In its Policy with respect to the Declaration of Fundamental Principles Rights to Work, the Company states: 'Barrick is committed to providing its employees with just and favourable conditions of work, in particular: Reasonable remuneration for the work being performed, accounting for the cost of living where the work is performed'. However, there is no reference to living wage. [Policy with respect to the Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, Oct 2015: barrick.q4cdn.com] • 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 living 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: On its website section 'Stakeholder Engagement', the Company indicates: 'As a member of the Extractives Industries Transparency Initiative, Barrick reports in detail on payments made to governments' [Stakeholder Engagement] • Met: Reports of taxes and revenues beyond legal minimums: On its website section 'Social Economic Development', the Company indicates: 'Since 2006, we have voluntarily reported detailed country-by-country information, including environmental and social data, and the taxes and royalties we have paid to governments around the world.' Its Economic Contribution Report 2017 includes information about taxes, royalties and fees paid by country. [Social and Economic Development & Economic Contribution Report 2017, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Reports taxes and revenue by country: See above (S1.i.b) [Economic Contribution Report 2017, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Steps taken re non EITI countries • Not met: Disclosures contract terms where not a requirement
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: In its Policy with respect to Declaration of Fundamental Principles Rights at Work, the Company states: 'Barrick employees shall have freedom of expression and association, the right to establish and to join organizations of their own choosing to bargain collectively and advance their occupational interests, as well as administer such organizations, subject to applicable national laws, without the previous authorization and illegal or unreasonable interference by the Company.' However no information about commitment to not interfere with the right of workers to pursue these rights, nor measures put in place to prohibit any form of intimidation or retaliation against workers seeking to exercise these rights. [Policy with respect to the Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, Oct 2015: barrick.q4cdn.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining: In its Human Rights Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'Approximately 26% of our people are represented by unions or collective bargaining associations in three countries. In addition, personnel are represented by unions at the independently-operated Veladero and Porgera mines.' However, it is not clear whether this figure include Joint Venture operations. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <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)	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company reports its frequency injury rate in its Human Rights Report 2018 and in its website section Workplace safety. The figure includes Joint Ventures not operated by Barrick (2017: 0,35). [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & Workplace Safety, Jul 2019] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: The Company also discloses figures about Lost work days rate (2017: 3,25) (figure includes Joint Venture not operated by Barrick) [2017 ESG Data Tables (Excel file): barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Fatalities disclosures: The Company discloses the number of fatalities in its Human Rights Report: 2 (figure includes Joint Venture not operated by Barrick). [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & 2017 ESG Data Tables (Excel file): barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Set targets for H&S performance: In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'We are committed to achieving a zero-incident work environment with a safety culture based on teamwork and leadership.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] • Met: Met targets or explains why not: In addition, the Company reports: 'We have identified 15 fatal risk categories that continue to be our focus for improvement going forward.3 The top five risk categories include: Operation of Mobile Equipment (Heavy), Operation of Mobile Equipment (Light Vehicle), Stored Energy, Fires (fixed and mobile) and Use of Cranes and Lifting Devices. The internal assurance review process and trending analysis help to identify emerging risks, as well as to show where progress is being made towards improving controls and reducing fatal risk-related incidents. [...] We achieved the lowest safety incident record in our history in 2017 with a total reportable injury frequency rate of 0.35.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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: Process to identify indigenous rights holders: In its website section 'Indigenous Peoples', the Company indicates: 'Sites where Indigenous Peoples have rights over or special connections to the land where mining-related activities are located are required to develop and implement an Indigenous Peoples Plan that outlines specific actions to engage, address impacts, and provide opportunities to Indigenous Peoples. New projects and significant expansions of operations located on lands traditionally owned by, or under the customary rights of, Indigenous Peoples must also align their activities with the ICMM Position Statement on Indigenous Peoples and Mining. As a company, Barrick has committed to work towards obtaining consent from significantly impacted Indigenous Peoples for new projects and major changes to existing projects, aligned with the ICMM Position Statement. Four of Barrick's mine sites (Hemlo, Cortez, Goldstrike and Turquoise Ridge) are located near the traditional territories of Indigenous Peoples. Barrick has formal agreements with the communities near these sites. As well, the Pascua-Lama project is located near the traditional territories of the Diaguita people.' However, CHRB could not find further information about the process to identify and recognise affected or potentially affected indigenous peoples or how it engaged directly in carrying out the assessment. [Indigenous Peoples] • Not met: How engages with communities in assessment: Although the Company references the ICMM position statement, no evidence found in relation to its specific engagement with indigenous communities in carrying out the assessment. [Indigenous Peoples] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM): In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'As a member of the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), we are committed to conducting business in accordance with the ICMM's Sustainable Development Principles, which include a commitment to upholding fundamental human rights and respecting culture, customs, and values in dealing with our people and others affected by our activities. