

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



Company Name Chevron Corporation
Industry Extractives
Overall Score (*) 28.8 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
3.4	10	A. Governance and Policies
5.4	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
5.4	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
6.9	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
5.8	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
2.0	10	F. Transparency

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

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

Detailed assessment

A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: General HRs commitment: The Company states that they 'have a responsibility to respect human rights' in their Human Rights Policy. [Human Rights Policy, 2016: chevron.com] • Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2 • Not met: UDHR: The Human Rights policy also states that 'our conduct in our global operations is consistent with the spirit and intent of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the International Labor Organization (ILO) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. However, 'being consistent with' is not considered as a commitment. [Human Rights Policy, 2016: chevron.com] • Not met: International Bill of Rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGPs: The Company states 'Our approach to human rights is informed by the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.' However, 'being informed' is not the same as having a commitment. [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com] • Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	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: ILO Core: Chevron's human rights policy states that 'Our company policies and procedures adhere to all applicable domestic laws and are consistent

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>with ILO core labor principles concerning freedom of association and collective bargaining, non-discrimination, forced labor, and underage workers in the workplace'. However, 'being consistent with' is not considered as a commitment. [Human Rights Policy, 2016: chevron.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Not met: All four ILO apply to EX BPs: The Company states in their human rights policy 'We require that our key suppliers adhere to all applicable domestic laws and encourage them to be consistent with ILO core labor principles'. However, 'being consistent with' is not considered as a commitment. [Human Rights Policy, 2016: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: All four ILO Core: The Company states that they are consistent with the core 4 ILO principles. However, 'being consistent with' is not considered as a commitment. [Human Rights Policy, 2016: chevron.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company has an operational excellence management system. The operational system states 'The actions and visibility of leaders make evident their genuine care and concern and the company's commitment to place the highest priority on the safety and health of our workforce, and on the protection of communities, the environment and our assets.' [Operational Excellence Management System, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: H&S applies to Ex BPs
A.1.3.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (EX)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: VPs participant: The Company is a signatory to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. The Company was a founding member of the VPs. The Company also commits to the VPs in their Business Code of Conduct and Ethics Code. [Operational Excellence Management System, 22/06/2018: chevron.com & Business Conduct and Ethics Code, 2018: chevron.com] • Met: Respecting indigenous rights: The Company states 'Chevron acknowledges the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and is committed to interacting with indigenous communities in a way that respects their history, culture and customs, within applicable legal and constitutional frameworks.' The Company also has Chevron's Indigenous Peoples' Guidance document which outlines the key provisions for effective management of relations with Indigenous Peoples. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: ILO 169 • Not met: UNDRIP: The Company states that they 'acknowledge' UNDRIP however, this is not considered a commitment. • Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FPIC commitment • Not met: Vol Guidelines on Tenure • Not met: IFC performance standards • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expects BPs to respect all these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	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 stakeholder engagement: The Company has an Indigenous Peoples Guidance document which is used for when potential issues related to resettlement of communities or engagement with indigenous peoples are identified. <p>The Company Chief Executive Officer, Michael K. Wirth, states in the foreword of the CSR report 'We engage openly and often with stakeholders and stockholders to understand their perspectives on important environmental, social and governance issues, some of which we address in our 2017 Corporate Responsibility Report Highlights. This includes the work we're doing to manage risk; operate safely and reliably; address climate change; protect the environment; respect human rights; and promote diversity and inclusion in our workforce.' [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: The Company indicates that ESHIA's consider potential impacts on communities, natural resources, air quality and community health, incorporating human rights due diligence to help the Company consider how to safeguard the rights and interests of potentially affected communities. Chevron obtains inputs from communities for the various ESHIA's

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			which occur through a projects life cycle. If further assessment is needed, Chevron teams can conduct more detailed Human Rights Investigations. It states that early engagement with communities and key stakeholders is integral to planning a large capital project as it helps the project develop appropriate impact mitigation plans during the early stage of project development. [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com & Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy: The Company states 'our Grievance Mechanism Guidance and existing operational-level grievance mechanisms enable our business units to identify and respond to community concerns that may call for remedy.' However, the Company does not have a broader commitment to remedy. [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with EX BPs to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects EX BPs to reflect company HRD commitments

