

Company Name Shoprite
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
Overall Score (*) 3.6 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
1.3	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.8	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
0.5	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
0.7	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
0.3	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	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: General HRs commitment: "The Company mentions the existence of a Code of Conduct and a Code of Ethics, however, there is no further evidence in the public domain. <p>The Company states in the Integrated Report that in 2018, "the Committee received and considered the following reports by management [...] the Group's compliance with the principles of the UN Global Compact Principles and the OECD Guidelines; [...] employment equity plans for the Group; labour practices and policies; compliance with the Group's code of conduct and ethics management and performance; [...] and environmental, health and safety performance'. However there is no further information about the materialization of those discussions." In addition, Sustainability Report 2018 states that its Social and Ethics Committee oversees some of the issues stipulated in UNGP and ILO, however, there is no clear commitment to those rights and the list of rights are not comprehensive. [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za & Sustainability Report 2018, October 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company mentions in the Integrated Reports regarding its compliance with the UN Global Compact, however, there are no formal commitments disclosed in public. [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] Not met: UDHR Not met: International Bill of Rights

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGPs • Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: ILO Core: The Company states in its Sustainability Report that it 'respect [s] the right of employees to join a trade union and engage in collective bargaining'. In addition, the Company states 'Our people enjoy freedom of association and the right to join trade unions.' However, this is not a clear commitment to freedom of association. The Company does not disclose a commitment to prevent forced labour or child labour. [Sustainability Report 2018, October 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core • Not met: Respect H&S of workers • Not met: H&S applies to AG suppliers
A.1.3.AG.a	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - land and natural resources (AG)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Respect land ownership and natural resources • Not met: Respecting the right to water: The Company states that it is seeing to improve water resilience in communities. However, there is no clear commitments disclosed regarding the right to water. [Sustainability Report 2018, October 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights Score 2 <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	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: Although the Company has an initiative to Empower Women, no evidence found of formal commitment to respect Women's rights. [We empower women: shopriteholdings.co.za] • Not met: Children's rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights Score 2 <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: Although the Company reports in its Integrated Report 2018 that it "maintains relationships with a range of interested parties to continuously improve the alignment of interests between the Group and its key stakeholders.", it does not take into account the groups which could be negatively affected by the Company, but only the ones which could affect it or benefit from it. The Company's criteria are as follows: ""the extent to which they can influence or benefit from the financial and operational performance of the Group; the degree to which we depend on their support to achieve our strategic goals; the extent to which they can influence the reputation and brands of the Group; and the risks and opportunities that may present themselves through our engagement, or lack thereof." [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <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 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEO or Board approves policy • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The Company has a board committee, the Social and Ethics Committee. It focuses in particular on the Group's strategy and performance in respect of: social and economic development; the promotion of equality and the prevention of unfair discrimination; the Group's ethics and the prevention of fraud, bribery and corrupt practices; the deterrence of human rights violations; the contribution to the development of communities in which the Group's activities are predominantly conducted; consumer relationships which includes advertising, public relations and compliance to consumer protection laws; the environment, health and public safety, and the impact of activities and products and services; and labour and employment. [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs: In the Social and Ethics Committee Report (Board Committee), Shoprite states that the Committee received and considered the following reports by management during 2018: 'the Group's compliance with the principles of the UN Global Compact Principles and the OECD Guidelines'; 'labor practices and policies', 'compliance with the Group's code of conduct and ethics management and performance' and 'confirmation that the Group adheres to South African legislation aligned to compliance with the International Labor Protocol on decent work and working conditions'. [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion [Sustainability Report 2018, October 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member • Not met: At least one key AG HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company describes its senior responsibility for ethical issues, including the Code of Conduct. However, there is no evidence that those ethical issues refer to ILO core elements. [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for AG in supply chain