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Gives recent example FPIC or dropping deal: In its website section 'Indigenous Peoples', the Company discloses information about 3 cases where it is working with indigenous communities to set Collaborative Agreements, for instance: 'The Cortez, Goldstrike, and Turquoise Ridge mine sites in northern Nevada exist within what was the traditional territory of the Western Shoshone people. While ownership of nearly all of this traditional territory now resides with the United States government, Barrick believes that the Western Shoshone tribes and bands that are located near our operations should realize long-term benefits from the development of mineral resources on these lands. For this reason, Barrick entered into a "Collaborative Agreement" with a group of Western Shoshone Tribes and Bands. The Collaborative Agreement is aimed at maintaining regular, ongoing engagement between Barrick and these Western Shoshone communities and sharing a spectrum of benefits derived from Barrick's operations with this important stakeholder group. <p>The Collaborative Agreement between Barrick and the leaders of four Western Shoshone Tribes (Duckwater, Ely, Yomba, and Duck Valley) was signed in 2008. The South Fork and Wells Bands of the Te-Moak Tribe subsequently signed in 2011, the Elko Band signed in 2012, and the Te-Moak Tribe signed in 2013. While the Battle Mountain Band has not yet signed the Agreement, this community is included in virtually all of the Western Shoshone programs that Barrick implements or supports. All of the signatories agreed to an Update of the Agreement, which was finalized in 2014.' [Indigenous Peoples]</p>
D.3.6	Land rights (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: Describes approach to doing so if no recent deals: In its website section 'Land Acquisition and Resettlement', the Company indicates: 'When resettlement cannot be avoided, Barrick's Community Relations teams work together with affected households, communities, and host governments to manage resettlement in a manner consistent with local laws and international best practice. We know that effectively, responsibly, and respectfully managing the impacts and risks where displacement is unavoidable will help to limit negative outcomes, help us respect human rights, and support our license to operate. Our approach to resettlement is set out in our Community Relations Management System (CRMS) and Community Relations Standard. Barrick has also developed guidance for sites contemplating resettlement to help them align with best practice. When faced with resettlement, sites are required to develop a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP). RAPs are developed with input from the affected communities and local authorities. A comprehensive RAP includes an entitlement framework, comprehensive compensation standards, livelihoods development programs, and ongoing monitoring and evaluation. These activities, complemented by continuous engagement, help us to deliver on our commitment to improve or, at least, restore the livelihoods and living standards of displaced families and communities. We did not undertake any resettlement activities at Barrick-operated mine sites in 2017.' On the other hand, in its website section 'Joint Venture', the Company indicates: 'While our programs and policies do not always extend to those sites and operations we do not operate, we seek to influence management action, for example, through contractual rights and Board membership. That may mean conducting or advocating for audits and assessments, pressing for compensation structures to reflect our priorities, seeking reports on incidents, engaging over aspects of their human rights programs, seeking regular progress reports, asking for details on training and stakeholder engagements, and through other efforts.' [Land Acquisition and Resettlement & Joint ventures]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: How valuation and compensation works: In addition, it discloses information about the Resettlement at Porgera Joint Venture: 'In 2012-13 the company undertook a comprehensive strategic review of relocation activities, with the aim of assessing whether to develop an alternative and improved process. The review was undertaken over an 18-month period and involved engagement with various local landowners and other stakeholders, and consideration of international practices and standards with respect to resettlement. The key recommendation of the review was to pilot an "off SML Resettlement" framework at Porgera. The essential difference in the two approaches (relocation versus resettlement) will involve moving from a "relocation" compensation based approach to a "livelihood" resettlement framework, which aims to facilitate improved social and economic outcomes for relocated households and, in doing so, significantly reduce the likelihood of landowners gradually moving back to the SML, which has been a significant issue under more recent relocation programs at the mine.