

Company Name Exxon Mobil
Industry Extractives
Overall Score (*) 22.7 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
2.1	10	A. Governance and Policies
1.7	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
1.7	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
9.4	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
3.8	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
4.1	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 "ExxonMobil is committed to respecting human rights as a fundamental principle in our operations, implemented through training and the application of our internal policies and practices. The company's practices and operations reflect the spirit and intent of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights." [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] Not met: International Bill of Rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs: In its Sustainability Report 2017, the Company indicates: 'Through many rigorous due diligence processes, ExxonMobil's approach to human rights, for example, closely aligns with the UNGPs.' However, this statement is not a clear commitment. [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: ILO Core: The Company's 'Standards of Business Conduct provide a worldwide framework for responsible operations and are consistent with the spirit and intent of the International Labour Organization 1998 Declaration Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. However, 'consistent with the spirit and intent' is not considered a formal commitment to the Declaration, according to CHRB wording criteria. In addition, as indicated above, it is not clear the extent of the

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>commitment to some ILO core standards. [Statement on labor and the workplace, 03/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs: ExxonMobil supplier, vendor and contractor expectations includes prohibition to child and forced labour and non-discrimination, but there is no explicit reference to freedom of association and collective bargaining. Although in its website section 'Respecting Human Rights', the Company indicates: '[...] our ExxonMobil's supplier, vendor and contractor expectations, a set of guidelines that outlines our expectations of contractors and suppliers inclusive of 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 Labour Organization Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.', the explicit reference to freedom of association and collective bargaining is still not included in the expectations for supplier, vendor and contractors document. [Supplier, vendor and contractor expectations (website) & Respecting human rights, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four 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. With respect the last two, the Company states: 'ExxonMobil recognizes and respects its employees' right to join associations and choose representative organizations for the purpose of engaging in collective bargaining in a manner consistent with applicable laws, rules and regulations as well as local customs as appropriate.' However, It is not clear whether it is committed to respect these rights in all contexts and locations (i.e alternative mechanisms for those countries where there are legal restrictions to the exercise of these rights), as the Company indicates that it respects these rights 'consistent with applicable laws'. [Statement on labor and the workplace, 03/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Respect H&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, 04/2017: cdn.exxonmobil.com & Safety, Health and the Workplace, 03/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: H&S applies to EX BPs: 'ExxonMobil expects its suppliers, vendors and contractors to: [...] promote a safe, secure and healthy workplace.' [Supplier, vendor and contractor expectations (website)]
A.1.3.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (EX)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Voluntary Principles (VPs) participant: In its 2017 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'We participate in the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, an initiative that provides guidance to extractive companies on human rights risk assessments relating to the safeguarding of company operations or facilities'. In addition in its Corporate Citizenship Report 2016, the Company states: '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: cdn.exxonmobil.com & 2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • 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: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • 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: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not met: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) • Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights: On its website the Company discloses the supplier vendor and contractor expectations, however, no explicit requirements found in relation to these issues. [Respecting Human Rights, 24/10/201: corporate.exxonmobil.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure Rights • Not met: IFC performance standards • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water: In 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. [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not met: Expects BPs to commit to all these rights: On its website the Company discloses the supplier vendor and contractor expectations, however, no explicit requirements found in relation to these issues. [Respecting Human Rights, 24/10/201: corporate.exxonmobil.com]
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: In its 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'. No new relevant evidence found in the latest Sustainability Report. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: cdn.exxonmobil.com & Socioeconomic Management: cdn.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • 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 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. No new relevant evidence found in the latest Sustainability Report. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: cdn.exxonmobil.com & 2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to remedy: In 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'. No new relevant evidence found in the latest Sustainability Report. [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 30/03/2016: cdn.exxonmobil.com & Socioeconomic Management (website): corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with EX BPs to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects EX BPs to reflect company HRD commitments

