

Company Name Equinor
Industry Extractives
Overall Score (*) 41.3 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
4.0	10	A. Governance and Policies
7.3	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
5.8	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
6.9	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
12.5	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 2019 Methodology document. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

Detailed assessment

A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: General HRs commitment: The Company states in its Human Rights policy that it will "conduct our business consistently with the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the ten principles of the United Nations Global Compact. We respect all internationally recognised human rights, including those set out in the International Bill of Human Rights, the International Labour Organisation Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and applicable standards of international humanitarian law." [Human Rights Policy 2019, 2019: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs: The Company states in its Human Rights Policy that it will conduct its business consistently with the United Nations Guiding Principles and provides links to the external voluntary codes it adheres to across its policy, code of conduct and its Business code - the "Equinor Book". Moreover, in its new Human Rights webpage, the company indicates that "to specifically guide our human rights efforts, we are committed to operating consistently with (...) UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights." However, the use of the wording 'consistent with' does not qualify as a formal commitment following CHRB Criteria. [Human Rights Policy, n/a: equinor.com & The Equinor Book 2018, 16/05/2018: equinor.com] Not met: OECD

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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"> • Met: ILO Core: The Company states that 'we respect all internationally recognised human rights, including those set out in the International Bill of Human Rights, the International Labour Organisation Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. [Equinor's Code of Conduct, 06/2018: equinor.com & Human Rights Policy 2019, 2019: equinor.com] • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company states that 'we will conduct our business consistently with the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the ten principles of the United Nations Global Compact'. It is signatory to the UN Global Compact. [Human Rights Policy 2019, 2019: equinor.com & Communication on Progress 2019, 27/03/2019: unglobalcompact.org] • Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs: The supplier declaration contains requirements regarding minimum age labour (not employ children below the age of 15), Forced labour, discrimination and freedom of association and collective bargaining. In relation to these two, it states that 'as a supplier to Equinor we recognise that our employees are entitled to be - or refrain from being- union members and to be represented in collective bargaining agreements. In countries where these rights are restricted our employees will anyway have the right to influence their work situation. It is not clear, however, the scope of this policy, whether it includes extractive business partners (and JVs), as it only refers to 'suppliers', without further definition. [Human Rights Policy 2019, 2019: equinor.com & Supplier Declaration, 16/07/19] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: No statement found including explicit commitment to respect: freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining, the rights not to be subject to forced labour, child labour or discrimination in respect of employment and occupation [Our approach - Human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.com & Human Rights Policy 2019, 2019: equinor.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company indicates that it is 'committed to Respecting all internationally recognised human rights, and in particular (...) providing safe, healthy and secure working conditions'. [Human Rights Policy 2019, 2019: equinor.com] • Met: H&S applies to EX BPs: The Company indicates that 'we require all our employees and hired contractors to comply with this policy and will offer capacity building to this end (...) we expect our suppliers and business partners to follow the spirit and intent of this policy when working for or together with us. [Human Rights Policy 2019, 2019: equinor.com]
A.1.3.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (EX)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Based on UN Instruments • Met: Voluntary Principles (VPs) participant: The Company states in the Equinor book that it is committed to 'perform our security activities in line with our commitment to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights' and is a signatory to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com & Engagement commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] • Not met: Uses only ICoCA members • Not met: Respecting indigenous rights: The Company states that 'we will be particularly attentive to the human rights we are at risk of impacting most and to those people most vulnerable to adverse impacts, including women, children, migrant workers and indigenous peoples'. However, no evidence of commitment to indigenous peoples rights was found. Moreover, the company indicates that 'Routinely using public consultations, surveys, interviews, one-to-one meetings and community panels to better understand the expectations from local communities is an important process to ensure our commitment the Rights of Indigenous Peoples'. However, no formal publicly available statement of policy committing the company to respecting indigenous peoples rights found. [Human Rights Policy 2019, 2019: equinor.com & Our approach - Human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.com] • Not met: ILO 169 • Not met: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) • Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights: The Company indicates that 'the Code applies to Equinor's board members, employees and hired contractors'. Also, 'we expect our suppliers and business partners to comply with applicable laws, respect internationally recognised human rights and adhere to ethical standards which are consistent with our ethical requirements when working for or together with us'. However, as no commitment to indigenous rights was found, the awarded