[...] Considering these factors, PJV's commitment to resettlement must be expressed in terms of a joint government, landowner and PJV commitment to resettlement. Such a commitment will be formalized in agreements that outline the specific roles and responsibilities of all parties as well as core principles of what is being agreed and mutually supported.' [Land Acquisition and Resettlement] 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)	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: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC): The Company indicates in relation to security management system that is 'designed to respect human rights while protecting persons and property associated with our mines. We categorize our operations according to the security risk and, based on the security threat and the location of the operation, we determine which procedures and what type of protective equipment and infrastructure are required. Recognizing the risks that security-related matters pose to human rights and other areas of sustainability, security is subject to partial oversight from Barrick's legal governance and compliance function. All security personnel receive human rights training on an annual basis. All of Barrick's training requirements apply to third-party organizations providing security personnel. The Voluntary Principles on Business and Human Rights (VPs) guide and dictate our overall approach to providing security on a global basis and are integrated into our Security Policy and operationalized by our Security Management System. This includes our engagement with public security providers (e.g., host nation military and police representatives) who may provide external security and response assistance, as well as private security providers. The VPs also help us formulate guidelines and train security personnel on the use of force and respect for human rights. We have Memorandums of Understanding with security agencies in Zambia, Peru, and the Dominican Republic, reflecting the terms of the VPs. The Porgera Joint Venture also has a Memorandum of Understanding with local police forces in Papua New Guinea. Barrick has created a template reflecting our security and human rights expectations for joint ventures and affiliates in which we have an interest but do not control, and seek to use our leverage to help implement those expectations.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: Example of respecting HRs in security: See above.. In addition, it also reports: 'In 2017, we regret that we experienced a security-related incident at the Lumwana mine in Zambia. [...] At Lumwana there was an incident in which site security personnel improperly treated suspects arrested in the township. Following an investigation site security personnel were terminated.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach: See above [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Assesses and involves communities: In its Human Rights Report, the Company indicates: 'Over the past several years, there are many ways we have sought to abide by the VPs, including: [...] Encouraging local stakeholder consultations related to public security arrangements with a range of governments;[...]. However, no details found in relation to include inputs from local communities about security in assessments. [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: Working with local community

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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: At Barrick, we strive to use only what we need and to reduce our impact on other water users in the countries and communities with whom we partner. Our water use, through all stages of the mining life cycle, is guided by Barrick's Water Management Framework. The Framework is designed to facilitate site-based water stewardship that brings value to the Company while protecting our people, our partners, and the environment. It is aligned with the ICMM Position Statement on Water Stewardship and is based on three pillars: Assess, Assure and Collaboration. [...] Barrick also engages and collaborates with other water users, such as agricultural producers, to pursue sustainable management of water resources. In communities that lack clean water, we have programs in place to help maintain fresh water supplies.' [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Headline: Barrick Gold accused by Mining Watch Canada of human rights abuses in Papua New Guinea Area: Right to security of persons Story: On April 24, 2018, in a statement released during Barrick Gold's annual general meeting, Mining Watch Canada claimed that the company was violating human rights at its Porgera mine in Papua New Guinea. According to the NGO: "On March 25th, 2017, some 150 houses in the village of Wangima were burnt to the ground by Mobile Units of the Papua New Guinea police, according to reports from human right organization Akali Tange Association. The violent raid on the village occurred while people were sleeping. Barrick Gold confirmed the allegation. During the raid, police officers allegedly gang raped as many as eight women, and assaulted six men. In July, a dump of chemical waste material caused burns to the skin of some 150 men, women and children exposed to the caustic material." Additionally, the NGO reported on October 3rd, "15 year old Boi Nelson Nai, was run over and killed by one of the mine' s loader trucks." As of February 2018, the family was still seeking compensation for his death. " <p>Upon visiting the mine in December of 2017, MiningWatch Canada's Catherine Coumans found that none of the victims of these serious mine-related harms, or their families, had received compensation. "Barrick seems to think it is enough to hand out medicine to the burn victims, and pay for the funeral of the teenage boy," says Coumans "But these essentially humanitarian gestures do not constitute equitable compensation for the very serious harm done to the victims and their families."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources: [Mining Watch Canada - 24/14/2018: miningwatch.ca][Mining Watch Canada - 05/02/2018: miningwatch.ca][Mining Watch Canada - 28/03/2017: miningwatch.ca][Vice News - 30/03/2017: news.vice.com]
