

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



Company Name Ecopetrol
Industry Extractives
Overall Score (*) 37.8 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
1.7	10	A. Governance and Policies
12.4	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
2.5	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
8.8	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
7.6	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
4.8	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 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 Integrated Sustainable Management Report states that the Company needs to ensure that 'human rights are promoted and respected'. The report is signed off by the President of Ecopetrol. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company Integrated Sustainable Management Report highlights and describes the 10 principles of the UNGC. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Not met: UDHR: The Company discloses a commitment to human rights and undertakes to "Carry out all its business operations within the framework of respect for Human Rights and in accordance with the principles enshrined in the Constitution of Colombia and international laws and treaties such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the American Convention on Human Rights, the declarations of the ILO, the United Nations Global Compact, and the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights." However, this is only disclosed on a section of the Company website, and not on a formal policy document. [Our Commitment to Human Rights, 08/11/2014: ecopetrol.com.co] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs Not met: OECD

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of 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: ILO Core: The company discloses a commitment to human rights and undertakes to "Carry out all its business operations within the framework of respect for Human Rights and in accordance with the principles enshrined in the Constitution of Colombia and international laws and treaties such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the American Convention on Human Rights, the declarations of the ILO, the United Nations Global Compact, and the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights." However, this is only disclosed on the Company Website. [Our Commitment to Human Rights, 08/11/2014: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: Ecopetrol joined the United Nations Global Compact in 2009. The Company also describes and lists the UNGC 10 principles in their integrated sustainability report. [Global Compact, 08/11/2014: ecopetrol.com.co & Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: All four ILO apply to EX BPs: The Company's Human Rights guidelines which also cover the four ILO core labour standards are also part of contracts with business partners. [Our Commitment to Human Rights, 08/11/2014: ecopetrol.com.co] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: All four ILO Core: The Company also describes and lists the UNGC 10 principles in their integrated sustainability report, this covers the core ILO areas. [Global Compact, 08/11/2014: ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: Respect H&S of workers • Not met: H&S applies to Ex BPs
A.1.3.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (EX)	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: Based on UN Instruments • Not met: VPs participant: The Company is states their commitment to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. The Company states on their website 'since 2008, Ecopetrol has implemented a series of practices aimed at the application of the Voluntary Principles'. However, the Company is not an official corporate participant of the Voluntary Principles. [Voluntary Principles, 08/11/2014: ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: Uses only ICoCA members • Not met: Respecting indigenous rights: The company notes the importance of respecting indigenous rights and has committed to a code of conduct for their Gibraltar Gas Processing Plant as based on "respect for the cultural differences of the local population, both indigenous and settler, and the environmental protection of the project's area of influence." However, this information is disclosed on the Company's website and not in a formal policy document. [Ethnic Groups, 17/10/2014: https://ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: ILO 169 • Not met: UNDRIP • Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FPIC commitment • Not met: Vol Guidelines on Tenure • Not met: IFC performance standards • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water: The company discloses "water care" as an objective across a range of its material risk areas, including community and society risks within its integrated report. It also notes its support of the CEO Water Mandate - Global Compact. However, the company is not listed on the CEO water mandate website and water rights are not specifically noted in its disclosures. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • 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: Regular stakeholder engagement: The company runs a stakeholder engagement plan which specifies the groups it engages with and the specific policies and issues discussed and measured against. The Company has detailed that they have identified 'seven stakeholders' shareholders and investors; customers; partners; employees, pensioners and their beneficiaries; contractors and their employees; society and community, and the State. The Company then identifies the 'stakeholder subgroups' for the society and community - which includes NGOs, ethnic organisations and land owners. This information is detailed in the Company's integrated report.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>The company formerly ran a Mobile Citizen Participation strategy aimed at stakeholder engagement and entry into new territories. This collected requests, claims and suggestions from the communities in which it operates. As of 2016, it is no longer operational. However, the company discloses engagement across the following areas for the year - Orinoco: Aguazul, Tauramena, Castilla, Guamal, Acacías, Villavicencio, Yopal.</p> <p>Caribbean and Pacific: Cartagena, Coveñas, Santa Marta, Tolú, Tumaco. Center: Barrancabermeja, Sabana de Torres, El Centro, Yondó, Tibú, Puerto Nare, Cúcuta. South: Neiva, Aipe, Villavieja, Orito. It also discloses a table of areas in which dialogue was undertaken and the number of meetings held. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: The stakeholder engagement plan for society and community specifically mentions compliance with human rights as per its tactical plan on human rights. The process through which company's actions are adjusted based on issues identified from stakeholder engagement is disclosed in the integrate report. The company formerly ran a Mobile Citizen Participation strategy aimed at stakeholder engagement and entry into new territories. This collected requests, claims and suggestions from the communities in which it operates. As of 2016, it is no longer operational. However, the company discloses engagement across the following areas for the year - Orinoco: Aguazul, Tauramena, Castilla, Guamal, Acacías, Villavicencio, Yopal. <p>Caribbean and Pacific: Cartagena, Coveñas, Santa Marta, Tolú, Tumaco. Center: Barrancabermeja, Sabana de Torres, El Centro, Yondó, Tibú, Puerto Nare, Cúcuta. South: Neiva, Aipe, Villavieja, Orito. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]</p>
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy: The company notes compensation and social investment measures as follows: "Compensation measures that will maintain the inhabitants' quality of life, in cases where there is an impact on the infrastructure or economic activities in the direct and specific area of influence". Conflicts due to water use and supply, tertiary roads, negative impacts on land and impacts on traditional economic activity, are specified. The application of these compensation activities upon extractives business partners is not specified. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] <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	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects 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	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: CEO or Board approves policy • Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	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: Board/Committee review of salient HRs • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	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: Incentives for at least one board member • Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&S <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Senior responsibility for HR (inc ILO): A Human Rights Committee is discussed, but the relationship of this committee to the Board or Senior levels is not specified. [Human Rights Committee, 17/10/2014: ecopetrol.com.co] Score 2 <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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Senior manager incentives for human rights: There is no disclosure of human rights beyond H&S related to incentives for senior managers. Accident frequency rate is discussed as part of variable compensation. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S: The Company does discuss frequency rate as part of variable compensation. However, this does not extend to the health and safety of local communities or workers in the supply chain. Variable compensation is determined through Balanced Scorecards for senior management, however the specific content of the scorecards is not disclosed. Fixed compensation and general comments regarding assessment are disclosed in the integrated report. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Performance criteria made public: The risk management framework does not discuss human rights risks. The Tactical Plan on human rights discloses the way in which strategic human rights objectives are integrated into operations of the business and result in particular focus areas or initiatives. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: HR part of enterprise risk system Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Audit Committee or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: The Company's sustainability agenda includes 'labour practices and human rights'. This agenda is communicated across the company's seven stakeholders - which includes employees at own operations. The Company's human rights policy covers core ILOs (covering all 10 UNGC principles) [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder: The integrated report discusses the stakeholder engagement framework and notes that the company's human rights strategy is discussed. Society and community are one of the groups with which engagement occurs. The company website and integrated report also discuss human rights commitments. Communication of human rights in local languages is not specifically discussed. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience: The integrated report discusses the stakeholder engagement framework and notes that the company's human rights strategy is discussed. Society and community are one of the groups with which engagement occurs. The company website and integrated report also discuss human rights commitments. Ecopetrol performs an annual consultation regarding their perception in terms of general and specific attributes relating to corporate responsibility. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs: The company notes that supplier contracts and third party contracts include clauses requiring adherence to the company's human rights commitments, specifying the UN Global Compact. A human rights evaluation is noted for completion among new partners, and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>reaffirmed each year for existing partners. The Company's human rights policy covers all ten UNGC principles (covers ILO). [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including to EX BPs: The company notes that supplier contracts and third party contracts include clauses requiring adherence to the company's human rights commitments, specifying the UN Global Compact. However, this commitment does not cascade down the supply chain [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: The company's integrated report notes that "The annex on human rights and corporate social responsibility was reviewed and updated for all Ecopetrol contracts. It sets out the clear commitment that contractors must make with regard to respecting human rights, as well as identifying, preventing and mitigating situation that may potentially or actually affect the exercise of rights during the course of operations and the performance of contractual obligations in light of relationships with stakeholders". [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: Including on EX BPs: The company's integrated report notes that "The annex on human rights and corporate social responsibility was reviewed and updated for all Ecopetrol contracts. It sets out the clear commitment that contractors must make with regard to respecting human rights, as well as identifying, preventing and mitigating situation that may potentially or actually affect the exercise of rights during the course of operations and the performance of contractual obligations in light of relationships with stakeholders". However, this commitment does not cascade down to other business relationships. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The stakeholder engagement plan notes that relevant stakeholder groups are notified of the human rights commitments, and employees, suppliers and third parties are provided with training. However, it is not clear whether this is all workers. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: Trains relevant managers including security personnel: The company discloses the number of employees trained and the type of human rights training provided within its integrated report. It separately discloses specified training for security personnel and other specialised personnel regarding human rights. The company discusses training of security personnel on human rights, and provides data on the number of relevant employees and managers trained in the human rights policy. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: The company measures quarterly indicators on its Tactical Plan on Human Rights and discloses the percentage of compliance over the last two years. A quarterly report goes to the Human Rights Committee, including details of risks identified. The number of human rights complaints recorded is also disclosed publicly. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: Monitoring EX BP's <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	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: HR affects selection extractives business partners: The Company website notes that joint venture contracts now include a clause on international Human Rights agreements which must be adhered to in order to proceed. It also notes that "All Ecopetrol contractors must declare their adherence to the company's Code of Ethics. Significant effects are attributed to this declaration within the contracts, because the Code qualifies as a contractual obligation, whose breach generates the application of the agreed sanction measures (Penalty clause for enforcement, early termination). Similarly, workers, contractors and third parties involved in the company's operations must know and accept the guidelines on corporate social responsibility (CSR) and the Human Rights Guide, which establish the company's rejection of child labor, and forced and compulsory labor." The company also has a

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Supplier Rating System which includes a section on whether or not the supplier adheres to each of the ten principles of the UN Global Compact. This adherence is evaluated and reaffirmed in every new contract (evaluation content is not provided). [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: HR affects on-going business partner relationships: The company website notes that "Ecopetrol requires a commitment from its employees and contractors on Human Rights, the rejection of child labor, forced labor, and discrimination in employment, through various means. In the first instance, through the Code of Ethics, which is a formal and institutional reference for personal and professional conduct." It also notes that "All Ecopetrol contractors must declare their adherence to the company's Code of Ethics. Significant effects are attributed to this declaration within the contracts, because the Code qualifies as a contractual obligation, whose breach generates the application of the agreed sanction measures (Penalty clause for enforcement, early termination). Similarly, workers, contractors and third parties involved in the company's operations must know and accept the guidelines on corporate social responsibility (CSR) and the Human Rights Guide, which establish the company's rejection of child labor, and forced and compulsory labor." The company also has a Supplier Rating System which includes a section on whether or not the supplier adheres to each of the ten principles of the UN Global Compact. This adherence is evaluated and reaffirmed in every new contract (evaluation content is not provided). [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirement under score 1 met: See above. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: Working with business partners to improve performance: The integrated report discusses how Ecopetrol worked together with UNICEF and 26 contractors to reduce the risk of sexual exploitation of children and adolescents in operational environments regarding transport services. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	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: Stakeholder process or systems: The company's stakeholder engagement program with society and community explicitly mentions human rights and measures compliance with the tactical plan on human rights as a percentage. Values, objectives, indicators, and the results of consultations from the stakeholder management plan are disclosed in detail as per the 2017 integrated report. The integrated report provides details on how the stakeholder engagement framework includes indicators on human rights. Stakeholder feedback against these indicators is disclosed, including survey responses against individual elements of the tactical plan, and the results are used to adjust the corporate responsibility model. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: The integrated report provides details on how the stakeholder engagement framework includes indicators on human rights. Stakeholder feedback against these indicators is disclosed, including survey responses against individual elements of the tactical plan, and the results are used to adjust the corporate responsibility model. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: workers in SP engaged: The stakeholder engagement plan does not specific supply chain workers or workers of extractives business partners. • Not met: communities in the SC engaged: The stakeholder groups identified include landowners, employees and beneficiaries, but does not specify communities affected by the supply chain. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them: The company discloses a comprehensive stakeholder engagement program including assessment of its human rights strategy and comments provided by stakeholders with regards to key human rights risks. The results, and how they inform work focus areas for the following year, are provided. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]