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			cannot be given. [The Equinor Book 2018, 16/05/2018: equinor.com & Equinor's Code of Conduct, 06/2018: equinor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FPIC commitment • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure Rights • Not met: IFC performance standards • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expects BPs to commit to all these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states that stakeholder engagement is a one of its four strategic enablers that will continue to support the business's needs, saying it "engages with stakeholders to secure industrial legitimacy, its social contract, trust and strategic support from stakeholders. This engagement extends to internal and external collaboration, partnerships, and other co-operation with suppliers, partners, governments, NGOs and communities in which it operates." Our operational management system requires us to establish an open communication channel with community stakeholders to deal with any potential grievances (see also our Human Rights Approach). Our operations make use of public consultations, surveys, interviews, one-to-one meetings and community panels to better understand the expectations from local communities and to devise mitigation strategies and plans that best suit local conditions." [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & Engagement commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: The Company indicates that 'respecting the human rights of people in communities impacted by our activities – including in relation to their use of land, water and other natural resources' is a priority area identified in the human rights policy. It also adds 'using a set of risk assessment processes, we develop stakeholder mapping and strive for collaboration with local representatives to help us understand the topics that communities are interested in discussing [...]. Routinely using public consultation surveys, interviews, one-to-one meetings and community panels to better understand the expectations from local communities is an important process to ensure our commitment to the rights of indigenous peoples'. However, no particular commitment found to engage with them in the design or monitoring of the human rights approach. [Our commitment to respecting human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement [Our commitment to respecting human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.com]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to remedy: The Company indicates in its Human Rights policy that 'we will provide or cooperate in providing appropriate remediation, including, where relevant, effective grievance mechanisms, where we have caused or contributed to adverse human rights impacts'. [Human Rights Policy 2019, 2019: equinor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives: In its 2017 Sustainability Report, the Company states that it 'operated country specific grievance mechanisms in support of the Sheringham Shoal offshore wind farm in the UK, our activities in Tanzania, and our offshore oil and gas operations in Brazil. In 2017 there were no grievances reported through the mechanisms in Tanzania and Brazil. Two grievances were received in connection with our Sheringham Shoal wind farm both of which have been settled. For our activities in Canada and our offshore oil and gas activities in the UK we participate in grievance and remediation processes that form part of the local regulatory process or that are coordinated by industry representative bodies (e.g. Oil and Gas UK "Fisheries Legacy Trust Company" (FLTC)).' [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • 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): The company indicates that "In line with the Code of Conduct Equinor will not tolerate any form of recrimination or retaliation to those who raise a concern with us. We recognise the right to advocate for and to defend human rights in a peaceful manner on behalf of

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			those who's rights may be at risk". However, no publicly available statement of policy committing it to neither tolerate nor contribute to threats, intimidation and attacks (both physical and legal) against human rights defenders in relation to its operations found. [Grievance mechanisms, 16/07/19: equinor.com] Score 2 • 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 • Met: CEO or Board approves policy: The Company's human rights policy has been approved by the board of directors, and is overseen by the Human Rights Steering Committee (HRSC) The HRSC's role is to oversee the implementation of human rights and is made up of senior leaders across the organisation. The HRSC reports into the Board of Directors Safety, Sustainability and Ethics Committee. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: See above [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] Score 2 • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs: The Company indicates that "the process is overseen by our corporate human rights steering committee, which reports bi-annually to the corporate executive committee and the board". However, no information about how salient human rights are reviewed by the board was found. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com] • Met: Examples or trends re HR discussion: It is stated that in 2018 the corporate human rights steering committee implemented some activities including: human rights risk assessments, awareness raising and training, human rights in the supply chain. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Incentives for at least one board member: The company indicates that "we have sustainability targets and indicators in place to measure progress and incentivise performance across the company – starting at the top. Key performance indicators have been established to measure climate and safety performance (CO2 intensity upstream; serious incident frequency; total recordable injury frequency; and oil/gas leakage). SIF and CO2 intensity impact the remuneration for the CEO". [Annual Report 2018, 2018: equinor.com & Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com] • Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&S: No evidence found on whether safety performance indicators impacting remuneration includes health and safety of local communities and workers in extractive business partners. Score 2 • Not met: Performance criteria made public