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: CEO or Board approves policy: Business conduct and Ethics code, which includes human rights policy, has been signed by the CEO and the Chairman of the board. This covers a broad commitment to human rights. [Business Conduct and Ethics Code, 2018: chevron.com] • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The Business Conduct and Ethics Code states that 'the Board Audit Committee, supported by the Corporate Compliance Policy Committee, made up of senior executives in the Company, governs our companywide compliance program.' [Business Conduct and Ethics Code, 2018: chevron.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO: The Company CEO foreword on the CSR reports mentions 'the work we're doing to manage risks; operate safely and reliably; address climate change; protect the environment; respect human rights; and promote diversity and inclusion in our workforce.' However, there is no broader evidence of board members or CEO's making speeches related to human rights. [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com]
A.2.2	Board discussions	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs: The Public Policy Committee assists the Board in 'fulfilling its oversight of risks that may arise in connection with the social, political, environmental, human rights and public policy aspects of Chevron's business, including climate change.' [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com] • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member • Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior responsibility fo HR (inc ILO): The Business conduct and Ethic code, which includes human rights policy, states that 'the Board Audit Committee, supported by the Corporate Compliance Policy Committee, made up of senior executives in the Company, governs our companywide compliance program. The Company must have a commitment to the core ILO. However, the Company does not have a core commitment to the core ILOs rather the Company states that "we expect suppliers to adhere to the ILOs". To be awarded this indicator the Company needs to have a commitment to the ILOS or the ILO Declaration or the UN Global Compact within its own operations as well. [Business Conduct and Ethics Code, 2018: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: HR part of enterprise risk system: Human rights risks are integrated into its wider enterprise risk management systems. The Company states that 'The Public Policy Committee assists the Board in fulfilling its oversight of risks that may arise in connection with the social, political, environmental, human rights and public policy aspects of Chevron's business and the communities in which it operates.' [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.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 Company's own operations	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: The Company states that its human rights policy is embedded in the Chevron Business Conduct and Ethics Code. The Human Rights Policy is published in 10 different languages (Chinese, English, French, Indonesian, Kazakh, Portuguese (Brazil), Portuguese (Europe), Russian, Spanish, Thai). However, it is not clear how the code is communicated throughout the Company's operations. The Company Code of Conduct states that 'each of us' has a duty to uphold the code, however, it is not clear how each employee is communicated the code and policies. Furthermore, the Company's human rights policy commitment does not include the ILO core labour standards. [Human Rights Policy, 2016: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs: Chevrons Human Rights webpage states under the suppliers heading that on an annual basis the Company sends out letters to the executive leadership team of 850 suppliers. These letters remind suppliers that Chevron expects business partners to treat their employees and interact with communities in a manner consistent with the Human Rights Policy and the ILOs. However, in a manner consistent with cannot be considered a formal commitment according to CHRB criteria. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com & Chevron expectation for suppliers and contractors (letter), 2017: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including to EX BPs: See Above • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on EX BPs