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response available: The company has responded to the allegations but disputes the details of the incident. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Response goes into detail: The company stated that it had no prior knowledge of a police raid on March 25, 2017 and disputes the allegation that 150 structures were burned, stating that only 18 structures were destroyed by police. The company provided aerial photographs of the site, before and after the alleged incident. Additionally, the company stated that it had received no evidence to support the claim of any sexual assaults or rapes that happened during the March 25, 2017 raid. The company stated that upon learning of the incidents, it "launched a formal inquiry to better understand the situation and have also urged senior police to investigate any complaints." <p>In regards to police activities surrounding the allegations, Barrick states the following: "At the request of community leaders and the government, the Porgera Joint Venture provides limited assistance for police activities in the region on the condition that participating law enforcement officers receive appropriate training in community engagement and human rights and adhere at all times to domestic and international obligations for law enforcement officers. Mine management confirms that mine personnel had no involvement in or prior knowledge of the</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			police operation." [Response to Mr. Yapari, April 2017: barrick.q4cdn.com & Statement on Policing Activities in the Porgera Region, March 2017: barrick.q4cdn.com]
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Company policies address the general issues raised: Barrick's human rights policy states: 'A human right is a right to which all human beings are entitled. These rights are internationally defined and recognized, and identified in international conventions. For purposes of implementing this Policy, a human right shall be one recognized by the International Bill of Human Rights, or as otherwise identified or described in this Policy or its relevant implementing procedures.' The company states that the International Bill of Human Rights includes the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. However, the company's human rights policy does not apply to the Porgera Joint Venture, which maintains its own human rights policy. [A Framework of Remediation Initiatives in Response to Violence Against Women in the Porgera Valley, 2012: barrick.q4cdn.com & Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] Not met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The company's human rights policy does apply to contractors and suppliers. However, Barrick's human rights policy does not apply to the operations at Porgera, the location of the alleged abuses. The company states, "In such instances, Barrick will seek in good faith to encourage the entities exercising operational control to institute an appropriate human rights policy and programs that strive to comply with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights." [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: Barrick Gold is a Voluntary Principles (VPs) participant. In its Human Rights Policy, the company states: 'Barrick will seek to adhere to the requirements of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights in its dealings with private and public security providers, local communities, and potential victims of human rights violations.' The company is a member of the VPs Steering Committee. It also has a security policy in which the company states it will 'treat all people with respect and dignity, and to be guided in our approaches and actions by the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights.' [Human Rights Policy, Jan 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
E(1).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	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: Denies allegations, but has engaged affected stakeholders: The company has denied the allegations and engaged with stakeholders - The company engaged BSR in June 2017 to "help enhance access to remedy for people living in the communities surrounding the mine". The BSR team was led by Dr. Margaret Jungk, former chair of the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights, and Bennett Freeman, former U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor. Over the course of 12 months, BSR undertook in-person consultations with a wide range of local, national and international stakeholders – including the ATA itself – with a focus on the needs of those seeking to raise and resolve grievances. The result is a comprehensive set of findings and recommendations aimed at addressing the complex and unique challenges that exist in the Porgera context." [In Search of Justice - BSR, Sept 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com & BSR Report "In Search of Justice – Pathways to Remedy at the Porgera Gold Mine", 17/09/2018: barrick.com] Not met: Denies allegations, but reviewed systems to prevent such impacts <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims: There is no evidence to suggest that the company has provided remedies to the victims. Met: Denies allegations, but implements review recommendations: In September 2018, the company stated that consistent with BSR's recommendations, Barrick (Niugini) Limited (BNL) will: "begin to develop a plan that is responsive to the report. In the coming weeks, the company will be seeking to engage meaningfully with other stakeholders in preparing an action plan to address the recommendations identified by the BSR researchers. These consultations will include discussions with rights-holders and their representatives about the structure and implementation of proposed company responses. It will also involve engagement with relevant Government authorities, given how central they are in the process. BNL intends to finalize that plan before the end of the year." Additionally, it stated: "both Barrick and BNL will continue to assess and try to improve not only our grievance mechanisms, but our wider interaction and engagement with communities and other important stakeholders where we

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>operate." [BSR Report "In Search of Justice – Pathways to Remedy at the Porgera Gold Mine", 17/09/2018: barrick.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Denies allegations, and ensures systems prevent such impacts: The company states: "Barrick and BNL remain committed to respecting the rights of individuals and communities impacted by our respective operations." However, this statement does not suffice as evidence that the company ensures that its systems changed. [BSR Report "In Search of Justice – Pathways to Remedy at the Porgera Gold Mine", 17/09/2018: barrick.com]