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company has a Human Rights Steering Committee whose role is 'to oversee the implementation of the human rights policy. Its members include senior leaders from our corporate procurement, people and leadership, legal and communications functions and from the exploration and development and production international business areas'. Moreover, 'the Executive Vice President of GSB is the Chair of Equinor's Human Rights Steering Committee. This steering committee is mandated by our Corporate Executive Committee (CEC) to oversee and provide guidance to the implementation of Equinor's human rights policy and reports bi-annually to the Board of Directors Safety, Sustainability and Ethics Committee (BoD SSEC) on progress. The CEC and the BoD SSEC regularly discuss human rights dilemmas'. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com & Our approach - Human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.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	0.5	<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: Senior manager incentives for human rights: The company indicates that "we have sustainability targets and indicators in place to measure progress and incentivise performance across the company – starting at the top. Key performance indicators have been established to measure climate and safety performance (CO2 intensity upstream; serious incident frequency (SIF); total recordable injury frequency; and oil/gas leakage). SIF and CO2 intensity impact the remuneration for the CEO and other members of the executive committee". [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com & Annual Report 2018, 2018: equinor.com] • Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S: No evidence found of health and safety performance indicators related to remuneration including health and safety of local communities and workers of extractive business partners. <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 risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system: The company indicates that "we formally introduced human rights as a risk in our risk management framework. The approach assesses the risk to individuals, where the risk levels are based on the severity criteria set forth in the UNGPs. We expect that this tool will strengthen our ability to identify potential human rights effects of our operations and business partners' conduct". [Risk Management and governance, 25/05/2018] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment: The Company indicates that 'we formally introduced human rights as a risk in our risk management framework. The approach assesses the risk to individuals, where the risk levels are based on the severity criteria set forth in the UNGPs. We expect that this tool will strengthen our ability to identify potential human rights effects of our operations and business partners' conduct'. In addition, the Company indicates that 'the responsibility for ensuring respect for human rights in our daily operations sits in the business line. The Corporate Sustainability team, within Global Strategy and Business Development (GSB) is the corporate function responsible for developing implementation of our due diligence processes, capability building and reporting. The Executive Vice President of GSB is the Chair of Equinor's Human Rights Steering Committee. This steering committee is mandated by our Corporate Executive Committee (CEC) to oversee and provide guidance to the implementation of Equinor's human rights policy and reports bi-annually to the Board of Directors Safety, Sustainability and Ethics Committee (BoD SSEC) on progress. The CEC and the BoD SSEC regularly discuss human rights dilemmas'. However, it is not clear how the company assesses the adequacy of the enterprise risk management systems in managing human rights during the company's last reporting year. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com & Our approach - Human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.com]
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: The Company provides an e-learning course on human rights, available to all workers and consultants. Furthermore, during 2017, 500 people registered for the human rights e-learning awareness training, giving us a running total for registration of 3,500,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	Company's own operations		<p>since its launch in 2016. This awareness training is made available to Statoil employees and consultants through the Statoil University. Human rights focus sessions were included on the agenda of various management meetings during 2017. These sessions offered insight and practical examples on the human rights issues specifically relevant for these management teams. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions • 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: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers • Not met: Communicating policy to EX contractors and joint ventures: No disclosure of steps taken to communicate policy to extractive partners was found. The supplier declaration covers each ILO core area. However it is not clear whether it covers extractive business partners (and no definition of "suppliers" found suggesting the inclusion of extractive partners in the definition). The supplier declaration is to be signed. [The Equinor Book 2018, 16/05/2018: equinor.com] • Not met: Including to EX BPs (removed) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on EX BPs
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The company indicates that it "provides regular training across the organisation to build awareness and understanding of our Code of Conduct and anti-corruption compliance programme. In addition to in-person workshops, we have a mandatory Code of Conduct e-learning". The code contains the company's human rights commitments. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com] • Not met: Trains relevant EX managers including security personnel: The company declares that "We expect the public and private security providers and law enforcement authorities we utilize to ensure that their security personnel are aware of, have been trained in, understand and adhere to the principles underlying the VPSHR – the UN Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials, and the UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials". However, no evidence of actual trainings taking place was found. Also, the company indicates that activities aimed at increasing awareness of human rights took place in 2018, and this included "expectations to suppliers were conveyed and discussed in senior management meetings with key suppliers within construction and marine segments. (...)Expectations to suppliers were conveyed and discussed in senior management meetings with key suppliers within construction and marine segments". Nevertheless, no evidence of proper training was found. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com & UK Modern Slavery Statement 2018, 05/03/2019: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: The Company indicates on the human rights section of its website that 'our human rights efforts cover topics such as community impact, labour standards and security. Human rights aspects are incorporated in our annual monitoring plans, as relevant, based on risk'. [Human Rights commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] • Not met: Monitoring EX BP's <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of EX 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 EXs business partners: The Company indicates in its Sustainability report that it expects that its suppliers and partners respect

