

# Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



**Company Name** Exxon Mobil  
**Industry** Extractives  
**Overall Score (\*)** 18.5 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
1.7	10	A. Governance and Policies
1.3	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
1.7	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
8.1	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
4.4	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
1.4	10	F. Transparency

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

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

## Detailed assessment

### A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

#### A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: General HRs commitment: The Company has a statement that it respects human rights and this statement is also referenced in the report 2017 [Respecting Human Rights: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a> & Statement on Labor and the workplace: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a> ] • Not met: International Bill of Rights Score 2 • Not met: UNGPs: It also states that 'our approach to human rights is consistent with the United Nations (UN) Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights', however, 'being consistent with' is not considered as a commitment. [Statement on Labor and the workplace: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a> ] • Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: ILO Core: The Company's statement on labor and the workplace includes the prohibition of child and forced labour, non-discrimination and respect the right to collective bargaining and freedom of association [Statement on Labor and the workplace: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a> ] • Not met: All four ILO apply to EX BPs: ExxonMobil supplier, vendor and contractor expectations include the prohibition of child and forced labour and non-discrimination only. [Supplier, vendor and contractor expectations (website): <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a> ]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: All four ILO Core: See above [Statement on Labor and the workplace: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Respect H&amp;S of workers: The Company has a public commitment to provide a healthy and safe working environment for employees and business partners. These commitments are included in its Standards of Business Conduct. [Standards of Business Conduct, Apr 2017: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a> &amp; Safety, health and the workplace: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: H&amp;S applies to Ex BPs</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: VPs participant: In its Corporate Citizenship Report 2016, the Company indicates: 'We have been a member of the Voluntary Principles since 2002, and have served on multiple occasions as one of the corporate representatives on its steering committee.' [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Respecting indigenous rights: On its website section 'Indigenous peoples', the Company states: 'We respect indigenous peoples and their cultures, commit to conduct meaningful consultations with them, incorporate traditional knowledge and land use information into our plans, and seek mutually beneficial long-term relationships.' [Indigenous peoples: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: ILO 169: In addition, it indicates: 'Our approach to interacting with indigenous peoples around the world is consistent with the principles of the International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability, and the World Bank Operational Policy and Bank Procedure on Indigenous Peoples.' However, being consistent is not considered as a commitment. [Indigenous peoples: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: UNDRIP</li> <li>• Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: FPIC commitment: On its website section 'Land use and resettlement' the Company indicates: 'Prior consultation should be conducted when the temporary or permanent use of land for exploration, development, or production purposes has the potential to impact individuals, households or entire communities. Land access and acquisition, resettlement (avoidance of), compensation, and cash management is done in a fair and transparent manner following ExxonMobil's Upstream Land Use Standards.' This approach does not follow FPIC principles for all. [Land use and resettlement: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Vol Guidelines on Tenure</li> <li>• Not met: IFC performance standards</li> <li>• Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs</li> <li>• Not met: Respecting the right to water: In addition, Exxon Mobil proactively works on improving water efficiency, however, it does not have a commitment in the context of the right to access water. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Expects BPs to respect all these rights</li> </ul>
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: In its Corporate Citizenship Report, the Company states: 'We recognize the significant responsibilities we have to our shareholders, neighbours, customers and communities as we find ways to bring affordable energy to the global market. For a company of our size and scope, building and maintaining relationships with a diverse group of stakeholders is critical. Regular stakeholder engagement helps us understand a variety of perspectives and improve our company's performance.' In addition, in its Socioeconomic Management document, it states: 'We continually engage with our stakeholders, inform them of plans and activities, and appropriately incorporate their input into designs and operations'. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a> &amp; Socioeconomic Management: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design</li> <li>• Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: The Citizenship report provides the review of the company's corporate citizenship activities by its External Citizenship Advisory Panel (ECAP): 'The ECAP consists of academics, nongovernmental organization (NGO) representatives and former government</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			employees who have expertise in social, governance and environmental topics. In addition to providing input on ExxonMobil's annual Corporate Citizenship Report, the ECAP discusses key topics with company executives at least once a year.' However no evidence found of engagement with affected stakeholders and/or their representatives (workers, their families, local communities, etc.) in the development or monitoring of human rights approach. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a> ]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Commits to remedy: In the community relations section of the Corporate Citizenship report 2015, the Company states that 'We utilize ESHIAs to identify the actual and potential impacts of a specific project and ways to avoid, reduce or remedy those impacts'. [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 2015: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a> &amp; Socioeconomic Management (website): <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies</li> <li>• Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives</li> <li>• Not met: Work with EX BPs to remedy impacts</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs)</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Expects EX BPs to reflect company HRD commitments</li> </ul>