E(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Headline: NGO still accusing Acacia Mining, owned by Barrick Gold, of violation of Human Rights in its Tanzanian Mara gold mine Area: Right to security of persons Story: On April 24th, 2018, in a statement released during Barrick Gold's annual general meeting (majority owner of Acacia), Mining Watch Canada claimed that Acacia was still violating human rights at its Mara gold mine in Tanzania. <p>According to the statement, the mine security and police guarding the mine were accused of violence and sexual violence against villagers, including children, who seek to cross the mine road after dark. There have been injury cases including loss of limbs, loss of eyesight, broken bones, internal injuries. In addition, at least four men had drowned in 2016 and 2017 in a mine pit after Acacia removed a barrier wall. It was also claimed that a large vehicle destroyed a home and ran over a child.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources: [Raid, 17/04/2018: raid-uk.org][Mining Watch Canada, July 2017: miningwatch.ca][Business & Human Rights Resource Centre , 16/07/2018: business-humanrights.org]
E(2).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response available: The Company states that "Acacia provided a detailed response to these allegations in July 2018, indicating that these are historical and that it is not aware of any new allegations of abuse. It also outlined the extensive action the company took in 2011 upon learning of these incidents, described that the remedy provided was developed in consultation with claimants and international experts, and invited any dissatisfied individual who received remedy to have that remedy reviewed." [Company response on various allegations, July 2018: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Response goes into detail: In the response letter, Acacia states that "The Mine has been engaging for many years with the challenges facing the women of North Mara. As the Mine reported here and here in 2011 (with an update in 2013 here), the Mine heard disturbing allegations regarding sexual assaults committed by Mine security or members of the Tanzanian Police Force against women trespassing on the mine site or in neighbouring communities in 2011. The Mine took immediate and extensive action to seek to understand or discover the bases for the allegations; to seek to ensure that any illegal or abusive conduct that was identified was ceased immediately and future recurrences prevented; to urge the Tanzanian State to do the same; and to seek to provide proportionate and rights-appropriate remedies to the women allegedly affected". [Company response on various allegations, July 2018: business-humanrights.org & NORTH MARA GOLD MINE LIMITEDResponse to a June 2018 blog post and video by MiningWatch Canada, July 2018: business-humanrights.org]
E(2).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Company policies address the general issues raised: The Company states that its "human rights program is grounded in international human rights norms, including the International Bill of Human Rights and the eight core conventions of the International Labor Organization". [Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The Company states that "Suppliers must comply with the International Bill of Human Rights in providing goods and/or services to Barrick". [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, Sep 2016: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company states that it commits "to treat all people with respect and dignity, and to be guided in our approaches and actions by the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights". Based on the principle, the Company runs a dedicated committee and takes place assessment. [Security Policy: barrick.q4cdn.com & Human Rights Report, 2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(2).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	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: Engages with affected stakeholders: CHRB did not find the evidence of the Company's engagement with affected stakeholders. [NORTH MARA GOLD MINE LIMITEDResponse to a June 2018 blog post and video by MiningWatch Canada, July 2018: business-humanrights.org & Company response on various allegations, July 2018: business-humanrights.org] Met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders: The Company states that Acacia have been engaging with affected stakeholders. Acacia states that "the Mine engages with local stakeholders and invests in a range of initiatives in the area around the mine site as part of the Mine's broader commitment to promote the development of sustainable communities at North Mara." [NORTH MARA GOLD MINE LIMITEDResponse to a June 2018 blog post and video by MiningWatch Canada, July 2018: business-humanrights.org & Company response on various allegations, July 2018: business-humanrights.org] Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: The response letter by Acacia only mentions the remedies provided and reviewed for the women who experienced sexual violence at site, and does not mention if the remedies were provided to all the affected stakeholders. According to Acacia's own statistics, published in 2017, 93 per cent of victim's claims were rejected with no explanation provided. The Company states it has revised its remedy mechanism, however, it is not transparent. [NORTH MARA GOLD MINE LIMITEDResponse to a June 2018 blog post and video by MiningWatch Canada, July 2018: business-humanrights.org & Raid article on security violation in Tanzania, April 2018: raid-uk.org] Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company reviewing the system followed by the case. In addition, Acacia states that it has reviewed its system, however, it is not transparent. [NORTH MARA GOLD MINE LIMITEDResponse to a June 2018 blog post and video by MiningWatch Canada, July 2018: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims: See above. Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company's improving the system.