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>internationally recognised human rights. As it states in the risk management section of the website, ‘in countries or contexts in which exposure to human rights breaches are particularly significant, dedicated human rights assessments may be carried out. Human rights are addressed as a part of our standard integrity due diligence (IDD) research of third parties with whom we may enter into a business relationship. Our standard contracts require adherence to national laws and regulations and, where necessary, all efforts are made to include specific provisions relating to human rights in contracts with partners and suppliers’. Although it provides details on human rights requirements for suppliers (the supplier declaration covers all ILO core) and security services (as stated in the sustainability report, ‘we include human rights criteria as part of pre-qualification screening, integrity due diligence, and in contractual provisions and clauses, as appropriate’), no further details have been provided for extractive business partners and the human rights considered.</p> <p>In 2017 the Company indicates that it ‘continued with our supplier human rights verification activities, while continuing to train suppliers and personnel in Statoil with responsibility for contract and supplier management. We also introduced a new compliance appendix for procurement contracts that is being rolled out globally for new contracts, covering, inter alia, human rights, ethics, anti-corruption and sanctions clauses. Work was also started during 2017 on the drafting of principles for sustainable supply chains that will provide suppliers with supplementary guidance for specific human rights-related contract requirements contained in the compliance appendix. This will be finalised and implemented during 2018.’ It is not clear if this process extends to involvement in joint ventures. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & Risk Management and governance, 25/05/2018]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with EX business partners to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Stakeholder process or systems: The Company indicates in the engagement and dialogue section of its website that ‘our operational management system requires us to establish an open communication channel with community stakeholders to deal with any potential grievances’. ‘Our operations also make use of public consultations, surveys, interviews, one-to-one meetings and community panels to better understand the expectations from local communities, and to devise mitigation strategies and plans that best suit local conditions’. It has not published any documents describing how it identifies those at heightened risk of vulnerability and stating whether it engages with workers amongst its extractive business partners on Human rights issues. In the context of the company’s plans to drill Great Australian Bight, it indicates that “we are committed to transparency and have engaged broadly in the community and beyond. Ever since we became the owner and operator of the exploration permit in June 2017, we have travelled across South Australia and beyond, meeting with interested groups. We have spoken with hundreds of individuals and organisations during this process and attended more than 130 meetings”. Also, the company specifies that “relevant persons are state and Commonwealth relevant persons (department, agencies and authorities); people and organisations who have an interest that is close to the drilling activity and might be impacted. So far, the company has meet: Individual community members; Charities; Fishers; Fishing organisations; State and Commonwealth agencies and departments; Local government (councils); Aboriginal; Academic; Aquaculture; eNGOs; Conservation groups; Tourism operators; Unions; Politicians; Sporting bodies; Business groups. However, this is only the context of one of the company’s operation. It is not clear how has identified, and engaged with affected and potentially affected stakeholders in the last two years in the rest of its activities. [Engagement commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com & Australia - Consultation and engagement, 17/06/19: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • 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	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 indicates on the risk management section of its website that 'human rights due diligence are integrated in all the Company's general systems for assessing and managing risks and impacts. In countries or contexts in which exposure to human rights breaches are particularly significant, dedicated human rights assessments may be carried out.' The Company also indicates on the human rights area of the website that 'we assess human rights aspects and potential impacts of our ongoing activities and new business opportunities in order to avoid adverse impacts on individuals and nearby communities potentially affected by our operations. Our human rights efforts cover topics such as community impact, labour standards and security. Human rights aspects are incorporated in our annual monitoring plans, as relevant, based on risk'. <p>The Company has not disclosed any public document with information regarding consultation with human rights experts, and details on when HRIAs or ESIAS that include human rights are/will be carried out, nor how systems are triggered [Risk Management and governance, 25/05/2018]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: identifying risks in EX business partners: In relation to business relationship, the Company states 'Human rights are addressed as part of our standard integrity due diligence (IDD) research of third parties with whom we may enter into a business relationship' [Risk Management and governance, 25/05/2018] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: The Company indicates that 'risk management is an integrated part of all our business processes and decisions. Equinor has developed an integrated human rights risk assessment tool allowing us to evaluate risk to people in all operations and supply chain activities. This approach enables Equinor's senior leaders to take holistic business decisions, which incorporates mitigating measures and risk re-assessments. In this way, risk to people's human rights are regularly reported to CEC and Board of Directors as part of the internal risk reporting process. Our management system allows the human rights, country entry and supply chain risk assessments to be evaluated alongside our Impact Assessments and in conjunction with key milestones within our Capital Value Process". [Our approach - Human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.com] • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Met: Triggered by new circumstances: See above. Our management system allows the human rights, country entry and supply chain risk assessments to be evaluated alongside our Impact Assessments, which are used in all operations and supply chain activities.. [Our approach - Human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.com] • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): The Company indicates that 'in joint ventures and in partner operated projects, we endeavour to promote Statoil's principles for impact assessment as a tool for managing environmental and social impacts in project performance'. It also says that 'our requirements for impact assessments are based on national requirements in the countries we operate'. However, it is not clear when social impact assessments (ESIAS) that include human rights are or will be carried out. [Impact Assessments, 17/07/19: equinor.com]