## A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: CEO or Board approves policy: The Board of Directors of the Corporation has adopted and oversees the administration of the Corporation's Standards of Business Conduct. The Standards have been signed by the chairman of the board. However, the Company does not clarify that the Standards of Business Conduct cover Human Rights Issues. [Standards of Business Conduct, Apr 2017: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO</li> </ul>
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs</li> <li>• Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both examples and process</li> </ul>
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Incentives for at least one board member: In the Proxy statement the Company describes the performance criteria/areas considered within compensation, and this includes safety performance and operations integrity, such as Lost-time injuries and Illnesses rate. There is no evidence, however, on whether the Company takes into consideration health and safety performance of local communities and workers in extractive business partners. [Proxy Statement, 2018: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&amp;S</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Performance criteria made public</li> </ul>

## 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 • Not met: Senior responsibility fo HR (inc ILO) Score 2 • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: HR part of enterprise risk system Score 2 • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations Score 2 • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs: In its Corporate Citizenship 2016, the Company indicates: ' We published our ExxonMobil Supplier Expectations, a set of guidelines for our contractors and suppliers that covers human rights. These Expectations include references to key international human rights frameworks such as the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the International Labor Organization Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. Starting in 2017, the Supplier Expectations will become part of ExxonMobil's annual letter to our suppliers [Company has being communicating].' However, it is not clear if extractive partners (including Join Ventures) are included in these communication actions and no evidence found in public sources on whether these letters are being sent. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a> & Supplier, vendor and contractor expectations (website): <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a> ] Score 2 • Not met: Including to EX BPs • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on EX BPs
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments • Not met: Trains relevant managers including security personnel: In its Corporate Citizenship Report 2016, the Company indicates: ' we delivered human rights awareness training tailored to procurement professionals in the supply chain. Through early 2017, we have trained approximately 100 ExxonMobil procurement professionals, and will continue training through the rest of 2017.' No evidence found, however, of all security-related personnel trained in Human rights. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a> ] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments • Not met: Monitoring EX BP's Score 2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Discloses % of supply chain monitored</li> </ul>
B.1.7	Engaging 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"> <li>• Not met: HR affects selection extractives business partners: In its CCR 2016, the Company indicates: 'To be a supplier for ExxonMobil, a local vendor must agree to meet our robust safety, technical, environmental and human rights expectations and requirements.' However, it is not clear whether supplier includes its extractive business partners. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: HR affects on-going business partner relationships</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> <li>• Not met: Working with business partners to improve performance</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Stakeholder process or systems</li> <li>• Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement</li> <li>• Not met: workers in SP engaged</li> <li>• Not met: communities in the SC engaged</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them</li> </ul>