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	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: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company details in their integrated Sustainable Management Report, the Company details that Comprehensive risk management in Ecopetrol is analysed at two levels: 1. Corporate risks and 2. Process risks. The Company also publishes a 'corporate risks map' that includes operational risks such as 'incidents due to operational causes or natural events' and 'ethics and compliance failures, and negative impacts on the company's reputation'. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: identifying risks in EX business partners: The company website notes that "All Ecopetrol contractors must declare their adherence to the company's Code of Ethics. Significant effects are attributed to this declaration within the contracts, because the Code qualifies as a contractual obligation, whose breach generates the application of the agreed sanction measures (Penalty clause for enforcement, early termination). Similarly, workers, contractors and third parties involved in the company's operations must know and accept the guidelines on corporate social responsibility (CSR) and the Human Rights Guide, which establish the company's rejection of child labor, and forced and compulsory labor." The company also has a Supplier Rating System which includes a section on whether or not the supplier adheres to each of the ten principles of the UN Global Compact. This adherence is evaluated and reaffirmed in every new contract (evaluation content is not provided). [Assurance, 28/10/2014: ecopetrol.com.co] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: The company discloses a comprehensive stakeholder engagement program including assessment of its human rights strategy and comments provided by stakeholders with regards to key human rights risks. The results, and how they inform work focus areas for the following year, are provided. Separately, the company also discloses situations in which external NGOs have been involved in initiatives to address human rights concerns. [Assurance, 28/10/2014: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: In consultation with HR experts: NGOs, grassroots organisations and "ethnic organisations" included in stakeholder engagement, including feedback on the Tactical Plan for Human Rights. The company discloses an example of UNICEF assisting with improving transport services with contractors to reduce the risk of sexual exploitation in the areas of operation. State and Judicial courts are also included in the stakeholder engagement plan, and the company discloses summaries of cases they have taken to court for decision. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	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): The company's integrated report provides information regarding a materiality assessment conducted by the Company, the materiality assessment was conducted in consultation with stakeholders perceptions and expectations. The issues were then prioritised the issues considering the importance to Ecopetrol in a sustainability context, and their importance to stakeholders. The report provides a graph of material issues, grading them as per importance to the company and stakeholders against severity. The graph includes human rights and occupational health and safety as material risks (rated at 2.5 on a 0-3 scale). [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The company notes an ongoing human rights risk of child labour and exploitation at operational sites and discloses action plans taken to address these risks and their progress. This includes NGOs (UNICEF) and the number of supplier parties involved, the details of the initiative and the number of activities that were taken out as a result of the plan. One result discussed regarded the inclusion of a new clause in code of conduct and supplier agreements. Separately, rights of association and trade union freedom, and security and human rights are other areas in which risks were identified and details are provided of actions taken. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met: See above

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The company notes an ongoing human rights risk of child labour and exploitation at operational sites and discloses action plans taken to address these risks and their progress. This includes NGOs (UNICEF) and the number of supplier parties involved, the details of the initiative and the number of activities that were taken out as a result of the plan. One result discussed regarded the inclusion of a new clause in code of conduct and supplier agreements. Separately, rights of association and trade union freedom, and security and human rights are other areas in which risks were identified and details are provided of actions taken and action plans developed. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Met: Example of Actions decided: The company provides conclusions reached and actions taken on a range of risk areas. This includes child labour and sexual exploitation, right of association and trade union freedom and security and human rights. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Not met: Including amongst EX BRs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: System to check if Actions are effective Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Comms plan re identifying risks: The Company has communicated on its website and in the integrated report how it has a system to identify human rights risks and impacts including own operations and business partners (see b.2.1). [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co & Assurance, 28/10/2014: ecopetrol.com.co] Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: The Company has communicated in its integrated sustainable management report how it has a system to assess which are its human rights issues, including a disclosure of these (see b.2.2). Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans Not met: Including EX BRs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company has an ethics line available to all employees and contractors. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The integrated report provides details on the number of human rights complaints made in relation to the Tactical Plan for Human Rights. This includes the level of escalation, and the responsible department, as well as the stage at which the complaint is in relation to resolution. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: It is not clear whether the channel is accessible in all appropriate languages. Met: Opens own system to EX BP workers: The integrated report notes visits to contract workers as part of Contract Worker Service Scheme, to monitor and address requests, complaints, claims and suggestions, as well as to check compliance with labour standards. The company reports eighty labour checks in 2016, with 229 findings. The company does not otherwise disclose that extractives business partners must have grievance mechanisms. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Grievance mechanism for community: The stakeholder engagement plan is comprehensive, but no information is provided about the expression of grievances outside this channel. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co & Our Commitment to Human Rights, 08/11/2014: ecopetrol.com.co] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages Not met: Expects EX BP to have community grievance systems Not met: EX BP communities use global system: Aside from the Contractor Work Service Scheme, there is no description of how external individuals can use the company's channels.
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Engages users to create or assess system Not met: Description of how they do this Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Engages with users on system performance Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance Not met: EX BPs in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Response timescales: The company does not disclose who handles human rights complaints. A Human Rights Committee is discussed, but their responsibilities and the escalation of issues to the committee is not explained. Not met: How complainants will be informed Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The company's Code of Ethics notes that retaliation against those who inform about breaches of the Code will not be accepted. The Code notes that "workers who inform about the breach of the Code will not be able to receive any kind of reprisals. Those who take action against said collaborators will have to face the corresponding disciplinary actions." Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Has not retaliated in practice Not met: Expects EX BRs to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided: The company notes an ongoing human rights risk of child labour and exploitation at operational sites and discloses action plans taken to address these risks and their progress. This includes NGOs (UNICEF) and the number of supplier parties involved, the details of the initiative and the number of activities that were taken out as a result of the plan. One result discussed regarded the inclusion of a new clause in code of conduct and supplier agreements. Separately, rights of association and trade union freedom, and security and human rights are other areas in which risks were identified and details are provided of actions taken. The company does not explain how this human rights concern arose from the human rights risk detection mechanisms, or that this initiative was provided as a remedy. Human rights risks identified, and remedied, are not explicitly stated otherwise. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Changes introduced to stop repetition: The company notes that its work in preventing child labour and sexual exploitation resulted in new clauses being

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			introduced to contracts, and describes work undertaken with 26 contractors to change transfer services. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: With regards to wages, the company notes that "In 2016, the minimum monthly wage in Colombia was \$689,454, while in Ecopetrol, the minimum wage was \$1,721,850 per month, i.e. 2.4 times the national minimum. Ecopetrol ensures equal pay among men and women, considering that the reference compensation applied relates to the position, regardless of whether a position is held by a man or a woman." No discussion of living wages was identified. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] 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"> • Not met: Member of EITI: The company notes that it is a participant in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative and discusses the progress made with respect to the relevant governments in the areas in which it operates. However, the Company is not listed as an EITI Supporting Company on the EITI Website. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: Reports of taxes beyond legal minimums: The company discloses taxes paid to the State and territorial agencies by year and type. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Reports taxes and revenue by country: The company discloses taxes paid to the State and territorial agencies by year and type. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: Steps taken re non EITI countries: The company discloses its participation in meetings with the Colombian government regarding encouragement of and participation with the EITI. It notes its ongoing support for and participation in the EITI and discloses State and territorial taxes. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • 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)	1	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: The integrated report discloses that the company will act within the framework of respect for the right of association and trade union freedom. It also notes the unions that its members are a part of and the percentage of workers that were part of a union or covered by a collective bargaining agreement. No discussion is provided around what commitments are made to non-retaliation against employees. The company only notes that it complies with and monitors agreements. • Met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining: The integrated report discloses the percentage of workers covered by collective bargaining agreements as well as the unions to which employees belong. The Company discloses that 47.3% of workers were members of a union. At the same date, the current Collective Bargaining Agreement applied to 79% of workers at Ecopetrol S.A. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 discloses Occupational Accident Frequent Rate in its integrated report. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: The company discloses absenteeism rates in its integrated report. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: Fatalities disclosures: The company discloses fatalities in its integrated report. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Set targets for H&S performance: The company discloses its performance against Health and Safety as a material issue within its sustainability processes, providing the average rating against the importance level. The Company sets targets for TRIF and occupational disease rate, in addition to absenteeism, and 'effectiveness of health risk and management' [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Met: Met targets or explains why not: The company provides detailed analysis of its health and safety incidents - including an analysis of targets in their integrated sustainable management report. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co]
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"> • Met: Process to identify indigenous rights holders: The company's integrated report discusses that a Procedure for ethnic group management is in place at the company. It also notes that activities in new areas are preceded by a discussion with the Ministry of the Interior to identify ethnic groups in the area and the Ministry provides direction on the communities that need to be consulted. The company then proceeds with consultations, and determines indigenous reserves and lands certified to Community Councils. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: How engages with communities in assessment: The company provides information on the communities that have been consulted and the stage of consultation, but there is no explanation of how indigenous communities are engaged in assessment outside of the regular stakeholder engagement program. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM) • Not met: Gives recent example FPIC or dropping deal
D.3.6	Land rights (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders: The company's integrated report notes that activities in new areas are preceded by a discussion with the Ministry of the Interior to identify ethnic groups in the area and the Ministry provides direction on the communities that need to be consulted. The company then proceeds with consultations, and determines indigenous reserves and lands certified to Community Councils. No discussion of the processes regarding identification of legitimate land tenure holders is provided otherwise. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • 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: The company notes that it establishes "a framework for the impacts to be compensated and the share in profits generated by the projects, in accordance with the provisions of Law 21/91, within the context of their own forms of governance and their development plans.". No further details of how this valuation and compensation works are provided. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: Steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals • Not met: Describes approach if no recent deals

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.7	Security (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"> • Met: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC): The integrated report notes that private security contractors undergo training on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. No requirements are disclosed for extractives business partners to enforce the voluntary principles in their human rights and security training. The Company also states 'Those managing contracts with the companies providing private security services for Ecopetrol, follow up on compliance with the obligations set out in the contractual clause regarding compliance with the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights'. However, it is not clear whether this extends to joint venture partners or contractors. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: Example of respecting HRs in security • Not met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Assesses and involves communities • Not met: Working with local community
D.3.8	Water and sanitation (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks: The company is a member of the CEO Water Mandate. It outlines a range of initiatives regarding water supply and protection of water supply across several locations of operation. Water reuse programs, produced water and general sanitation investments are detailed. Key water risks are briefly identified. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Water targets considering local factors • Not met: Reports progress in meeting targets and shows trends in progress made

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity thresholds were found, and so the score of 30.23 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 7.56 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	2.42 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Ecopetrol made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 23 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 2.42 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Company reports on GRI: The Company maps their Integrated Sustainable Management Report to the GRI G4 Standards. [Integrated Sustainable Management Report, 2016: ecopetrol.com.co] • Not met: Company reports on SASB • Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0.4 out of 4	<p>Ecopetrol met 1 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0.4 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator.</p> <p>Specificity and use of concrete examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) <p>Discussing challenges openly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts • Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned <p>Demonstrating a forward focus</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 1 for D.3.1 : Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs) • 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.