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The human rights policy is embedded in Chevron's Business Conduct and Ethics Code compliance training for all employees. However, the human rights policy commitment must include the ILO core labour standards at a minimum, or at least a commitment to the ILO Declaration or the 10 principles of the UN Global Compact. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: Trains relevant managers including security personnel <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: Business conduct and Ethics code states that 'audits performed by our internal and external auditors help ensure compliance with established policies, procedures and controls'. However, there is no further information available about monitoring. Furthermore, in order to receive this indicator, the human rights policy commitment must include the ILO core labour standards at a minimum. [Business Conduct and Ethics Code, 2018: chevron.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Monitoring EX BP's • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	1	<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 extractives business partners: Chevrons Human Rights website states that the Company seeks to implement human rights related expectations of contractors, suppliers and service providers through a variety of due diligence and performance management processes. Following this the Company provides an example in 2017 where It disqualified two companies competing for a contract after becoming aware of the forced labour in their operations. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: HR affects on-going business partner relationships <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with business partners to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	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: The Company discloses that they have several corporate guidance documents identify stakeholder engagement as a business requirement. Chevron's Stakeholder Engagement Process includes 'general guidance, principles and steps for identifying stakeholders, planning and executing an engagement process that can be scaled to local operating environments, and specific business requirements. This includes fostering 'ongoing two-way engagement with communities, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), government and regulatory authorities, and other appropriate stakeholders to address potential security, safety, health, environmental, supply chain, social, human rights and other concerns.' This is assumed to cover potentially affected stakeholders. The Company also refers to the Indigenous Peoples Guidance Document which includes information regarding stakeholder identification. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: The Company states 'At Chevron, stakeholder engagement is a continual process through which the views of individuals or groups are obtained and considered in decision making. It is critical in identifying and mitigating risk, bringing about sustainable social and economic development, and fostering constructive relationships. ' The Company also discloses that stakeholder engagement is practiced at both the corporate, regional, and local levels. The Company states that Several corporate guidance documents identify stakeholder engagement as a business requirement. Furthermore, the Stakeholder Engagement Process requires that 'Appropriate plans are in place and updated on a continual basis to include stakeholder engagement, issues management, and social investment. ' [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: workers in SP engaged: It is not clear whether the stakeholder identification and engagement process includes workers amongst its extractive business partners or local communities.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: communities in the SC engaged: This includes fostering 'ongoing two-way engagement with communities' and engaging with indigenous peoples. The Company states that the Indigenous Peoples Guidance Document 'provide our business units with a roadmap for how to navigate those situations in a manner that respects the involved rights holders'. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company has an Environmental, Social and Health Impact Assessment (ESHIA) process. The Company describes how the ESHIA process provides a 'systematic and risk-based approach to identifying, assessing and managing potentially significant impacts, including human rights-related issues'. [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com & Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: identifying risks in EX business partners: The Company states that the ESHIA process applies to projects within Chevron's operational control. This would include operated joint ventures. However, it is not clear what the process is for the Company's non-operated joint ventures or contractors. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: The Company states that they conduct extensive engagements with key stakeholders which cover human rights issues to ensure that the board and management understand and address issues that are important to stakeholders. The Company describes how this process is critical in identifying and mitigating human rights risks. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): The Company explains their use of HRIA. The Company describes 'Early engagement with communities and key stakeholders is integral to planning a large capital project as it helps the project develop appropriate impact mitigation plans during the early stage of project development. If initial assessments demonstrate the need for a more detailed Human Rights Impact Assessment, Chevron experts will undertake that due diligence (an ongoing risk management process enabling a company to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how it addresses its adverse human rights impacts) to help the company consider how to safeguard the rights and interests of potentially affected communities.' [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com]
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company states 'Our [human rights] policy applies to all of our employees and operations, guides our respect for human rights across the business, fosters greater awareness of human rights issues throughout the company and enhances our capabilities to identify and manage human rights risks. Chevron regularly identifies and manages potential impacts through processes and tools, including global and context-specific impact assessments.' [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company's Stakeholder Engagement Process requires that appropriate systems and plans be in place at the operational level to manage community input and issues. However, it is not clear whether the Company has action plans to mitigate, or remediate its salient human rights issues. The Company also states that they have a grievance mechanism guidance to encourage best practice for grievance mechanisms, however, it is not clear whether the company has a system to mitigate broader human rights risks. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: Example of Actions decided • Not met: Including amongst EX BRs