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	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: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: In the Company's Sustainability Report 2016, under the heading "Operationalising our Human Rights Policy" the Company states it uses risk and impact assessment processes and tools, scoped around the key elements included in the UNGP such as due diligence, training and remedy. Furthermore, the Company identifies three broad focus areas for human rights relative to the Company's activities, these include labour rights and working conditions of the workforce and suppliers, respecting human rights in security arrangements and respecting human rights of individuals in communities. [Sustainability Report 2016, 31/12/2016: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings	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: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company states in the "Risk management and governance" section of its website 'To manage risks in our day to day activities, we apply our Compliance and Leadership Model to ensure safe,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	internally and taking appropriate action		<p>consistent and high quality deliveries across the value chain', and details on the Compliance and Leadership Model approach can be found in the Equinor Book. It does not make clear whether human rights issues are incorporated in this risk management process. [Risk Management and governance, 25/05/2018 & The Equinor Book 2018, 16/05/2018: equinor.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including amongst EX BPs • Not met: Example of Actions decided: The Company indicates that 'in 2018 we conducted the highest number of supplier verifications performed during a year to date, covering select suppliers in our first and second tier supply chain identified as being particularly exposed to potential breaches of workers' human rights. For one construction site we trialled a new form of direct supplier engagement, which is based on in-depth interviews with select workers. To date, this has resulted in a concrete action plan to prevent and remediate identified challenges regarding with the workers' situation, which we are supporting for instance by providing external expert resources and capacity building. During 2018 we conducted 75 supplier verifications, interviewing more than 1,000 workers". However, this seems related to changes in procedures for compliance monitoring rather than action plan to mitigate a particular human rights salient issue. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective: The company indicates that "in 2018, Equinor's corporate audit team performed a review of activities related to the supply chain, to ensure that systems and processes are supporting a meaningful implementation of our human rights policy". However, it is not clear if there is system for tracking the actions taken in response to human rights risks and impacts assessed and for evaluating whether the actions have been effective or have missed key issues or not produced the desired results. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	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: 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 business partners <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company indicates in its Code of Conduct that 'the Ethics Helpline is a multi-language service 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and provides a toll-free phone service and web submission portal. It is available for any person who has a legitimate concern. You may choose remain anonymous where allowed by law'. The human rights section of the code indicates to the employee to 'report any human rights abuse in our operations or in those of our business partners'. The Company indicates in its Sustainability report that 107 cases were received in 2017 including 24 reported concerns relating to harassment, discrimination and personal misconduct. The Company has not published any further details on the number of human rights grievance received and addressed or resolved, nor an evaluation of the effectiveness of the channel. [Equinor's Code of Conduct, 06/2018: equinor.com & Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system: The company indicates that "in larger operations we have implemented community-based grievance mechanisms (...). Long-standing community based non-judicial grievance mechanisms are accessible at our operations in Tanzania and Brazil (...). For assets where our partners are operating, we expect an equivalent grievance system to be in place". [Grievance mechanisms, 16/07/19: equinor.com] • Not met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: The Company indicates in its Sustainability report that 'the ethics helpline is available 24/7 to both employees and the general public'. In addition, the Company has a framework for community grievance mechanisms. As stated in the sustainability report, the Company 'operated country specific grievance mechanisms in support of the Sheringham Shoal offshore wind farm in the UK, our activities in Tanzania, and our offshore oil and gas operations in Brazil... For our activities in Canada and our offshore oil and gas activities in the UK we participate in grievance and remediation processes that form part of the local regulatory process or that are coordinated by industry representative bodies.' [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: The Company's helpline is independently hosted; available online for anyone involved or affected by the Company's activities, and is in 6 different languages. [Our commitment to respecting human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.com] • Met: EX BPs communities use global system: The Company has an 'independently hosted helpline available for anyone involved in or affected by our activities to raise a concern. We call this the Ethics helpline, as it is related to our efforts to act in an ethical, sustainable and socially responsible manner, which includes respect for human rights. All information provided into this helpline is confidential and anonymous and is available in six different languages'. [Our approach - Human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.com & Our commitment to respecting human rights, 16/07/19: equinor.com]
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	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: Engages users to create or assess system: In the Company's Sustainability Report for 2016, under the heading "Community Grievance Mechanisms", it states that "these mechanisms are designed in collaboration with community representatives to reflect their needs, with the intention that that are culturally suited and do not impede communities access to their appropriate judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms." The Company also cooperates with other non-judicial and judicial remedy processes including the OECD National Contact Points and Ombudsman offices. Furthermore, the Company provides examples of how it engage with users in the design of these systems in the USA and Canada. [Sustainability Report 2016, 31/12/2016: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with users on system performance • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: EX BPs consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level: The Company only indicates in the Sustainability report 'the number and types of cases from the Ethics Helpline are reported quarterly to the board of directors.' No other information about how complaints may escalate to senior or independent levels was found in the new material. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com]
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The Company states in its Sustainability report that the 'Ethics Helpline is structured to allow for anonymous reporting' and that the Company has a 'strict no-retaliation policy for anyone who reports in good faith,' [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects EX BPs to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms: The Company states that "cooperate, as appropriate, with other non-judicial and judicial remedy processes, such as the OECD National Contact Points and Ombudsman offices, as well as providing the applicable regulatory and legal processes for grievance handling and access to remedy." [Sustainability Report 2016, 31/12/2016: equinor.com] • 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: The Company states in its Sustainability report that 'In 2017 there were no grievances reported through the mechanisms in Tanzania and Brazil. Two grievances were received in connection with our Sheringham Shoal wind farm both of which have been settled.' It does not explain what the grievances were about or what it did to resolve these issues. No additional information was found in the new material checked. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com] • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.1	Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage target timeframe or achieved • Not met: Describes how living wage determined <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Pays living wages • Not met: Reviews living wages definition with unions
D.3.2	Transparency and accountability (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Member of EITI: The Company is member of the EITI and also discloses a specific report on payments to governments on its website. In its "Payments to Governments Report 2018", it discloses revenues, licenses, projects, taxes paid, etc. in the countries where it operates. [Payments to governments 2018, 2018: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Reports taxes and revenue by country: In its "Payments to Governments Report 2018", it discloses revenues, licenses, projects, taxes paid, etc. in the countries where it operates. [Payments to governments 2018, 2018: equinor.com]