## 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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company states that 'ExxonMobil defines our location-specific community awareness programs and government relations protocols using our Best Practices in External Affairs (BPEA) coupled with ESHIAs and/or Environmental, Social and Health Management Plans (ESHMPs). Our BPEA process is designed to help identify the specific needs, expectations and interests of host communities and aligns those needs with our community investment programs. We utilize ESHIAs to identify the actual and potential impacts of a specific project and ways to avoid, reduce or remedy those impacts. Together, BPEA and ESHIAs help build and maintain a positive and transparent relationship in the communities in which we operate.' This includes the identification of human rights related issues and covers business partners. [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 2015: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: identifying risks in EX business partners: See above [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 2015: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Ongoing global risk identification</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with HR experts</li> <li>• Not met: Triggered by new circumstances</li> <li>• Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)</li> </ul>
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	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"> <li>• Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company states that 'in 2015, we developed a risk assessment tool — as part of our Environmental, Socioeconomic and Health Impact Assessment (ESHIA) process — that enhances operational due diligence by strengthening awareness of potential human rights impacts and risks'. However, there is no further information disclosed. [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 2015: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	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"> <li>• Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks</li> <li>• Not met: Example of Actions decided</li> <li>• Not met: Including amongst EX BRs</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Channel accessible to all workers: Procedures and Open Door Communication' section of the Standards of business conduct explains detailed procedures of reporting for all employees. [Standards of Business Conduct, Apr 2017: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved</li> <li>• Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages</li> <li>• Not met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system</li> <li>• Not met: Opens own system to EX BP workers</li> </ul>
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Grievance mechanism for community: In its Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, the Company states that 'once a project starts, we provide local groups and individuals with communication channels to voice concerns. Our Upstream Socioeconomic Management Standard includes provisions for establishing a systematic and transparent grievance management process to address individual and community concerns about a project'. In its Corporate Citizenship 2016, it adds 'our community-tailored grievance management processes are clearly communicated through our ongoing community engagement, and allow us to track, analyse and respond to community grievances in a timely and effective manner.' [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 2015: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a> &amp; Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages</li> <li>• Not met: Expects EX BP to have community grievance systems</li> <li>• Not met: EX BP communities use global system</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Engages users to create or assess system</li> <li>• Not met: Description of how they do this</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Engages with users on system performance</li> <li>• Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance</li> <li>• Not met: EX BPs in creation or assessment</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Response timescales: In its CCR 2016, the Company indicates: 'Our community-tailored grievance management processes are clearly communicated through our ongoing community engagement, and allow us to track, analyse and respond to community grievances in a timely and effective manner'. However, there is no further information about: 'response timescales, who is handling the complaint,</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>how complainants will be informed and escalation process to senior/independent level.' [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: How complainants will be informed</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level</li> </ul>
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: Standards of business conduct states that 'no action may be taken or threatened against any employee for asking questions, voicing concerns, or making complaints or suggestions in conformity with the procedures, unless the employee acts with wilful disregard of the truth'. This document also indicates that: 'Employees wishing to make complaints without identifying themselves may do so', and describes the channels. It is not clear, however, whether there is a commitment to 'no retaliation' against other stakeholders and how the Company ensures there is no retaliation against them. [Standards of Business Conduct, Apr 2017: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: In addition, the Company indicates: 'All persons responding to employees' questions, concerns, complaints, and suggestions are expected to use appropriate discretion regarding anonymity and confidentiality, although the preservation of anonymity and confidentiality may or may not be practical, depending on the circumstances.' However, this are not considered practical measures to prevent retaliation as anonymity has not been promised. [Standards of Business Conduct, Apr 2017: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Has not retaliated in practice</li> <li>• Not met: Expects EX BRs to prohibit retaliation</li> </ul>
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms</li> <li>• Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms</li> <li>• Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided</li> <li>• Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition</li> <li>• Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts</li> <li>• Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism</li> </ul>