E(3).0	Serious allegation No 3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Headline: Local communities protest against environmental impact of Pueblo Viejo gold mine in Dominican Republic Area: Environmental damage Story: On November 6th 2017, community members of Las Piñitas, Dominican Republic, began occupying space outside the Pueblo Viejo gold mine owned by Barrick Gold Corporation (60%) and Goldcorp (40%) in order to protest against the companies' causing the environmental damage to the Margajita River which is the community's water source. Community members claimed that more than 600 families impacted by the project. Since the start of commercial production in 2012, community members of Las Piñitas, Las Lagunas, El Naranjo, and La Cerca have expressed their concern regarding environmental impacts, which they believe has directly impacted their health and livelihoods. <p>The site was historically a small mining site, state-run from 1975 until 1999, by company Rosario Dominicana. The company's operations exposed enough sulfide ore to initiate acid mine drainage which left a community water source, the Margajita River, in an acidic state. However, the communities assert that the impacts of mining have significantly worsened since Barrick Gold Corporation began operating in the area.</p> <p>Individuals within the community, along with experts in the field, maintain that the alleged increased contamination within the area could be caused by the extensive use of cyanide at the Pueblo Viejo mine and the lack of suitable measures to dispose of the residue acid mine drainage.</p> <p>Members of nearby communities have lesions on their bodies. Most people indicated that these lesions appeared after having direct contact with the water in the area, leading them to believe it is due to mine contamination. Members of surrounding communities underwent blood testing; all five tested positive for cyanide traces above accepted safe levels." Great concern has also been raised in regards to a drastic decline in agriculture production. The communities allege that they have lost over 80 percent of cacao, a source of income on which many families depend.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources: [Axis of Logic, 05/12/2017: axisoflogic.com][El Caribe, 06/11/2017: elcaribe.com.do]
E(3).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response available: The Company denied that it was responsible for the pollution and stated that the environmental impact that exists were left by the former Rosario Dominicana. [Axis of Logic article on environmental damage in DRC, Dec 2017: axisoflogic.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Response goes into detail: In the 2018 Investor Sustainability Briefing, Barrick Gold Executive Director Juana Barcelo said that the water discharged into the Margajita River was safe and had been treated in line with the standards of the Dominican Republic and the World Bank guidelines. Additionally she claimed that since construction of the mine, a number of people had moved into the area surrounding the mine site, with the intention to be relocated and trying to benefit financially from the process. She said that most of those families claiming that the water had been contaminated were located upstream of the mines operations, and that allegations of pollution and sickness resulting from the mine site were inaccurate. [2018 Sustainability Briefing for Investors, 06/06/2018: webcast.fmav.ca & 2018 Sustainability Briefing for Investors slides, 06/06/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]
E(3).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Company policies address the general issues raised: The Company states that it commits to "protect the environment by applying proven management practices to prevent pollution and mitigate impacts" by its operations. [Environmental Policy: barrick.q4cdn.com] Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The Company states that "each supplier is expected to comply with Barrick's Environmental Policy and all related Standards and Procedures, as well as any contractual terms with respect to environment in its contract with Barrick." [Global Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, Sep 2016: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company has Barrick's Water Management Framework which is aligned with the ICMM Position Statement on Water Stewardship. However, this does not meet the CHRB requirement of UN Global Compact CEO Water Mandate [Water management]
E(3).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	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: Denies allegations, but has engaged affected stakeholders: The Company said it has been speaking with the representatives of the community regarding the environmental damage and the remedies. Additionally the company said in a webcast briefing, that they have provided compensation or relocated more than 400 families who were living around the mine site and that approximately 35 families chose to remain and made it clear they had no interest in relocation. [Axis of Logic article on environmental damage in DRC, Dec 2017: axisoflogic.com & Webcast (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: webcast.fmav.ca] Met: Denies allegations, but reviewed systems to prevent such impacts: In the webcast, Juana Barcelo, the Executive Director of Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo, said that all pollution to the Margajita River was historical (prior to Barrick's operations), and that the water now discharged into the river was treated with "a state of the art technology, and complies with the Dominican standard and also the World Bank guidelines". She said allegations of pollution are false, and that since 2012 the company has conducted 25 monitoring events, including water sampling, the last of which was completed in March 2018, with more than 100 members from communities around the mine to ensure there was transparency. [Webcast (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: webcast.fmav.ca & Slide show (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Denies allegations, but implements review recommendations: In the webcast, Juana Barcelo, the Executive Director of Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo, said allegations of pollution are false and that the water now discharged into the river was treated with "a state of the art technology, and complies with the Dominican standard and also the World Bank guidelines". She said since 2012 the company has conducted 25 monitoring events, including water sampling, the last of which was completed in March 2018. However there is no evidence provided that the company has reviewed its broader waste water management systems. [Webcast

