

Company Name Lindt & Spruengli
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain only)
Overall Score (*) 5.9 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
1.4	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.6	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.0	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
2.0	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.2	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
0.7	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"> Not met: General HRs commitment: The Company indicates that it is committed to a policy of equal opportunity for employment, development and advancement for those qualified and maintaining a workplace free of discrimination. However, the Company does not have an explicit commitment to respecting human rights. [Business Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com] Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company is a signatory to UN Global Compact, stating "We have been committed to this initiative since 2009." [Business Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com & Sustainability Report, N/A: lindt-spruengli.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company is a signatory to the Global Compact. In the Sustainability report the CEO indicates that 'our sustainability strategy also reflects the ten principles of the UN Global Compact. We have been committed to this initiatives since 2009 and provide an update on the progress we have made in our annual Sustainability Report'. [Business Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com & Sustainability Report, N/A: lindt-spruengli.com] Met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers: The Company indicates that its suppliers shall not, under any circumstances, use forced, bonded or indentured

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>labor or involuntary prison labor. Employment is voluntary. Suppliers shall not, under any circumstances, use child labor as defined by ILO and United Nations Convention and / or national law, whichever is more stringent. Suppliers shall strictly adhere to all applicable laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination in hiring and employment. 'Suppliers shall respect the rights of employees to form and join trade unions and bargain collectively. If Suppliers operate in a country where these rights are impaired by the law, they shall allow their employees to freely elect their own representatives which can enter into dialogue with the Supplier about working conditions.' [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company has a formal health and safety policy including ensuring compliance with all applicable national and international laws, regulations and industry standards, training employees and constantly update their knowledge, tracking relevant indicators, and etc. [Health and Safety Policy, 04/2018: lindt-spruengli.com] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: The Company states that its suppliers shall provide their employees with a safe and healthy workplace in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and industry standards, especially with view to building safety, housing conditions, electrical installations, machine safeguarding and personal protective equipment. Suppliers shall involve workers in the process of identifying and mitigating risks to worker's health and safety. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com]
A.1.3.AG.a	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - land and natural resources (AG)	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: Respect land ownership and natural resources • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights: The Company states in its Supplier Code of Conduct that suppliers shall provide their employees with adequate working facilities which, at a minimum, shall ensure reasonable access to potable drinking water and sanitary facilities. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure Rights • Not met: IFC Performance Standards • Not met: FPIC for all • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.3.AG.b	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry – people's rights (AG)	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: Women's rights • Not met: Children's rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles • Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business Principles • Not met: Convention on migrant workers • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
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: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states that it is committed to providing the various stakeholders with a transparent and detailed overview of the company. It engages with stakeholders including consumers, employees, investors, civil society organizations and NGOs, farmers and suppliers, and etc. [Sustainability Report, N/A: lindt-spruengli.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company states that it is committed to offering an attractive working environment and maintaining or increasing already high levels of employee engagement, satisfaction, and retention. In 2017, it comprehensively evaluated the results of the employee survey conducted in 2016, derived measures for improvement, and then started implementing these. However, it is not clear how often the company engages with stakeholders. [Sustainability Report, N/A: lindt-spruengli.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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Commits to remedy Score 2 • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with AG suppliers to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) Score 2 • Not met: Expects AG suppliers 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: CEO or Board approves policy • Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs Score 2 • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion Score 2 • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member • Not met: At least one key AG HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 • Not met: Performance criteria made public

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR Score 2 • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for AG in supply chain
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 AG 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 risks is integrated as 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 • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations Score 2 • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Communicating policy down the whole AG supply chain • Not met: Requiring AG suppliers to communicate policy down the chain [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on AG suppliers: The Company states that its goal is to work with Suppliers to assure full compliance with these requirements as they, in turn, take the responsibility to implement these requirements and necessary due diligence processes with their own employees, agents, temporary workers, subcontractors, homeworkers, suppliers and sub-suppliers with whom they work with in the delivery of goods and services to the Company. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com]
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments • Not met: Trains relevant AG managers including procurement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments • Not met: Monitoring AG suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of AG supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR affects AG selection of suppliers • Not met: HR affects on-going AG supplier relationships: The Company reports that as a last resort, farmers not willing to follow the Ghana Hazardous Child Labour Activity Framework are excluded from its Farming Program. However, it is not enough to be awarded. [Sustainability Report, N/A: lindt-spruengli.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with AG suppliers to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Stakeholder process or systems • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • Not met: Workers in AG SC engaged • Not met: Communities in the AG SC engaged Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations • Met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers: The Company states that the Lindt Cocoa Foundation also co-funds a second research project of the International Cocoa Initiative (ICI). The objective of this project is to develop further the ICI's Protective Cocoa Community Framework with a view to discovering which risk factors are strongly associated with child labour and developing a scoring system for these factors. This will enable stakeholders to adopt a targeted approach to reducing the risk factors which can lead to child labour. Also, the Company discloses that 'address the locally