## 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"> <li>• Not met: Living wage target timeframe</li> <li>• Not met: Describes how living wage determined</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Pays living wages</li> <li>• Not met: Reviews living wages definition with unions</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Member of EITI: The Company is a member of EITI. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Reports of taxes beyond legal minimums</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Reports taxes and revenue by country</li> <li>• Met: Steps taken re non EITI countries: In its Corporate Citizenship Report 2016, the Company indicates: 'ExxonMobil supports the EITI application, validation and implementation processes wherever we operate. We are also currently working with governments in several countries, including Guyana and Mexico, which are considering joining EITI. There are currently about 51 countries that are compliant members or have been accepted as candidates to begin reporting under the EITI Standard' [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Disclosures contract terms where not a requirement</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation: The Company has a commitment to respect the right of collective bargaining and freedom of association. However, there is no further information disclosed in its Standards of Business Conduct or other document where clear measures to prohibit intimidation or retaliation against workers seeking to exercise these rights are presented. [Statement on Labor and the workplace: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a> &amp; Standards of Business Conduct, Apr 2017: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company discloses its lost time incident rate and total recordable incident rate. The Company provides detailed explanations for the figures in its corporate citizenship report. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: See above [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Fatalities disclosures: The Company states that 'we deeply regret that three of our contractors were fatally injured in two separate incidents related to ExxonMobil operations in 2016'. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Set targets for H&amp;S performance</li> <li>• Not met: Met targets or explains why not</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Process to identify indigenous rights holders: The Company states that 'communities can decide if they want us to meet with elected leaders, community elders or other representatives, and if those engagements are conducted in a public forum, either formal or informal. We empower the communities to establish their preference for how often and how long their members meet with ExxonMobil representatives, and who will provide their viewpoints or represent their wishes.' However, the Company has not described its process to identify and recognise affected or potentially affected indigenous peoples. [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 2015: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: How engages with communities in assessment</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM): On its website section 'Community relations' the Company indicates: 'Whenever land is necessary for projects, we adhere to applicable host-country regulatory requirements that govern land acquisition. If projects are externally financed, we comply with land use, access and resettlement requirements stipulated by the lender(s). Consistent with the 2012 International Finance Corporation Performance Standards, when working on traditional lands, we endeavour to obtain the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples before initiating significant development activities.' [Community relations: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Gives recent example FPIC or dropping deal</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not met: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders: On its website 'Land use and resettlement', the Company indicates: 'Prior consultation should be conducted when the temporary or permanent use of land for exploration, development, or production purposes has the potential to impact individuals, households or entire communities. Land access and acquisition, resettlement (avoidance of), compensation, and cash management is done in a fair and transparent manner following ExxonMobil's Upstream Land Use Standards.' However, there is no further information about how it identifies legitimate tenure right holders or how it plans to provide financial compensation or other alternatives in case there is land resettlements. [Land use and resettlement: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Describes approach to doing so if no recent deals</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: How valuation and compensation works</li> <li>• Not met: Steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.7	Security (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	2	<p>• Not met: Describes approach if no recent deals</p> <p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC): In its Corporate Citizenship Report, the Company indicates: 'Our Statement and Framework on Security and Human Rights includes guidance on working with both host governments and private security personnel in a manner that respects human rights. We also have agreements with private security firms with which we work that contain requirements to uphold human rights. These agreements include expectations for training and compliance with relevant local, UN and other security-related frameworks. In 2015, we updated our Upstream Operations Integrity Management System (OIMS) for security to address expectations regarding the Framework, including responsibilities for employees and contractors in our Upstream operations. We conduct assessments to verify implementation of the Framework as part of our OIMS process' [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 2015: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Example of respecting HRs in security: In its Socioeconomic Management document, the Company indicates: 'We recently performed a review of the process used to develop the ESHIA and EMP for the Chad/Cameroon pipeline project, which encompasses activities and facilities in the west-central African countries of Chad and Cameroon. [...] Based on the review, the team determined a key strength of ESHIA/EMP development process for the project was its far-reaching and sustained stakeholder engagement process. The extensive multilayer consultation process helped build support for the project, avoid disruptions and schedule delays, develop and implement appropriate environmental and socioeconomic safeguards, and deliver compensatory and social development programs for the most affected communities.' [Socioeconomic Management: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach: Furthermore, the Company states: 'In 2015, we updated our Upstream Operations Integrity Management System (OIMS) for security to address expectations regarding the Framework, including responsibilities for employees and contractors in our Upstream operations. We conduct assessments to verify implementation of the Framework as part of our OIMS process'. [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 2015: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Assesses and involves communities: In addition, the Company describes its work with the community in the Chad/Cameroon pipeline project: 'ExxonMobil conducted an ESHIA for the project between 1993 and 1999, and we produced the EMP thereafter. The ESHIA and EMP development process included nearly 900 village-level stakeholder.' [Socioeconomic Management: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Working with local community: See above [Socioeconomic Management: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> </ul>
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: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks: In its CCR 2016, the Company indicates: 'ExxonMobil works to manage our water use and limit adverse impacts to water resources and consumers from our withdrawals and discharges, taking into account such factors as quality and availability. We pursue opportunities to reduce our water use and develop site-specific management strategies such as the deployment of water conservation technologies, the use of alternative freshwater sources, recycling of municipal and industrial wastewater, substitution with lower-quality water sources and harvesting of rainwater.' In addition, on its website section 'Water management, the Company describes some initiatives related with water consumption in local communities: 'Using the latest version of the oil and gas industry association for environmental and social issues (IPIECA) global water tool, we identified that almost 35 percent of our major operating sites are located in areas with the potential for water scarcity. We pursue opportunities to reduce our water use and develop site-specific management strategies such as the deployment of water conservation technologies, the use of alternative freshwater sources, recycling of municipal and industrial wastewater, substitution with lower-quality water sources and harvesting of rainwater. [...] In 2016, the net freshwater consumption at our operations was 290 million cubic meters, a decrease of more than 3 percent from the 2015 consumption of 300 million cubic meters and a more than 9 percent decline since 2007.</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>When the Banyu Urip, Indonesia, operations required increased injection water volumes to maintain adequate reservoir pressure, we developed a large reservoir to capture and store excess water available in the wet season that would have otherwise not been used. Using the reservoir helped mitigate potential effects of our water usage on the local population during the drier months when water resources are scarcer.' [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a> &amp; Water management: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a></p> <p><a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Water targets considering local factors</li> <li>• Not met: Reports progress in meeting targets and shows trends in progress made</li> </ul>