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	0.5	<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: CEO or Board approves policy: In its website section 'Respecting Human Rights', the Company states: 'Our Standards of Business Conduct and Statement on Labor and the Workplace guide and direct our efforts throughout our operations. All policies within these Standards are approved and administered by the board of directors.' The Statement on Labor and the Workplace cover Human Rights Issues. [Statement on labor and the workplace, 03/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com & Respecting human rights, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The Company indicates that 'Sustainability topics are routinely reviewed at board meetings and typically fall under the purview of the public issues and contributions committee, the board affairs committee and the compensation committee'. However, no explicit evidence found of this/or other committee being in charge of overseeing human rights issues. [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member: 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: cdn.exxonmobil.com] • Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	<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 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company provided evidence for this indicator to CHRB, however, it was not material. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	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: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy	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 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	commitment(s) within Company's own operations		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: On its website section 'Respecting human rights', the Company states the following: 'ExxonMobil has conducted human rights training for our employees for many years. We believe human rights training helps build understanding of such rights and awareness of potential impacts. In late 2015, we rolled out a new computer-based human rights training module to further enhance employee awareness of human rights. Since that time, more than 1,400 key employees in 46 countries have taken the training.' However, it is not clear whether all workers are trained/informed on its human rights policy commitments. [Respecting human rights, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 • 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	0.5	<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: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers • Met: Communicating policy to EX contractors and joint ventures: In its 2017 Sustainability Report, the Company 'In 2017, ExxonMobil's supplier, vendor and contractor expectations became part of an annual letter we send to our suppliers (supplier, vendors and contractors). 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.' [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com & Supplier, vendor and contractor expectations (website)] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including to EX BPs (removed) • 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: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: In its Sustainability Report 2017, the Company indicates: 'ExxonMobil is committed to respecting human rights as a fundamental principle in our operations, implemented through training and the application of our internal policies and practices'. In addition, in its website section about 'Respecting Human Rights', the Company indicates: 'ExxonMobil has conducted human rights training for our employees for many years. We believe human rights training helps build understanding of such rights and awareness of potential impacts. In late 2015, we rolled out a new computer-based human rights training module to further enhance employee awareness of human rights. Since that time, more than 1,400 key employees in 46 countries have taken the training.' However, it is not clear whether all worker are trained on its human rights policy commitments. [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com & Respecting human rights, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Trains relevant EX managers including security personnel: In its Sustainability Report 2017, the Company states: 'In 2017, more than 5,000 host government security and ExxonMobil-contracted security personnel were trained on the Voluntary Principles across 12 higher-risk countries.' [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: In its website section about 'Human Rights', the Company indicates: 'Respecting human rights in conjunction with our business activities consists of several core elements including adhering to corporate policies and expectations, complying with applicable host country regulatory requirements and universally recognized principles, and engaging with external groups. It also includes appropriate assessment and monitoring of labor and working conditions and people's access to basic necessities.' However, there is no further information describing its monitoring process. [Human Rights, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Monitoring EX BP's

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2: See indicator 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	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: HR affects selection EXs business partners: In its Sustainability Report 2017, the Company indicates: 'ExxonMobil's vendors must agree to meet our robust safety, technical, environmental and human rights expectations and requirements. For existing agreements, a select number of suppliers are audited each year for contract compliance. Audit components include pricing, safety, and drug and alcohol policy compliance. A contractor who does not meet our expectations may be subject to supplemental training and contractual remedies, including termination.' However, it is not clear HR affects selection of suppliers and whether suppliers includes its extractive business partners. [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not met: HR affects on-going EX business partner relationships: See above [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <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 • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • Not met: Engagement includes EX business partners workers • Not met: Engagement includes EX business partners communities <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	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: 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. No new evidence was found in the latest Sustainability Report. [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 30/03/2016: cdn.exxonmobil.com & 2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: identifying risks in EX business partners: See above [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 30/03/2016: cdn.exxonmobil.com & 2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): In its website section 'Respecting human rights', the Company indicates: 'Our company has developed a risk assessment tool — now integrated into our Environmental, Socioeconomic and Health Impact Assessment process — that enhances operational due diligence by strengthening awareness of potential human rights impacts and risks.' However, there is no further information about when the ESIA is carried out. [Respecting human rights, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com]
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and	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: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company states in its website section 'Respecting Human Rights' that: 'Our company has developed a risk

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)		assessment tool — now integrated into our Environmental, Socioeconomic and Health Impact Assessment process — that enhances operational due diligence by strengthening awareness of potential human rights impacts and risks.' However, there is no further information disclosed. [Respecting human rights, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: Although the Company discloses information in its 2017 CSR document and on its website about different initiatives in relation to human rights issues, no evidence found of a global system put in place to prevent, mitigate or remediate its identified salient human rights issues. [Annual Report, 2017: corporate.exxonmobil.com & Respecting human rights, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including amongst EX BPs • Not met: Example of Actions decided Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <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 Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: Procedures and Open Door Communication' section of the Standards of business conduct explains detailed procedures of reporting for all employees. [Standards of Business Conduct, 04/2017: cdn.exxonmobil.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system • Not met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers
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"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: In its Sustainability Report 2017, the Company indicates: 'ExxonMobil creates grievance reporting mechanisms that provide opportunities for local citizens and communities to raise concerns.' 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.' [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com & Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: cdn.exxonmobil.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects EX BPs to have community grievance systems