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>relevant challenges such as poverty, child labor, and deforestation and at the same time secure the supply of high-quality cocoa beans. We achieve this through higher productivity on the farms, diversified incomes, preservation of biodiversity and natural ecosystems, reduced risk of child labor, and improved infrastructure in communities'. [Sustainability Report, 31/12/2017: lindt-spruengli.com & Sustainability Report, N/A: lindt-spruengli.com]</p> <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)
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"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings 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"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including in AG supply chain • Not met: Example of Actions decided <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including AG suppliers <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	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: Channel accessible to all workers <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect AG supplier to have equivalent grievance systems • Not met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or	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: Grievance mechanism for community <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects AG supplier to have community grievance systems

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	concerns from external individuals and communities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: AG supplier 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: AG suppliers consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
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 • Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects AG suppliers to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts: The Company states in its Supplier Code of Conduct that suppliers shall comply with all applicable laws, regulations and industry standards concerning wages and benefits. Wages and benefits paid for a standard working week shall meet at least legal or industry minimum standards, or comply with legally binding, freely negotiated collective bargaining agreements, whichever is higher. They should always be sufficient to meet basic needs of workers and their families. No evidence found, however, on requirement to wages allowing some discretionary income. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers <p>Score 1 met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs (purchasing practices) • Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights (purchasing practices)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.1.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Identifies suppliers back to manufacturing sites (factories or fields): The Company reports that it implemented Farms Programs in Ghana, Ecuador, Madagascar and Dominican Republic and mentioned its actions against child labour. However, it is not clear on the supplier list in each place. [Sustainability Report, N/A: lindt-spruengli.com] Score 2 • Not met: Discloses significant parts of SP and why
D.1.4.b	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts • Met: How working with suppliers on child labour: The Company reports that it has a Child Labor Monitoring & Remediation System (CLMRS), in which is an action plan against child labour in Ghana. The CLMRS is consisted by training of staff, raising awareness among communities and making people more conscious of situations which might favour child labour, creating local child labour committees, and requiring unannounced visits two days per month. It also has remedy cases of child labour identified and conducting follow-up visits. In addition, the Company has an action plan against Child Labour which aim to diversify an increase farmer's incomes to make them less dependent on farming and selling cacao. [Sustainability Report, N/A: lindt-spruengli.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.b	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: The Company states in its Supplier Code of Conduct that deductions from wages as a disciplinary measure shall not be permitted unless authorized by applicable law and by a freely negotiated collective bargaining agreement in force. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.d	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on free movement Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: The Company states in its Supplier Code of Conduct that its suppliers shall provide their employees with a safe and healthy workplace in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and industry standards, especially with view to building safety, housing conditions, electrical installations, machine safeguarding and personal protective equipment. Suppliers shall involve workers in the process of identifying and mitigating risks to worker's health and safety. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2016: lindt-spruengli.com] • Not met: Injury Rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosure Score 2 • Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S • Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.8.b	Land rights: Land acquisition (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Rules on land & owners in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on land issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.9.b	Water and sanitation (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Rules on water stewardship in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on water stewardship issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.10.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found, and so the score of 4.70 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 1.18 out of 20 points for theme E.

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	0.67 out of 4	Out of a total of 42 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Lindt & Spruengli made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 7 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.67 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	0 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Company reports on GRI • Not met: Company reports on SASB • Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Lindt & Spruengli met 0 of the 8 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions • Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers • Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts • Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management

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.