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (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"> • Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation • Met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining: The Company has only disclosed that 73% of its employees in Norway are members of trade unions, according to the Sustainability report, which represents approximately 65% of employees globally. The Company has not published a policy or any other documents stating its commitment not to interfere with the right of workers to form or join trade unions and to bargain collectively. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] <p>Score 2</p> <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)	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: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company reports figures for the period 2013-2018 on: Serious incident frequency (0.5 in 2018); Total recordable injury frequency (2.8 in 2018); Lost time injury frequency (1.1 in 2018) and fatalities (0 employees, 0 contractors in 2018). [Sustainability Data Hub - web, 01/04/2019: sustainability.equinor.com & Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: See above. Met: Fatalities disclosures: See above. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Set targets for H&S performance: The Company states that 'The targets set in 2017 were 0.6 (number of incidents per million hours worked) for total SIF.' However, the Company has not set targets for lost days or fatalities. In the SR2018, the company indicates that 'during 2018 development of strategic safety initiatives were continued, and a corporate improvement project was launched: "Safety beyond 2020". The goal of this project is to further strengthen the safety culture and performance in Equinor through embedment of safety thinking and proactive behavior at all organizational levels'. The public disclosure of the goals of this project was not found. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com] Not met: Met targets or explains why not: The company indicates that it "seen a continuous decline in the number of work-related illness cases (WRI) since 2014. Psychosocial factors including workload are the most important contributors to this positive development". However, targets were not found and nor was an explanation for other work related accidents and incidents. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com]
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Process to identify indigenous rights holders: The Company states in its Sustainability report that its 'activities in Canada involved engagement with Indigenous Peoples. For our onshore oil sands projects in Canada the engagement focused on the planned divestiture, including the transitioning out of some longer-term commitments. For our offshore activities in Canada, we focused on our planned exploration activities in the Flemish Pass, offshore Nova Scotia.' The Company has not either disclosed any documents describing its process to identify and recognise affected or potentially affected indigenous peoples. Not met: How engages with communities in assessment <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM): The Company states in its Sustainability report that in 2017 ' worked with our peers and external experts on building understanding of the differing regional and local expectations on free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and the rights of indigenous peoples and communities in specific regional and local contexts.' However, this is not sufficient as a commitment to FPIC. No new information or evidence was found in the SR 2018. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & Sustainability Data Hub - web, 01/04/2019: sustainability.equinor.com] 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 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)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC): The Company indicates in the Human rights section of its website that 'Statoil is an active participant in the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights Initiative and strives to respect and implement these principles in our operations. Our commitment to the principles is reflected in our policies and procedures for risk assessment, deployment, training and follow-up of private and public security providers in high-risk locations'. [Human Rights commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Example of respecting HRs in security: The Company states 'Statoil uses armed security services provided by the local government in Tanzania and Nigeria. Human rights training is provided in each case. In addition, such training is provided for unarmed guards and security personnel protecting our operations in Algeria'. In its Sustainability report the Company states 'In the area of security and human rights, we worked on maritime and offshore activities, and engagement with public security in host countries.' [Human Rights commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] • Met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach: The Company's Human Rights Policy sets out the principles for how the company relates to 'our employees, partners, contractors, suppliers and communities affected by our business activities.' The Human Rights Policy states the companies commitment to conducting security activities in line with their commitment to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. The Company states 'Prior to procuring security services, we include human rights criteria as part of pre-qualification screening, integrity due diligence and contractual provisions and clauses as appropriate. Where needed, our security providers are given training that is commensurate with their duties'. [Human Rights commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com & Human Rights Policy 2019, 2019: equinor.com] <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)	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: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks: The company indicates that "the purpose (of the company) has been to ensure that risk assessments and evaluations of solutions to further improve produced water management, are based on a holistic approach across business units". However, no description found of how it implements preventive and corrective action plans for identified specific risks to the right to water and sanitation in its own operations. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Water targets considering local factors: No target related to water stewardship that take into consideration water use by local communities and other users in the vicinity of its operations found. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: 13 people died after a helicopter crashed when it was in route to Bergen • Area: Health and safety • Story: On April 29, 2016, 13 people were killed after a helicopter crashed in route to Bergen, Norway. Among the victims was one employee of Equinor (at that time Statoil) and employees of Aker Solutions, Schlumberger, Karsten Moholt, Halliburton and CHC Helicopter Service. The helicopter, a Eurocopter Super Puma EC225LP, manufactured by Airbus, and operated by CHC Helicopter Service, crashed after having departed from Statoil's Gullfaks B platform in the North Sea. Three days before the incident, the same helicopter was reportedly forced to abort an offshore trip after a warning indicator lamp flashed on the cockpit display. Despite a component replacement, the warning light reappeared and other components were subsequently changed until the issue was considered to be resolved. An investigation by Norway's Accident Investigation Board has reportedly been launched as a result of the accident. • Sources: [Norway helicopter crash: 13 killed near Bergen - BBC News - 29/04/2016][Super Puma crash: Helicopter 'showed warning light' - BBC News - 01/05/2016][Name of Statoil employee released - Statoil press release - 02/05/2016]
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response available <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Response goes into detail: The Company communicated about the accident through several press releases. It reported that the Accident Investigation Board in Norway would investigate the accident, and said that Statoil would contribute. Statoil would also reportedly start its own investigation in cooperation with the employee representatives and the safety delegates. This investigation was to be coordinated with the work of the Accident Investigation Board. Statoil's