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: EX BPs communities use global system
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this <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: 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'. In addition, on its website section 'Community relations', it states: 'ExxonMobil creates grievance reporting mechanisms that provide opportunities for local citizens and communities to raise concerns. Management systems enable us to track, analyze and respond to community grievances in a timely and effective manner. The grievance process incorporates guidance from the International Finance Corporation and IPIECA on best practices for addressing community concerns.' However, there is no further information about: 'response timescales, how complainants will be informed and escalation process to senior/independent level.' No new relevant evidence was found in the latest Sustainability Report 2017. [Corporate Citizenship Report, 2016: cdn.exxonmobil.com & Community relations, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How complainants will be informed • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: 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. [Standards of Business Conduct, 04/2017: cdn.exxonmobil.com] • 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.' It is not clear whether there are alternative measures to prevent retaliation in those cases where the Company cannot guarantee anonymity. [Standards of Business Conduct, 04/2017: cdn.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects EX BPs to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation EX of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.1	Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage target timeframe or achieved • Not met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Pays living wages • Not met: Reviews livings wages definition with unions
D.3.2	Transparency and accountability (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Member of EITI: The Company is a member of EITI. In its Sustainability Report 2017, the Company indicates: 'Since its inception, we have been an active participant in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) — a global organization that promotes the open and accountable management of oil, gas and mineral resources.' [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Reports of taxes and revenues beyond legal minimums • Not met: Reports taxes and revenue by country • 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: cdn.exxonmobil.com] • Not met: Disclosures contract terms where not a requirement
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation: The Company has a commitment to respect the right of collective bargaining and freedom of association. However, The no retaliation policy included in the Standards of Business Conduct is related to retaliation 'for exercising any of the rights protected by this policy and the various EEO statutes.', and collective bargaining and freedom of association is not included in this Standards. CHRB could not find further information in its Standards of Business Conduct or other document where clearly prohibits intimidation or retaliation against workers seeking to exercise these rights are presented. [Statement on labor and the workplace, 03/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com & Standards of Business Conduct, 04/2017: cdn.exxonmobil.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
D.3.4	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company discloses its lost time incident rate and total recordable incident rate. The Company provides detailed explanations for the figures in its corporate citizenship report. [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: See above [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Fatalities disclosures: The Company discloses quantitative information on fatalities in its workforce, including employees and contractors. [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Set targets for H&S performance: In its 2017 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates that its ' global health and safety goal is zero injuries and illnesses.' [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Met targets or explains why not: The Company discloses information about its performance on health and safety: 'Since 2000, we have reduced our workforce lost-time incident rate by more than 80 percent. While this number is declining, safety incidents do occur. We deeply regret that two contract workers were fatally injured in separate incidents related to ExxonMobil operations in 2017. [...] <p>ExxonMobil's Operations Integrity Management System (OIMS) establishes a framework for addressing risk across all aspects of our operations. [...] OIMS also establishes a framework for addressing risk across our supply chain.[...] The success of ExxonMobil's operations depends on a healthy and competent workforce. We have corporate-wide expectations for identifying, evaluating and managing health risks related to our operations that can potentially affect our employees, contractors or the public.' [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com]</p>
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Process to identify indigenous rights holders: In its website section 'Community relations', the Company indicates: 'Indigenous communities can be especially vulnerable in a rapidly changing world due to their relatively small numbers and underrepresentation in governments. We are committed to engaging with indigenous communities in a manner that respects and preserves their cultures and customs. Our interactions with indigenous peoples around the world are consistent with the following guidelines: International Labor Organization Convention 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries; United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; International Finance Corporation Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability; World Bank Operational Policy and Bank Procedure on Indigenous Peoples' However, there is no specific information describing its process to identify and recognise affected indigenous peoples. [Community relations, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: How engages with communities in assessment: In addition, the Company indicates: 'When our business operations interact with indigenous communities, we conduct frequent consultations to maintain good relationships. This includes understanding how each individual indigenous community prefers to engage with ExxonMobil. For example, communities can decide if they want us to meet with elected leaders, community elders or other representatives, and whether those engagements should be conducted in a formal or informal public forum. Through open consultation, we work to understand and incorporate indigenous perspectives into project planning, design, execution and ongoing operations.' With respect Land resettlement, the Company states: 'When physical or economic displacement is unavoidable, we seek to restore the livelihoods of displaced persons by developing and implementing location-specific resettlement action plans. These plans are informed by consultations with landowners as well as surveying and mapping of housing structures, gardens, wildlife, natural products, harvesting areas and other assets. When appropriate, we assign individuals or groups to priority resettlement assistance programs.' [Community relations, 07/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM) • Not met: Gives recent example FPIC or dropping deal
D.3.6	Land rights (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders: 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.' <p>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. The Company provided the same evidence to CHRB during latest revision. [Land use and resettlement: corporate.exxonmobil.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.7	Security (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC): 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' No new relevant evidence was found in the latest Sustainability Report. [Corporate Citizenship Report 2015, 30/03/2016: cdn.exxonmobil.com & 2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • 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: cdn.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach: Furthermore, the Company states: 'In 2017, more than 5,000 host government security and ExxonMobil contracted security personnel were trained on the Voluntary Principles across 12 higher-risk countries.' And in Corporate Citizenship report, it indicated: '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, 30/03/2016: cdn.exxonmobil.com & 2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: cdn.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Working with local community: See above [Socioeconomic Management: cdn.exxonmobil.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.8	Water and sanitation (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks: In its 2017 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'We continuously work to improve our understanding of our water consumption, including when, where and how much. Using the latest version of a water tool developed by IPIECA, [...], we identified that almost 37 percent of our major operating sites are in areas with the potential for water scarcity. Therefore, we pursue site-specific management strategies such as the deployment of water conservation technologies, the use of alternative water 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. 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.' [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com & Water management: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Water targets considering local factors • Not met: Reports progress in meeting targets and shows trends in progress made