## 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"> <li>• Area: Right to land</li> <li>• Headline: Papua New Guinea tribe representative allege Exxon LNG project is illegally settled</li> <li>• Sources: Tribe Leader Claims LNG Project Illegally Settled On Their Land - EMTV - 12/11/2015 - <a href="http://emtv.com.pg">emtv.com.pg</a> PNG LNG Quarterly Environmental and Social Report, Third Quarter 2012 (p.24) - <a href="http://pnglng.com">pnglng.com</a> PNG LNG Environmental and Social Report 2017 (p.22) <a href="http://pnglng.com">pnglng.com</a> Post Courier, 27/12/2017 – <a href="http://postcourier.com.pg">postcourier.com.pg</a> Jubilee Australia Research Centre 09/05/2018 and 29/04/2018 <a href="http://jubileeaustralia.org">jubileeaustralia.org</a></li> <li>• Allegation: In November 2015, press articles reported claims by Tuguba tribal leader Simon Ekanda alleging that the Exxon-owned Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) project in Papua New Guinea had illegally appropriated their land: "The LNG project is illegal because the Tuguba tribe, which I am the Chairman, did not give our consent for Exxon Mobil to have access to our private property (the land)," Ekanda said. He argued proper procedures had been ignored These processes include social mapping, clan vetting and land identification and were supposed to be carried out and solved before the project was established.</li> </ul>
E(1).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"> <li>• Not met: Public response available: As far as CHRb was able to ascertain, the Company has not responded publicly to the allegation.</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Response goes into detail</li> </ul>
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Company policies address the general issues raised</li> <li>• Not met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: As far as CHRb was able to ascertain, the Company does not have a public policy relating specifically to land. The Company has stated that 'ExxonMobil employs practices and policies to respect property rights in the locations where we operate, and we pay particular attention to those areas populated by indigenous peoples'. It has also said that 'we work with indigenous communities to respectfully protect their cultures and customs'. Exxon Mobil's Corporate Citizenship Report 2015 lists ILO Convention 169, UNDRIP and IFCPS as the principles with which the Company is consistent, however 'being consistent with' is not considered a commitment. The Company has not made clear whether these apply to business partners.</li> </ul> <p>The Company has also stated: 'Prior consultation should be conducted when the temporary or permanent use of land for exploration, development, or production purposes has the potential to impact individuals, households or entire communities. Land access and acquisition, resettlement (avoidance of), compensation, and cash management is done in a fair and transparent manner following ExxonMobil's Upstream Land Use Standards'.</p>
E(1).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	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"> <li>• Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders</li> </ul>
E(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area: Right to security</li> <li>• Headline: Court allows Alien Tort Statute case over alleged complicity in human rights violations in Indonesia to proceed</li> <li>• Sources: The BHRRC - <a href="http://business-humanrights.org">business-humanrights.org</a> 'Torture Allegations Shadow Rex Tillerson's Time at Exxon Mobil', Mother Jones 11/01/2017) – <a href="http://motherjones.com">motherjones.com</a> 'At State, Tillerson could get Exxon off human rights charges' Climate Home News 11/01/2017) - <a href="http://climatechangenews.com">climatechangenews.com</a> 'Exxon Human Rights Case Survives — on Claim that Execs Knew All Along', 100 Reporters 16/07/2015) – <a href="http://100r.org">100r.org</a> 'A Matter of Complicity?' report by International Centre for Transitional Justice (2008) - <a href="http://ictj.org">ictj.org</a></li> <li>• Allegation: A lawsuit filed against ExxonMobil in the Federal District Court of Columbia alleges that the company assisted human rights violations including torture, murder and rape perpetrated by the Indonesian military in the territory of Aceh during unrest in the 1990s. The lawsuit, filed in 2001 by 11 Indonesians, alleges Exxon Mobil employed and provided material support to the Indonesian military forces. It claims soldiers were