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			emergency response organisation was mobilised. Statoil's vice-president stated that the company had suspended oil production at the Gullfaks B platform to "take care of the staff in the best way possible". Operations were reportedly resumed at the platform after two days.
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Company policies address the general issues raised • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The company discloses on its website and in its 2018 sustainability report the number of fatalities, serious injury rate and serious injury frequency for the year. [Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com]
E(1).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Engages with affected stakeholders: In a detailed report on the helicopter crash, Equinor (Statoil) explain the follow-up and engagement that was conducted with the next-of-kin of those individuals who had died in the helicopter crash. This includes the establishment of a next-of-kin centre at a hotel to brief those affected by the crash and the provision of updated information through the establishment of a call centre. [Statoil report into Turoy helicopter crash, 29/09/2016] • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: There is no evidence contained within the report of compensation or remedy being provided to the next-of-kin of the individuals who died in the helicopter crash. The CHRB could not identify any other publicly available evidence of remedy being provided. • Met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: The report into the helicopter crash contains detailed information on the specific elements of the management systems that were reviewed, the overall mandate for the review addressed the following factors "Statoil's emergency response handling of the accident, including interaction with the authorities and partners; Statoil's organisation and activities related to helicopter services, including the division of roles and responsibilities between Statoil, helicopter operators and other stakeholders involved in the operation and maintenance of helicopter operations for Statoil on the NCS; How helicopter incidents are followed up by Statoil and the company's contractors/suppliers". [Statoil report into Turoy helicopter crash, 29/09/2016] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims: There is no evidence contained within the report of compensation or remedy being provided to the next-of-kin of the individuals who died in the helicopter crash. The CHRB could not identify any other publicly available evidence of remedy being provided. Thus remedy cannot be considered satisfactory to the victims. • Met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders: The company outlines a number of measures that have been undertaken on internal systems in the wake of the helicopter crash, including improvements to the storage of contact information in the DaVinci system. [Statoil report into Turoy helicopter crash, 29/09/2016]
E(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: A consortium led by Lundin Petroleum may have been complicit in war crimes committed in Sudan between 1997 and 2003 • Area: Security of Person • Story: Equinor holds 20% of Lundin Shares. In October 2018, The Swedish Government has authorised the prosecution of a case regarding the activities of two corporate directors within Swedish Oil company Lundin Petroleum (which Equinor holds a 20% share). The prosecution relates to an investigation into Lundin Petroleum, prompted by the submission of a report by the European Coalition on Oil in Sudan (ECOS) titled 'Unpaid Debt', for allegedly being complicit in crimes against humanity in Sudan and South Sudan between 1998 to 2003. These events occurred prior to Equinor's ownership in Lundin. <p>During this time there was a non international armed conflict between the Government of Sudan and the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Army, among others. According to the report, when Lundin formed a consortium which carried out oil exploration in an area called Block 5A, this activity set off a battle for control of the disputed region and exacerbated conditions, leading to thousands of deaths and forced displacement of local populations. It is claimed that Lundin Consortium provided logistical assistance or directly or indirectly financed the Sudan Armed Forces and allied armed groups, who stand accused of having systematically committed war crimes and crimes against humanity against the civilian populations. In November 2018 the Swedish Prosecution Authority issued a</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>notification of a corporate fine of SEK 3million and forfeiture of economic benefits of SEK 3,282 million against Lundin Petroleum in relation to past operations in Sudan. This fine would only be imposed at the conclusion of a trial, should one eventuate. However, Lundin's chairman and CEO both claim to be absolutely certain that neither they, nor any representative of the company did anything wrong during the time in Sudan. In an open letter published 15 November 2018 they claim that the report 'Unpaid Debt' makes false and baseless claims against the company.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources: [Sudan Tribune - 22/10/2016: sudantribune.com][BHRC: business-humanrights.org][European Coalition on Oil in Sudan - 27/02/2013: ecosonline.org][European Coalition on Oil in Sudan - June 2010: ecosonline.org]
E(2).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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 response available: Equinor doesn't provide a public response to the reports that Lundin executives will likely be charged by Swedish Prosecutors, nor does it point to the public response provided by the Lundin executives in the form of an open letter written by the CEO & Chairman. In previously reported comments in 2013 by the Stavanger Aftenbladet, Statoil states that the company will not comment on Lundin's involvement in other countries...Press spokesperson Ola Anders Skauby is quoted as saying "We've got a good cooperation with Lundin on the licenses where we both have interests," [Lundin Letter from CEO & Chairman, 15/11/2018: lundin-petroleum.com & Stavanger Aftenbladet article, 27/02/2013: ecosonline.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response goes into detail: Equinor doesn't provide a public response to the reports that Lundin executives will likely be charged by Swedish Prosecutors, nor does it point to the public response provided by the Lundin executives in the form of an open letter written by the CEO & Chairman. In previously reported comments in 2013 by the Stavanger Aftenbladet, Statoil states that the company will not comment on Lundin's involvement in other countries...Press spokesperson Ola Anders Skauby is quoted as saying "We've got a good cooperation with Lundin on the licenses where we both have interests," [Lundin Letter from CEO & Chairman, 15/11/2018: lundin-petroleum.com & Stavanger Aftenbladet article, 27/02/2013: ecosonline.org]
E(2).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: Equinor's 'Human Rights Policy' says "We respect all internationally recognized human rights, including those set out in the International Bill of Human Rights, the International Labour Organization Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and applicable standards of international humanitarian law." [Human Rights Policy, n/a: equinor.com & Lundin Human Rights Policy, 28/10/2015] • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The company's 'Human Rights Policy' says, "we expect our suppliers and business partners to follow the spirit and intent of this policy when working for or together with us"..."We will strive to exercise influence in our business relationships to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts to human rights directly linked to our activities". Equinor's stake in Lundin was non-controlling and so this is sufficient to apply to the type of business relationship. [Human Rights Policy, n/a: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The company in its Human Rights policy says "We respect all internationally recognized human rights, including those set out in the International Bill of Human Rights, the International Labour Organization Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and applicable standards of international humanitarian law". Additionally in its 2018 Sustainability Policy, the company says "Equinor is committed to conducting our security activities in line with our commitment to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights". The company is also listed as a corporate participant on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights webpage. [Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, 2019: voluntaryprinciples.org & Sustainability Report 2018, 05/03/19: equinor.com]
E(2).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Denies allegations, but has engaged affected stakeholders: Lundin Petroleum denies that it violated the norms of international law or that it participated in or had, or ought to have had, knowledge of any of the illegal acts in South Sudan. In an article titled 'Lundin Petroleum experience in Sudan' written by Christine Batruch, Lundin's Vice President of Corporate Responsibility, it says that