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>(Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: webcast.fmav.ca & Slide show (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Denies allegations, and ensures systems prevent such impacts: In the webcast, Juana Barcelo, the Executive Director of Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo, said allegations of pollution are false and that the water now discharged into the river was treated with "a state of the art technology, and complies with the Dominican standard and also the World Bank guidelines". She said since 2012 the company has conducted 25 monitoring events, including water sampling, the last of which was completed in March 2018, with more than 100 members from communities around the mine to ensure there was transparency. However there is no evidence provided that the company has reviewed its broader waste water management systems to prevent future risks of chemical contamination in the river system. <p>[Webcast (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: webcast.fmav.ca & Slide show (Barrick Gold Pueblo Viejo mine site), 06/06/2018: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p>
E(4).0	Serious allegation No 4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Headline: Barrick Gold to face lawsuit regarding subsidiaries' contaminating mining operations in Marinduque island Area: Environmental damage Story: Marinduque residents reveal the damage that has been done to their livelihoods by Marcopper. In 2006 Barrick Gold acquired mining company Placer Dome, which had open cut mining operations on Marinduque, a small island in the Phillipines. Between 1975 and 1991 an estimated twenty million cubic meters of toxic mine effluent was dumped into a bay on the Island by the company Marcopper Mining (which was part owned by Placer Dome). Then, following a regulatory crackdown, the tailings and mining effluent were no longer permitted to be dumped in the ocean and had to instead be stored in former mine pits on the island. In 1996 one of Marcopper's drainage tunnels collapsed, releasing the tailings and mining waste and poisoning the river systems. For a number of years after the residents on Marinduque reported strange illnesses, including cancers and skin diseases, believed to be from the high lead levels in the water. The Marinduque provincial government, in 2005, filed a \$100-million class suit against the mining company Placer Dome at the Nevada district court in the United States, for the devastation caused by the rupture of the drainage tunnel in 1996 . In 2015 the Nevada State Supreme Court threw out the case on the basis that the US was the wrong jurisdiction to hear the claim. The provincial board of Marinduque, in June 2016, issued a resolution to refile the case in a Canadian court against Barrick Gold. Sources: [Sueddeutsche Zeitung: gfd.sueddeutsche.de][Barrick Gold response - 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org][Manila Bulletin - 27/10/2016: news.mb.com.ph][Enquirer.net - 09/11/2016: newsinfo.inquirer.net]
E(4).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response available: The company says that "When Barrick took over Placer Dome in 2006, the company inherited litigation related to the historic mining activities at the Marcopper mine. The litigation seeks a range of remedies for alleged un-remediated harm from the tailings spill in 1996. Although Placer Dome relinquished its indirect minority stake in Marcopper in 1997, it voluntarily funded and ensured that extensive reclamation, compensatory and other measures to address the effects of the spill were taken. The consequences of this unfortunate incident were remediated long before Barrick acquired Placer Dome." [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRCC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Response goes into detail: The response Barrick Gold provides goes into detail regarding the history of ownership of the Marcopper mine and the harms caused by the tailing spill in 1996, it further states that "Over the past three years, Barrick has made a good faith effort to settle these matters in a principled way. As this is currently before the courts, we are unable to comment further on any settlement discussions related to this case, except to say that we are disappointed that an out-of-court settlement has not been reached." [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRCC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org]
E(4).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Company policies address the general issues raised: The company says it is committed to "Fully comply with all applicable environmental laws, regulations, and other environmental obligations; Protect the environment by applying proven management practices to prevent pollution and mitigate impacts; Continuously improve its environmental systems and performance; and Communicate openly and transparently with internal and external interested parties to develop a