under ExxonMobil's direction and control, making the company liable. The lawsuit was dismissed by a federal judge in September 2009, but the decision was appealed. On 8 July 2011, the Court of Appeals reversed the district court's dismissal of the case, finding that a corporation should not be immune from liability under the Alien Tort Claims Act. ExxonMobil filed a motion with the Court of Appeals asking the court to rehear the case before all the judges of a court and not before a panel. In September 2014, the District Court had allowed plaintiffs to file for leave to amend their complaint in order to try to demonstrate that the facts of the case sufficiently 'touch and concern' the United States so as to overcome the presumption against extraterritoriality that applies to ATS cases. In a decision issued in July 2015, a US federal court ruled that the plaintiffs' claims sufficiently "touch and concern" the United States and may proceed in US court.</li> </ul>
E(2).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Public response available: ExxonMobil denies that it was complicit in abuses, but does not deny the events took place. In an article from 2017, a spokesman for the company said ExxonMobil “categorically denies any complicity in any human rights abuses committed by Indonesian soldiers during an Indonesian civil war”.</li> </ul> <p>In a 2001 press article it said: “The company said its internal investigation found that managers on the scene were never told of the atrocities by local employees at the time, and that the troops who guarded the gas operations were not used in offensive operations.”</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Response goes into detail</li> </ul>
E(2).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Company policies address the general issues raised</li> <li>• Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company has been a member of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights since 2002.</li> </ul>
E(2).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Denies allegations, but has engaged affected stakeholders: ExxonMobil denies that it was complicit in abuses, but does not deny the events took place. In an article from 2017, a spokesman for the company said ExxonMobil “categorically denies any complicity in any human rights abuses committed by Indonesian soldiers during an Indonesian civil war”. In a 2001 press article it said: “The company said its internal investigation found that managers on the scene were never told of the atrocities by local employees at the time, and that the troops who guarded the gas operations were not used in offensive operations.”</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Denies allegations, but reviewed systems to prevent such impacts</li> <li>• Not met: Denies allegations, but implements review recommendations</li> </ul>

## F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	1.37 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Exxon Mobil made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 13 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 1.37 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	0 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Company reports on GRI: In its Corporate Citizenship Report 2016, the Company indicates the following: 'The majority of these indicators are also consistent with the indicators used by the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) in its G4 Sustainability Reporting Guidelines; this report is informed by the G4 guidelines but has not been prepared in accordance with a particular GRI model'. No evidence found of a GRI index allowing to navigate the non-financial information. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: <a href="http://cdn.exxonmobil.com">cdn.exxonmobil.com</a> &amp; IPECA/ GRI / SDG Index: <a href="http://corporate.exxonmobil.com">corporate.exxonmobil.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Company reports on SASB</li> <li>• Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF</li> </ul>
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Exxon Mobil met 0 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)</li> </ul> Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned</li> </ul> Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management</li> <li>• Not met: Score 1 for D.3.1 : Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for D.3.4 : Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)</li> </ul>

### 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.