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness: The Company states 'Chevron benefits from an internal "community of practice" network of experienced social performance practitioners. For example, Chevron convenes workshops for company practitioners who are involved in managing land issues related to resettlement. In the workshops, Chevron practitioners discuss how the company's expectations on human rights extend to resettlement issues, discuss relevant international standards and share lessons learned from their practical experiences.' However, it is not clear whether this comes from a system to check if the Company's actions relating to human rights are effective, or rather whether this is just a knowledge-sharing format for the Company. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including EX BRs Score 2 • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: Chevron Hotline is available for 24 hours, 7 days a week. The Hotline is operated offsite by Global Compliance Services, an independent agent. The Hotline covers human rights related issues and is accessible to all workers. [Business Conduct and Ethics Code, 2018: chevron.com] Score 2 • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system • Not met: Opens own system to EX BP workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: In 2016, Chevron introduced a Grievance Mechanism Guidance to encourage best practice in community feedback systems and to enable our business units to identify and respond to community concerns that may call for remedy. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] Score 2 • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: Furthermore the Grievance Mechanism Guidance helps business units to update or design a grievance mechanism that is 'legitimate, accessible, predictable, equitable, transparent, and rights-compatible'. The Company provides information regarding the Myanmar Grievance Mechanism, which was established as part of its stakeholder engagement programs. The Myanmar Grievance Mechanism Procedure Document highlights how a 'handout/brochure will be provided in Myanmar language with information about the grievance mechanism and contact details.' [Chevron Myanmar Grievance Mechanism Procedure, 31/08/2015: chevron.com & Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Met: Expects EX BP to have community grievance systems: The Company's guidance helps business units design or update a grievance mechanism that strives to be legitimate, accessible, predictable, equitable, transparent, and rights-compatible. The mechanism should be based on engagement and two-way dialogue and promote continuous learning. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Engages users to create or assess system: The Company highlights how the Grievance Mechanism Guidance encourages best practice in community feedback systems. The Company states that 'the mechanism should be based on engagement and two-way dialogue and promote continuous learning.'. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: Description of how they do this <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Engages with users on system performance: Chevrons Grievance Management Guide section 5.1.1 Include Stakeholders in Evaluating the Mechanism states that the Company "track external stakeholder feedback on the use and effectiveness of the mechanism in the form on satisfaction surveys, inputs from town halls and feedback forms from complainants who used the mechanism. Ensure to demonstrate that stakeholder inputs is considered." [Grievance Management Guidance Summary Document, August 2018: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: EX BPs 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"> • Met: Response timescales: Chevron summarises its Grievance Mechanism Process into a six step process. Receive and register grievance, acknowledge, screen, evaluate, respond and follow up and close out. Within these six steps the Company indicates that tries to address responses immediately but the type and complexity of the issues may vary the length and scale of the response. [Grievance Management Guidance Summary Document, August 2018: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: How complainants will be informed: Under the section 3.2 Acknowledge of Chevrons Grievance Mechanism Process Document it states that "once lodged, grievance should be acknowledged in writing as soon as practical." The Company does not provide information on how complainants will be informed on the result of the grievance process required for this indicator. [Grievance Management Guidance Summary Document, August 2018: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0	<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: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The Company states that they do 'not tolerate any form of retaliation for reports made in good faith. This includes blatant actions, such as firing, transferring, demoting or publicly attacking someone, as well as more subtle retaliation, such as avoiding someone, leaving him or her out of professional or social activities and so on.' The company does not clarify whether this covers broader stakeholder reporting. [Business Conduct and Ethics Code, 2018: chevron.com] • Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects EX BRs to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	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: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.1	Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage target timeframe • Not met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Member of EITI: The Company is a member of EITI. [Board of directors, governance and ethics, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Steps taken re non EITI countries: The Company describes how 'Chevron is the longest continuously serving member on the EITI international board, has played a leadership role in establishing the EITI's global standard for financial transparency, and has actively supported the launch of EITI in many countries, including the United States'. [Board of directors, governance and ethics, 22/06/2018: chevron.com]
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining: The Company discloses the percentage of U.S. employees represented by unions (11%). However, the Company does not disclose other percentages covering their broader operations. [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
D.3.4	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company reports on the Total Recordable Incident Rate per 200,000 work hours. All incident figures are broken down between the total workforce, employees and contractors. [Corporate Responsibility Performance Data, 2017: chevron.com] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: The Company reports the Lost-Time Incident Frequency (Days Away From Work incidents and fatalities per million work-hours) and the Days Away From Work Rate (incidents per 200,000 work-hours) [Corporate Responsibility Performance Data, 2017: chevron.com] • Met: Fatalities disclosures: The Company reports the number of work-related fatalities for the workforce. [Corporate Responsibility Performance Data, 2017: chevron.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Set targets for H&S performance: The Company compares their results against a benchmark figure, derived from the APIs Benchmarking Survey of Occupational Injuries, Illnesses and Fatalities in the Petroleum Industry. However, the Company does not describe set targets. [Corporate Responsibility Performance Data, 2017: chevron.com] • Not met: Met targets or explains why not