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>mutual understanding of environmental issues, needs, and expectations." [Environmental Policy: barrick.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: Barrick Gold took over Placer Dome in 2006 and therefore inherited the litigation related to the Marcopper mine. In Barrick Gold's environmental policy it says that it will "Ensure that our leadership and our people understand, support, and maintain our EMS through appropriate training and periodic evaluations of the system's performance." Additionally the policy says that it will "Insist that those who provide services or products adhere to our environmental policy and practices". The environmental policies apply to the type of business relationship involved as Barrick owns the Placer Dome mining company, which owns the Marcopper Mine. [Environmental Policy: barrick.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: Though the company has a water policy which aligns with the ICMM Position Statement on Water Stewardship, this is not sufficient to meet CHRB threshold on water. [Environmental Policy: barrick.q4cdn.com & Code of Business Conduct and Ethics: barrick.q4cdn.com]
E(4).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	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: Denies allegations, but has engaged affected stakeholders: Barrick Gold denies they are linked to the event. The company claims that it inherited litigation from the historical operations of the Marcopper mine related to the harms caused by the 1996 tailings dam collapse. Barrick Gold says that "Over the past three years, Barrick has made a good faith effort to settle these matters in a principled way. As this is currently before the courts, we are unable to comment further on any settlement discussions related to this case, except to say that we are disappointed that an out-of-court settlement has not been reached." In 2014, Barrick Gold offered a \$20-million settlement but the Marinduque provincial board turned it down after it felt that the amount was not enough to compensate for the environmental damage cause by the mining disaster on the island. [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRRC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: Denies allegations, but reviewed systems to prevent such impacts: The company's statement doesn't make any reference to reviewing management systems or tailings disposal methods in the wake of the disaster. It claims that "the consequences of this unfortunate incident were remediated long before Barrick acquired Placer Dome." [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRRC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Denies allegations, but implements review recommendations: There is no evidence provided that a review was conducted into the effect of the disposal of the tailings. Instead, in the reports regarding the 2014 settlement proposed by Barrick Gold, its' 'Stipulate Statement of Facts' require that "(vii) the May 13, 1988 Order of the Office of the President includes express findings by the National Government that the continued operation of the Marcopper Mine and disposal of mine tailings into Calancan Bay was in the public interest... (ix) the weight of scientific evidence demonstrates that the mine tailings present in the Province's waterways do not currently pose and have not posed an unacceptable risk to human health" [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRRC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org & Marcopper mine article (Marinduque rising), 06/03/2014: marinduquegov.blogspot.com] • Not met: Denies allegations, and ensures systems prevent such impacts: The company in its statements has not provided any evidence or description of how it ensures implementation of the current management systems on Marinduque. [Barrick response to Marcopper mine (BHRRC), 22/07/2014: business-humanrights.org & Marcopper mine article (Asia Pacific Post), 29/11/2016: asianpacificpost.com]

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	3.58 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Barrick Gold Corporation made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 34 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 3.58 out of 4 points.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
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: In its website section 'Transparency Hub', the Company indicates: 'We report on the management of significant matters affecting our license to operate, including environmental, workplace and social issues. This report has been prepared in accordance with the GRI Standards: Core option.' It publishes a GRI index. [Transparency Hub & 2017 GRI Content Index, 2017: barrick.q4cdn.com]
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	1.2 out of 4	<p>Barrick Gold Corporation met 3 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 1.2 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 Met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remediating adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned <p>Demonstrating a forward focus</p> <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) 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 2019 Key Findings report and technical annex for more details of the research process.

The Benchmark is made available on the express understanding that it will be used solely for general information purposes. The material contained in the Benchmark should not be construed as relating to accounting, legal, regulatory, tax, research or investment advice and it is not intended to take into account any specific or general investment objectives. The material contained in the Benchmark does not constitute a recommendation to take any action or to buy or sell or otherwise deal with anything or anyone identified or contemplated in the Benchmark. Before acting on anything contained in this material, you should consider whether it is suitable to your particular circumstances and, if necessary, seek professional advice. The 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.