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key AG HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers • Not met: Communicating policy down the whole AG supply chain • Not met: Requiring AG suppliers to communicate policy down the chain Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on AG suppliers
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: The Company states that All employees are expected to adhere to the code of conduct. However, the code is not publicly available and there is no evidence of ILO core elements in that training. [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains relevant AG managers including procurement • 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"> • Not 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 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: Although the Company describes an identification and engagement process, the definition of stakeholder used by the Company does not include the groups which could be negatively affected by its operations. In order to achieve this point the Company should show a systems to identify affected and potentially affected stakeholders or a description on how it engages on human rights issues by type or by stakeholder group. [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za & Sustainability Report 2018, October 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: The Company states 'Customers and members of the public are able to connect directly with us through common feedback platforms such as social media and our call centres.' In addition,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>The Company states it also deploys its CSI programmes to interact with communities. However, it is not clear how frequently the Company is engaging with its stakeholders. [Sustainability Report 2018, October 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Workers in AG SC engaged • Not met: Communities in the AG SC engaged <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	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: Identifying risks in own operations • Not met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers <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	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: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company indicates in its Integrated Report 2018 that: 'The Tip-Offs anonymous hotline is independently managed by a third party service provider. Employees are encouraged to report any unethical behaviour identified, anonymously and confidentially.' [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company reports the number of incidents of suspected unethical behaviour reported (129) and the number of disciplinary action, dismissals, resignations and/ or criminal charges presented as a result of this reports (18). However there is no further information about the issues reported, in order to identify which ones were related to human rights. [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] • 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 concerns from external individuals and communities	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 • 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			• 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.a	Living wage (in own agricultural operations)	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: Pays living wage or sets target date: The Company states in its Integrated Report 2018: 'The remuneration policy is aligned to Shoprite's approach of rewarding employees and management fairly and competitively, structuring remuneration packages in a manner commensurate with each employee's capabilities, skills, responsibilities and level of performance.' However, there is no reference to a living wage or how a remuneration is considered fair. [Integrated Report 2018, September 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] • Not met: Describes how living wage determined <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Paying living wage • Not met: Definition of living wage reviewed with unions
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 • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers <p>Score 2</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) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.1.3	Mapping and disclosing 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: Identifies suppliers back to manufacturing sites (factories or fields) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses significant parts of SP and why
D.1.4.a	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own agricultural operations)	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: Does not use child labour • Not met: Age verification of job applicants and workers <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remediation if children identified
D.1.4.b	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (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: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.a	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in own agricultural operations)	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: Pays workers in full and on time • Not met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.5.b	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (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: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.c	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on free movement 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.1.6.a	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own agricultural operation)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits not to interfere with union rights / Steps to avoid intimidation or retaliation: The Company states in its Integrated Report 2017 that it 'is committed to the principles of freedom of association and collective bargaining, as evidenced by a 27-year track record of recognising and interacting with Trade Unions.' In addition it indicates: 'Employees in RSA are represented by the South African Commercial, Catering and Allied Workers Union who holds a membership in the region of 33 000. This Union actively participates in the employment equity, skills development and occupational health and safety committees, among others. Eight other Trade Unions are recognised by the Non-RSA operations of the Group for the purpose of collective bargaining and organisational rights. Our relationship with Non-RSA Trade Unions are healthy. We are also proud to be the only retailer on the continent who has a relationship agreement in place with the Uni Global Alliance movement.' [Sustainability Report 2018, October 2018: shopriteholdings.co.za] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining agreements • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB 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.1.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Injury Rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosures Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Set targets for H&S performance • Not met: Met targets or explains why not
D.1.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (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: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements • Not met: Injury Rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosure Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.a	Land rights: Land acquisition (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders • Not met: Approach to doing so if no recent land deals Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How valuation and compensation works • Not met: Follows IFC5 in any state land deals • Not met: Describes approach if no recent land deals
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.a	Water and sanitation (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Water targets considering local factors • Not met: Reports progress and shows trends in progress made
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.a	Women's rights (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Process to stop harassment and violence against women • Not met: Working conditions take account of gender • Not met: Equality of opportunity at all levels of employment Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Meet all requirements under score 1
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 2.89 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 0.72 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	0.31 out of 4	Out of a total of 51 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Shoprite made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 4 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.31 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	Shoprite met 0 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions • Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers • Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly • Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts • Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 1 for D.1.1.a: Living wage (in own agricultural operations) • Not met: Score 2 for D.1.7.a : Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own agricultural operations)

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.