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Process to identify indigenous rights holders: Chevron's Indigenous Peoples' Guidance (internal) document outlines key provisions for effective management of relations with Indigenous Peoples. The Company clarifies that this internal document covers 'stakeholder identification, defining the regulatory framework, determining a preferred method of engagement, assessing potential impacts and benefits, conducting community consultations, and developing and managing plans.' [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Not met: How engages with communities in assessment: The Company does not publicly disclose their Indigenous Peoples Guidance Document and it is not clear from the Company's explanations of the document whether the Company works together with indigenous people and communities in their process to identify indigenous rights holders. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM): The Company states that 'Chevron supports the concept of free, prior and informed consultation as part of our work engaging stakeholders to foster trust and build relationships.' However, it is not clear whether 'supporting a concept' means that the company is committing to respect FPIC. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Gives recent example FPIC or dropping deal
D.3.6	Land rights (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders: The Company states that 'When potential issues related to resettlement of communities or engagement with indigenous peoples are identified, Chevron's Resettlement Guidance and Indigenous Peoples Guidance provide our business units with a roadmap for how to navigate those situations in a manner that respects the involved rights holders.' Further information is provided in the CSR report. However, the Resettlement Guidance and Indigenous Peoples Guidance are not public, and it is not clear how communities are involved in the identification of legitimate tenure rights holders. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com & Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com] • Not met: Describes approach to doing so if no recent deals <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How valuation and compensation works • Not met: Steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals • Not met: Describes approach if no recent deals
D.3.7	Security (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC): The Company is a founding member of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. The Company's Operational Excellence Management System provides a framework to identify and mitigate security risks in line with the VPs. [Human Rights, 22/06/2018: chevron.com & Operational Excellence Management System, 22/06/2018: chevron.com] • Met: Example of respecting HRs in security: The Company discloses in 2016 thousands of public and private security personnel associated with Chevron's global operations received training on the Voluntary Principles. The Company also provides information regarding respecting human rights in security in their reporting to the VPs Plenary. This includes information regarding their supporting policies, processes and guidelines, their risk assessments and their procedures to report incidents. [Corporate Responsibility Performance Data, 2017: chevron.com & The Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights2016 Report to the Plenary, 01/03/2017: voluntaryprinciples.org] • Met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach: The Company reports to the VPs plenary. indicates that 'standard security services contracts incorporate clauses that reflect our commitment to the Voluntary Principles. In particular, our contractual terms set forth expectations regarding training on the Voluntary Principles, background screening of contract personnel and investigation of allegations of security and human rights-related incidents.' [The Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights2016 Report to the Plenary, 01/03/2017: voluntaryprinciples.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Assesses and involves communities: The Company states that their Human Rights Policy explains the companies relationship with the Voluntary Principles, which covers engagement with communities on security. 'Our guidelines and management processes on security in our areas of operations are consistent with the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, which covers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interaction with private security providers, including (i) due diligence of potential security providers; (ii) monitoring of equipment and facilities to prevent misuse; (iii) engagement with communities on security; (iv) facilitating education and training on the Principles. ' <p>The report to the VPs plenary further discloses how risk assessments consider community grievances. [The Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights2016 Report to the Plenary, 01/03/2017: voluntaryprinciples.org]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Working with local community: The Company provides the example of working with the community in Angola. The Company describes how chevron works with business partners, the government of Angola and community members to identify needs. The Company describes how the VPS guide Chevron's local engagement in Angola, for example 'Chevron is an active member of the U.S.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Embassy Overseas Security Advisory Council (OSAC) in Angola. ' The Company also describes how Chevron Angola holds 'bi-weekly security consultations and meetings in Luanda and Cabinda with the Angolan Security Authorities, which include the Police, Military, Marine and Port Authorities. In addition, weekly internal security management meetings are held.' [The Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights 2016 Report to the Plenary, 01/03/2017: voluntaryprinciples.org]
D.3.8	Water and sanitation (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks: The Company states 'chevron recognizes the value of water as a fundamental societal, environmental and economic resource and is committed to responsible water management' However, the Company has not described their actions to prevent water risks in the community. [Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: chevron.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Water targets considering local factors: The Company states that they engage with governments, partners, local communities and other stakeholders on significant water resource issues in areas where we operate. However, it is not clear whether this includes setting specific targets on water stewardship that take into consideration water use by local communities and other users in the vicinity of its operations. [Water Statement, 25/06/2018: chevron.com] Not met: Reports progress in meeting targets and shows trends in progress made