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>"As a principle, Lundin refrains from getting involved in the political affairs of a country; it believes that it cannot make a meaningful contribution in this sphere and prefers to restrict itself to its commercial mission. The situation it encountered in Sudan, however, was exceptional, and the company needed to make clear to the protagonists in the conflict that it saw peace as the best means to ensure sustainable oil operations". The article states that Carl Bildt, one of Lundin's Board of Directors, was responsible for meeting with high level representatives from the Sudanese Government as well as representatives from other nations including Kenya, Norway, UK and USA who were acting as peace mediators. [Lundin Petroleum report (Christine Bartruch), 24/11/2003: lundin-petroleum.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Denies allegations, but reviewed systems to prevent such impacts: In the article titled 'Lundin Petroleum experience in Sudan', written by Christine Bartruch, Lundin's Vice President of Corporate Responsibility, it says "The company learned that, despite its desire to restrict itself to a commercial role, it could not ignore either the socio-political developments in its area of operations or the claims—even if unfounded—of a possible connection between its activities and the conflict. A reaffirmation of its values in a Code of Conduct, a greater involvement in community life, stakeholder engagement and the suspension of activities were the tools adopted by the company in response to the challenges it faced". However this isn't sufficient detail about what the review entailed and how it was conducted. [Lundin Petroleum report (Christine Bartruch), 24/11/2003: lundin-petroleum.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Denies allegations, but implements review recommendations: In the article titled 'Lundin Petroleum experience in Sudan', written by Christine Bartruch, Lundin's Vice President of Corporate Responsibility, it identifies the lessons that were learned from its business dealings in Sudan, however it failures to provide details on the type of review that was carried out into its systems, and simply notes that, "A reaffirmation of its values in a Code of Conduct, a greater involvement in community life, stakeholder engagement and the suspension of activities were the tools adopted by the company in response to the challenges it faced". This is not sufficient detail. [Lundin Petroleum report (Christine Bartruch), 24/11/2003: lundin-petroleum.com] • Not met: Denies allegations, and ensures systems prevent such impacts: In the article titled 'Lundin Petroleum experience in Sudan', written by Christine Bartruch, Lundin's Vice President of Corporate Responsibility, it identifies the lessons that were learned from its business dealings in Sudan, however it failures to provide details on the type of review that was carried out into its systems, and simply notes that, "A reaffirmation of its values in a Code of Conduct, a greater involvement in community life, stakeholder engagement and the suspension of activities were the tools adopted by the company in response to the challenges it faced". This is not sufficient detail demonstrating that its systems will prevent similar impacts occurring in the future. [Lundin Petroleum report (Christine Bartruch), 24/11/2003: lundin-petroleum.com]

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	2.84 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Equinor made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 27 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 2.84 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 third party assurance states 'in our opinion, the safety and environmental performance indicators, as defined above, are, in all material respects, prepare and presented in accordance with the G4 Guidelines of the Global Reporting Initiative including the Oil and Gas Sector Supplement' . The Company states 'Our annual sustainability report is externally verified and prepared in accordance with recognised frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) G4 Guidelines and the UN Global Compact Communication on Progress requirements.' The Company also publishes a GRI Index. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & GRI Content Index 2018, 2019: equinor.com]
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Equinor 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
			<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 • Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts • Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 1 for D.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 2019 Key Findings report and technical annex for more details of the research process.

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

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

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

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