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: Papua New Guinea tribe representative allege Exxon LNG project is illegally settled • Area: Right to land • Story: 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. In May 2018, Jubilee Australia research center released a report which investigated the impacts of the ExxonMobil led PNG LNG project on the local affected communities. The report found that while some royalties had been paid to communities near the LNG plant, not all affected parties had received payment. The report also supported the observations made by Mr Ekanda, stating that the failure to pay appropriate royalties was partly due to incomplete land owner identification and vetting process, which should have been completed prior to the commencement of the project. • Sources: [EMTV - 12/11/2015 -: emtv.com.pg][NG Quarterly Environmental and Social Report, Third Quarter 2012 (p.24) -: pnglng.com][Post Courier, 27/12/2017 -: postcourier.com.pg][Australia Research Centre 29/04/2018: jubileeaustralia.org]
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"> • Not met: Public response available: As far as CHRB was able to ascertain, the Company has not responded publicly to the allegation. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response goes into detail
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Company policies address the general issues raised: On its 'Socioeconomic Management site', the company says "We seek to implement fair,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>transparent and collaborative processes to assess and manage the restoration of households including their livelihoods when our activities result in physical or economic displacement....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 it isn't clear what the 'Upstream Land Use Standards' are, and this is not sufficient evidence of a commitment to respecting ownership and use of land. [Socioeconomic Management: cdn.exxonmobil.com & PNG LNG Environmental and Social Report: pnglng.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The company doesn't provide a description of how it identifies legitimate rights of land tenure. [Socioeconomic Management: cdn.exxonmobil.com & PNG LNG Environmental and Social Report: pnglng.com]
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"> • Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders • Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders • Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims • Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders
E(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: Court allows Alien Tort Statute case over alleged complicity in human rights violations in Indonesia to proceed • Area: Right to security • Story: 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. • Sources: [The BHRRC -: business-humanrights.org][Mother Jones 11/01/2017) -: motherjones.com][Climate Home News 11/01/2017) -: climatechangenews.com][100 Reporters 16/07/2015 -: 100r.org]
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:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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". <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"> • Not met: Response goes into detail
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 • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
E(2).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: 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.” Not met: Denies allegations, but reviewed systems to prevent such impacts Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Denies allegations, but implements review recommendations

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	1.68 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 16 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 1.68 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Company reports on GRI: In its website section 'IPECA/GRI/SDG Index' the Company indicates: 'This index is also cross-referenced with the Global Reporting Initiative G4 Sustainability Reporting Guidelines and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.' [2017 Sustainability Report Highlights, 2018: corporate.exxonmobil.com & Context - Index (IPECA/GRI/SDG), 03/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] Not met: Company reports on SASB Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0.4 out of 4	Exxon Mobil met 1 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0.4 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management Not met: Score 1 for D.3.1 : Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs) 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.