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity thresholds were found, and so the score of 23.07 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 5.77 out of 20 points for theme E.

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	2 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Chevron Corporation made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 19 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 2 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	0 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Company reports on GRI Not met: Company reports on SASB Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Chevron Corporation met 0 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management Not met: Score 1 for D.3.1 : Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs) Not met: Score 2 for D.3.4 : Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)

Disclaimer

A score of zero for a particular indicator does not mean that bad practices are present. Rather it means that we have been unable to identify the required information in public documentation.

See the 2018 Key Findings report for more details of the research process.

The Benchmark is made available on the express understanding that it will be used solely for general information purposes. The material contained in the Benchmark should not be construed as relating to accounting, legal, regulatory, tax, research or investment advice and it is not intended to take into account any specific or general investment objectives. The material contained in the Benchmark does not constitute a recommendation to take any action or to buy or sell or otherwise deal with anything or anyone identified or contemplated in the Benchmark. Before acting on anything contained in this material, you should consider whether it is suitable to your particular circumstances and, if necessary, seek professional advice. The material in the Benchmark has been put together solely according to the CHRB methodology and not any other assessment models in operation within any of the project partners or EIRIS Foundation as provider of the analyst team.

No representation or warranty is given that the material in the Benchmark is accurate, complete or up-to-date. The material in the Benchmark is based on information that we consider correct and any statements, opinions, conclusions or recommendations contained therein are honestly and reasonably held or made at the time of publication. Any opinions expressed are our current opinions as of the date of the publication of the Benchmark only and may change without notice. Any views expressed in the Benchmark only represent the views of CHRB Ltd, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither CHRB Ltd nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers or employees accept any responsibility for or make any representation or warranty (either express or implied) as to the truth, accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information contained in this Benchmark or any other information made available in connection with the Benchmark. Neither CHRB Ltd nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers and employees undertake any obligation to provide the users of the Benchmark with additional information or to update the information contained therein or to correct any inaccuracies which may become apparent (save as to the extent set out in CHRB Ltd's appeals procedure). To the maximum extent permitted by law any responsibility or liability for the Benchmark or any related material is expressly disclaimed provided that nothing in this disclaimer shall exclude any liability for, or any remedy in respect of, fraud or fraudulent misrepresentation. Any disputes, claims or proceedings this in connection with or arising in relation to this Benchmark will be governed by and construed in accordance with English law and submitted to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of England and Wales.

As CHRB Ltd, we want to emphasise that the results will always be a proxy for good human rights management, and not an absolute measure of performance. This is because there are no fundamental units of measurement for human rights. Human rights assessments are therefore necessarily more subjective than objective. The Benchmark also captures only a snap shot in time. We therefore want to encourage companies, investors, civil society and governments to look at the broad performance bands that companies are ranked within rather than their precise score because, as with all measurements, there is a reasonably wide margin of error possible in interpretation. We also want to encourage a greater analytical focus on how scores improve over time rather than upon how a company compares to other companies in the same industry today. The spirit of the exercise is to promote continual improvement via an open assessment process and a common understanding of the importance of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.